CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—THIRTIETH PARLIAMENT

25 Elizabeth II

VOLUME XIV, 1976

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE, 1976,
TO THE TWELFTH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1976, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

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

95570—1½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 8, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Monday, June 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue with my remarks on Bill C-84 which I commenced last night. Last evening I suggested that the abolitionists should become jail guards; I think they would then find out first hand what a precarious occupation it is, especially when dealing with dangerous murderers like Lucas and Kelly.

I was commenting last night on Donald Kelly's latest escapade when he attempted escape from jail with a toy gun. I was pointing out that it was not only a toy gun, it was a gun plain and simple. If a fake gun can be smuggled into or manufactured in a prison cell, then just as easily can a real one. As romantic as he may be at a distance, Kelly is a convicted murderer with experience in prison breakouts. It was only a fluke that he was unable to take a hostage, a procedure for which a toy gun concealed is every bit as effective as a real gun exposed. His overnight seige in the North Bay jail might have ended in an escape or shoot-out; had the gun been real it almost certainly would have. North Bay was lucky this time, but that is all the more reason to ensure that there is no second incident. How did Kelly obtain the gun? Why was he in a cellblock area when he should have been in his cell? Only a thoroughgoing investigation will provide the answers and I think they should be provided promptly.

Members of parliament have received letters from psychiatrists with regard to dealing with these dangerous murderers. I should like to quote from a letter I received from two psychiatrists in New Westminster, British Columbia:

> Dear Sir:
>
> We are writing to recommend that you decide upon and vote in favour of retention of the death penalty. We also recommend that you use your influence to ensure that it is implemented where there are no extenuating circumstances to warrant stay of execution. More humane and acceptable methods than hanging should also be considered.

This is a matter I have raised on two occasions in the House of Commons. I presented a motion to the effect that this subject be transferred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, where we could hear witnesses and discuss alternate methods to the rope. I feel that if we did find a more humane method of executing a murderer, maybe some of the abolitionists would reconsider, but unfortunately my motion was turned down by the Liberals. These two psychiatrists go on to say this:

> Both of us were born and grew up in the heartland of Canada. We are well qualified psychiatrists who have spent the past twenty-five years interviewing and treating Canadians from all walks of life. We feel that this background and experience qualifies us to offer you an opinion on this subject, and that we have both a professional and social responsibility to do so.

That is the opinion of two psychiatrists, Mr. Speaker. They say plainly and simply that rehabilitation is impossible in many cases.

Recently there was a news article containing comments by two leading psychiatrists who are experts when it comes to dealing with dangerous criminals. They say that it is better to hang killers than to introduce long prison terms with no hope of parole. Dr. Elliott Barker, who developed Ontario's treatment program for the criminally insane at one of our big mental hospitals, and Dr. Barry Boyd, medical director of the hospital, have said that they are opposed to capital punishment but that the death penalty is a lesser evil than mandatory sentences of up to 25 years as proposed by the federal government.

Among the numerous communications relating to capital punishment that I have received in the past few weeks are many from people who are of the opinion that Bill C-84 symbolizes the permissiveness that they believe is a threat to their safety. To many people it symbolizes a soft-on-crime attitude that is only encouraging further violence. The vast majority of Canadians are calling for a change in attitude and direction.

I wish to make it clear from the outset that I believe capital punishment should be retained in all cases of premeditated murder and other extreme types of murder. I have on several occasions spoken and voted in favour of the retention of capital punishment, and that will be the tenor of my remarks today. There are those who claim that, as a result of nearly a decade of debating capital punishment in parliament, *Hansard* is full of every conceivable argument for or against capital punishment. Perhaps that is so, but the fact of the matter remains that the murder rate has been consistently increasing and the public is not satisfied with the solutions offered by the government.

A strong conviction is growing among Canadians that we need the death penalty as one way of reversing the permissive trend of the past decade. Indeed, every national survey has indicated that a vast majority favours the retention of capital punishment, including surveys commissioned by this government. Yet, rather than asking

themselves why so many people are calling for the restoration of the death penalty, the abolitionists continue to vilify these people. Abolitionists should ask themselves why so many good, decent, law abiding people desire a continuation of the death penalty. These people are not cruel, but they are concerned and they are demanding that their government and parliament become concerned too.

● (1110)

Advocates of abolition have never claimed that public opinion is with them. They seem to be satisfied with in playing the role of an elitist minority, and speak as if the desire to retain the death penalty shows some kind of blood lust or a perverse sadism. Very few people would find much pleasure in the sight of someone being executed. The public wants protection, it does not want cruelty. Most individuals want to serve notice on the criminal element that society is prepared to defend itself. They cannot receive such assurances from the legislation presently before parliament.

Everyone knows full well that Bill C-84 is a nothing bill which will do nothing to reverse the trend towards violent crime in this country. I am opposed to this legislation, not out of a burning desire to invoke the death penalty, but because I see Bill C-84 as one more step down the road of permissiveness. The death penalty is, indeed, a subject being discussed widely these days. During the past few months the print and electronic media have been flooded with commentary on capital punishment.

One of the questions confronting Canadians everywhere, and especially those of Christian persuasion is, is it ever morally right for government to take the life of a human being who has murdered. Christians are, of course, divided on this subject, though a candid examination of the Bible shows that both the old and new testament support it. There are those, of course, who claim to have religious objections to capital punishment but avoid the practical consideration of the command "Thou shalt not kill". Thou shalt not kill is better translated as, you shall not murder. It should be clear to every thinking person that while murder is always killing, killing is not always murder. Capital punishment is killing but it is far from murder. To say thou shalt not kill as an argument against capital punishment is a flagrant misrepresentation of scripture. The Bible says society has a right to put a murderer to death. Numerous people in my riding believe that the current government is not fulfilling its moral obligation to society or its Christian obligation to God.

Naturally one has to ask just what the retention of the death penalty would do. Abolitionists would argue that abolition does not result in crime run rampant, or social peace if the death penalty is restored. They would argue that capital punishment has no deterrent value whatsoever. With that kind of an elitist argument they ignore the real issue at hand. A former Chief Justice and President of the United States, William Taft, once said:

The abolition of the death penalty is a mistake. It certainly is a deterrent for crimes of bloody violence.

In looking at the deterrent factor one must consider it as an attempt to save innocent lives in the future and not, in isolation, in relation to the fate of the guilty murderer. This very parliament considered capital punishment a sufficiently effective deterrent to reserve it for the protection of policemen and prison guards during the five-year moratorium. I have never heard it said that capital punishment is no deterrent to murder. The only question anybody raises is whether it is an effective or significant deterrent. Perhaps we should look at the deterrent factor from the point of view of whether capital punishment would prevent all murders. I think not. Surely, we could not expect that any more than a 25-year sentence in prison would stop murder.

In speaking of the 25-year prison sentence, one has to seriously consider the possibility that such a law could be amended or even repealed at any time. Such a law is no guarantee that society will be protected from the criminal element. In all seriousness, I wonder how effective the 25-year sentence would be and how strictly it would be enforced. Given this government's lax track record I would suggest it would be a risky venture. In this debate one could quote reams of statistics, but he will find the common sense of most Canadians leads them to believe that the threat of the death penalty is a deterrent. It is superficial to even suggest that the threat of capital punishment has no deterrent value.

There are those who would suggest that capital punishment brutalizes society. So, however, does murder and that fact is seldom mentioned. The people of this country would not, I am sure, hesitate to say that a properly carried out execution is less brutalizing than murders reported in the press with the brutal headlines that read: Elderly couple hacked to death with axe; Four children slaughtered by prison escapee; Young woman raped and strangled; Thirteen shot in gangland rampage, and numerous others of a similar character.

It is the growing number of brutal murders that cause the obvious reaction when abolitionists pose the question, would you go and witness an execution? The answer is: Yes, but only if you will accompany the police to the bloody scene of a violent murder in which the victim was beaten, mutilated, knifed or shot. One would then ask which was the more brutal scene. A great deal of the apprehension and opposition to the death penalty is based on revulsion against the gruesome aspect of hanging. In this day and age the medical profession is capable of devising methods which are not only painless but also certain and efficient.

On April 1 I spoke in favour of having the subject of capital punishment referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to find a more humane way of applying capital punishment. I still stand by that suggestion. I do so because of two overriding concerns: First, the majority of Canadians favour retention; and, second, many people consider hanging barbaric. Some abolitionists say it is asking too much of anyone to enforce capital punishment. I contend that the responsibilities of office carry with them the responsibility of carrying forward the administration of justice.

The death penalty represents the final right of organized society to rid itself of those who will not conform in any respect to civilized life. Such people are a minority and are not to be confused with others who might take a life in a moment of passion. There are those abolitionists who would lead people to believe that those who favour reten-

tion want a blanket imposition of capital punishment. That is a falsehood. The vast majority of Canadians are normal citizens who find the death penalty a distasteful subject to discuss. Common sense warns them that the removal of the final right of society to carry out the supreme punishment tells the criminal that no matter how horrible and vicious the crime, his own life will be protected.

Several weeks ago I mentioned that in the many letters and phone calls I have received from constituents they share with me their concerns about being safe and that their children will grow up in a safe society. At that time I quoted Mr. William Gold, of the Calgary *Herald*, who described the type of individual society fears when he wrote:

> Contemporary society is producing a singularly savage type of animal, entirely lacking in comprehension of, or respect for, the lives of other people. These psychopaths know perfectly well what they are doing is wrong legally and morally, but the act of murder causes them no sense of personal revulsion.

Society wants guaranteed protection from that sort of individual because who can say where he will strike next.

I have always rejected the notion that society seeks vengeance. I call it simple justice and a desire for safety. Capital punishment has been upheld through the centuries because of the commitment of society to the sanctity of life. It is a principle of law that the penalty must in some way fit the crime. That is the basis of having a penal code.

The death penalty is based on the belief that taking a life is so great an offence it requires the supreme penalty. Having regard to the qualms of those who cringe at the death penalty, Hon. Ernest Manning made a very pertinent observation as follows:

> In this respect there is evident in society today a strange and indefensible inconsistency. Many of those who are the most vocal in demanding the abolition of the death penalty because they hold it to be morally wrong to put a murderer to death are frequently the same people who are champions of abortion on demand. In other words, they argue it is morally right to deliberately destroy the life of an unborn innocent child, but it is morally wrong to exact the death penalty in the case of a murderer who has deliberately taken the life of another human being.

Such reasoning is beyond me. If our country is to be consistent about the state's right to impose the death penalty, then we must reject the idea that it is legalized murder. If that were the case a soldier defending this country in war and a policeman using his gun in the line of duty would be guilty of legalized murder. I doubt very seriously if anyone in this House would be ready to say that we should disarm our army and police.

● (1120)

Mr. Speaker, in the numerous articles I have had the opportunity to read on the issue of capital punishment I have searched for the one argument, the one statistic, the one tidbit of new information which could somehow shed new light on this debate. The fact of the matter is that as individuals we have been too concerned about statistics to meet the real issue head on. That issue is that we, as elected representatives of the Canadian people, have a moral responsibility to deal with capital punishment. I for one will not shrink from that responsibility.

Throughout history as organized nations emerged it has been recognized that society has the right to impose any kind of penalty on any offender against the law. In every case where the law is broken there is a penalty of some sort. A state that can incarcerate an offender for 25 years surely is capable of applying capital punishment. In the discussions concerning murders we hear such comments from abolitionists as, "the murderer is a product of his environment" and, "society must show some degree of sympathy". It worries me, Mr. Speaker, that we might be heading down a road of uncontrolled permissiveness that would have us take the easy way at the expense of public safety. How much sympathy I wonder has been shown for the family and friends of the victims of ruthless murderers.

Even if parliament does pass Bill C-84 and abolishes capital punishment, I believe that every citizen of this country should ask the government in a resounding chorus: What are you going to do about your soft-on-crime record? This government has gone too far in its efforts to appease an elitist minority who have no concern about crime run rampant. Time and time again we have seen this government shirk its responsibility in the field of law enforcement.

In the area of law enforcement, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly mention one segment of our society which will be especially endangered by the abolition of capital punishment,—our police and prison guards. There was a time when the boys in blue were held in high regard, indeed respected, and it was the boyhood dream of many to some day be a policeman. In view of the way our law enforcement officers are being hindered and threatened, must we say that those law enforcement officers who die in the course of duty will do so in vain! I should hope not.

The Nuremburg trials, Mr. Speaker, showed the world that no one can shrug off responsibility. The free nations had a responsibility to show the cold-blooded Nazis that wholesale murder will not be tolerated, so we must tell the criminal element that murder will not be tolerated in Canada. This parliament will not solve the problem of the cancer of crime by merely voting for or against capital punishment, but I contend that a vote for retention will be the beginning of an all-out battle against the ills of crime.

Now that I have put to this House my reasons for asking for the re-instatement of capital punishment I wish to return to the subject of public opinion and the will of the public. Some day all of us who have been elected to this parliament will be judged on our decisions in regard to bill C-84 and indeed on the attitude that we have towards crime. We live, supposedly, in a democratic society in which the government must express the will of the people. It certainly is a sad commentary on the members of the government when their arrogance makes them believe they are more knowledgeable than the vast majority of people. When this happens I fear that we have only seen the beginning of rule by elitist minorities.

As we head toward a decision on capital punishment I hope that every member of this House takes into account that this is not only a vote for or against capital punishment but that it will determine the attitude and direction of this country in years to come in regard to crime. A society without the ultimate protection might some day find itself in the sad state where the law of the jungle rules. When I say that, I can almost hear the professional liberals accusing me of being a prophet of doom. I believe

the time has come to stop lulling the Canadian people into believing everything will be fine if only they blindly follow. I for one have more faith than that in my fellow citizens. I would certainly derive no pleasure or satisfaction from saying I told you so, but I do wish that this parliament would face the fact that our society is not perfect, that crime does exist, and finally that we do have a responsibility to fight crime. Mr. Speaker, let us express the will of the people and continue capital punishment.

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, lest I be accused of benefitting from yesterday's order to prolong this debate, I will be very brief. My primary intention in rising is to correct an impression that was left by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) when he indicated that the Donald Kelly case, as I see it in *Hansard*, almost bankrupted the municipality. I trust he was speaking of North Bay. Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate for the record that the total cost of that chase was somewhere in the vicinity of $101,000, $92,000 of which was paid by the province of Ontario. Out of a total budget of $20.5 million for the city of North Bay, even if the Province of Ontario had not paid the amounts to which I have referred, surely there was no indication of an insolvency on the part of North Bay, a city by the way which is on a very sound financial basis and enjoying a fruitful economic life as well as a social life.

Also I should like to place on the record my intention to support the government's bill in this instance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: I have listened with a great deal of attention to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. I have heard those arguments before. I am not persuaded by them and I am sure he has not been persuaded by the arguments advanced by the abolitionists from whichever side of the House they may have been made.

In order to shorten my remarks I would simply adopt those arguments which have been advanced by the abolitionists that an act of hanging or execution, whether public or private, is in effect a collective act of violence. By such an act society condones violence and by condoning encourages it. I could not accept such a collective act of violence. Secondly, I am persuaded that capital punishment does not act as a deterrent in any sense. Statistics have been presented on both sides of that argument. I am persuaded it is not a deterrent.

The third argument flows directly from that, namely that I can see capital punishment in instances where it would be required as a means of self-defence, that is a method of self-defence available to society. I fail to see, when we have one of the most advanced systems of criminal justice and one of the most elaborate and sophisticated systems of the administration of justice, that indeed collective killing can serve as a means of self-defence.

Those are my comments. I will not vote in favour of capital punishment. I am pleased that the government has presented in this instance a bill proposing total abolition and I commend it for that measure.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on that point of order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Is the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre asking a question?

Mr. McKenzie: I did not hear the hon. member's original remarks. Was he speaking on a point of order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): No. He was recognized as a speaker for a short period of time.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on a point of order? I will apologize and withdraw the remark about bankruptcy in the honourable area of North Bay, but the area certainly was subjected to some financial problems. I believe the latest news reports show that the city is trying to negotiate more funds from the Ontario government to help pay for the excessive police costs. I will put this on the record and withdraw the bankruptcy statement.

● (1130)

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point to indicate that there is a dispute between the provincial authorities and the municipal authorities relating, I believe, to some overtime costs and statutory payments amounting to $9,000. However, that is a very small amount in comparison with the total budget of the police commission of $9.2 million.

While I am on my feet, I should like to indicate that indeed in rising I did not wish to demonstrate bravado in response to those of my constituents who have indicated that they wished me to support capital punishment. I would simply like to say that I have received correspondence from both sides, from those who wanted me to support capital punishment and from those who wished me to support the bill now before the House. I have dealt with them both on the same basis. I indicated to them that in accordance with parliamentary tradition my responsibility is to exercise my judgment in accordance with my conscience. If we agree that there is to be a free vote on this bill in the absence of whips, which means that hon. members will vote in accordance with their consciences freely and openly, then that is the way in which I intend to vote.

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I will not say in my opening remarks that it is a pleasure to be able to speak today on Bill C-84. It has never been a pleasure for me to rise in this House and discuss the pros and cons of the death penalty. However, I feel now as I have always felt that it is my responsibility to take part in these debates. It is my responsibility as a member of parliament, my responsibility to my constituents, and my responsibility to myself as a concerned Canadian.

I call again on the government to reinstate the death penalty for premeditated murders. I do so in the full knowledge that it is the will of the great majority of Canadians that we take drastic and serious measures to protect them from those people in our society who would take the life of another. I ask for the reinstatement of the death penalty for capital murder not because I have a low regard for life, but rather because I have such a high regard for life. I believe sincerely that we in the House

have a higher responsibility to the law abiding citizens of Canada than to those who take the law in their own hands.

Our responsibility is all the greater in that we cannot pass the buck along to someone else, and wipe our hands of the unpleasant duty of making a firm decision on this matter. The buck stops right here. It is an awesome responsibility to have to assume the responsibility of deciding whether or not a person convicted of deliberate, premeditated murder, should pay with his or her own life. I have never pretended that it is easy to say simply that someone or other must die by order of a court, and ultimately by order of the parliament of Canada.

We can make it easy though, if we want to, Mr. Speaker; we can say that state-ordered executions are murders in themselves, and pass the buck along to our courts, our prison system, our parole boards and along to the sociologists and criminologists and the rest of the bleeding hearts. We can wash our hands of this matter easily enough, and in fact the cabinet has been doing just that since the majority of members in this House decided several years ago to adopt this government's compromise solution to the problem of capital punishment. We decided that only murderers of policemen or prison guards should suffer the death penalty, but although several death penalties have been imposed by our courts under that law, not a single penalty has been carried out. The cabinet has commuted every sentence imposed during that period.

I said that we could make it easy on ourselves by passing along the responsibility for making a decision on capital punishment, Mr. Speaker, but that is not the same as saying that we have a moral right to do so. We know that no one else will make a decision, even if we were able to give them the authority. We know that everyone else, except our courts, takes the easy way out by adopting the holier-than-thou position of opposing capital punishment on moral grounds. This great liberal morality does not extend to the victims of murderers, however; it extends only to the murderers, as though they suddenly become a part of some higher civilization, or a cult of people who are above the law and above the condemnation of the very society against which they have raised their hand.

I maintain that we cannot avoid the moral responsibility before us any longer, Mr. Speaker. We must make a decision without too much delay that we will not and cannot look upon deliberate and premeditated murder as anything but what it is. Wilful murder and treason against one's own country are capital crimes. The argument that a civilized and sophisticated society does not condone state-ordered executions does not hold water. As the member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack) pointed out a few days ago in this House, a state that maintains a judiciary like ours, with its avenues of appeal and our reverence for justice, cannot commit murder.

Some people have used the argument that the state commits murder if it sentences its own citizens to death for capital crimes, but I consider that argument to be feeble and baseless. I consider it to be a cop-out. If the time comes when we consider murder and treason to be less than capital crimes, then I think that our days as a free and democratic country are numbered. When we decide that we do not want to fight back, that we do not consider it important to win the war that is being waged within our country between the law abiding and the lawless, then this great country of ours from that time on will be less than great.

When we are elected to parliament, those who vote for us must surely believe that we are capable and competent, and that we have the courage to make decisions and stick by them, no matter how distasteful those decisions might be to us personally. Not all of the decisions that we make here can be entirely to our liking. The alternatives to avoiding unpleasant decisions usually are more unpleasant in the long haul, and this is one of the reasons I insist that capital crimes in our society must carry the death penalty. The alternative that has been proposed by the government, 25 years in prison, has already incurred the wrath of the do-gooders and the social experts. They say that this is just as inhuman and inhumane as the death penalty. They wonder out loud how any civilized society could even think of caging up one of its own citizens for 25 years. Of course, Mr. Speaker, none of these experts and bleeding hearts propose any credible alternatives to the death penalty, or to the longer prison sentence. The best they can do is to condemn our proposals, and renounce our decisions.

When this House adopted the government's compromise solution to the question of capital punishment, it was a trade-off. In place of abolition we adopted selective capital punishment for murderers of policemen and prison guards. This presumably satisfied the abolitionists and the retentionists as well. The abolitionists could feel satisfied that the majority of murderers would escape the noose, and that in the cases where the death penalty applied, there was always the possibility that the cabinet would commute the sentences of convicted murderers of police officers. They had everything going for them, including a justice minister who was a public-avowed abolitionist.

On the other hand, the retentionists believed that the government would live up to the mandate of parliament. We believed that the government would honour their own commitment to execute convicted murderers of policemen and prison guards in exchange for this limited application of capital punishment. The fact is that they did not live up to their mandate from parliament, and they did not honour their own commitment. We have de facto abolition of capital punishment, and this speaks louder than anything else I can think of against the conscience of this government.

● (1140)

The trade off did not work, except to get the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) off the hook. I have always maintained that we do not have a moral right to engage in trade offs on an issue as important to our society as capital punishment. We have a moral responsibility to face this issue head on, and if we are called to make an unpleasant decision or if we are called upon to decide that persons convicted of a deliberate murder should pay with their own lives, then we must do that and live with our decision. It would take a lot more courage to do that than just to pass the buck along, but I hope that we possess that much courage.

During the years that the capital punishment issue has been before parliament many members have suggested

that this is a matter for the people of our country to settle by way of a national referendum, and I am one who believes that this is the only way it can be settled once and for all. In a survey conducted recently by the Metropolitan Toronto Police Association 55,282 people responded that the issue of capital punishment should be decided by a national vote, while only 3,444 felt that it should be decided in a forum such as the House of Commons. In this survey 55,374 people said they believed that capital punishment should be applied in the case of anyone convicted of the murder of any citizen during the commission of a crime. I would take this a step further and say that the act of premeditated murder is the crime which is being committed, and so I cannot distinguish between this premeditated murder and a murder committed during another type of crime.

The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) pointed out in his remarks on Bill C-84 that the abolitionists are playing down the overwhelming public support for capital punishment. The abolitionists say that we should not be influenced by the opinion polls which have been conducted on this subject around the country by various groups and agencies. If the polls were to show that the majority of Canadians were opposed to capital punishment, we would see and hear an awful lot of statistics from the abolitionists. However, they and we know that the polls show that anywhere from 75 per cent to 95 per cent of Canadians want to return to capital punishment, and the majority of them want a return to capital punishment for all premeditated murder.

The survey conducted by the Metropolitan Toronto Police Association indicates that 87.6 per cent of the 68,745 people responding to the poll favour a return to the death penalty. In my own riding of Victoria-Haliburton, of the people who contacted me on this subject, 95.66 per cent were in favour of retaining the death penalty for the crime of murder. They are concerned about the alarming rise in violent crime in Canada today. These people are concerned about the fact that the murder rate in Canada has doubled in the past ten years, and that is the actual rate per 100,000 people, as noted by the hon. member for Provencher.

The government has only itself to blame for the present public demands that we reinstate the death penalty for all types of premeditated murder. This government was given a mandate by parliament ten years ago, and this was reaffirmed four years ago. That mandate was about as simple and straightforward as a mandate could be. It called for the death penalty for murderers of police officers and prison officials, but as has been pointed out over and over again in these debates, not one convicted murderer of a policeman or prison guard has been executed.

In every speech I have made on this subject I have asked why there are so many people in our society, in the government and in the private sector who rush to the defence of murderers, while the victims of those murderers are ignored, forgotten and in most cases hardly even given a thought. I agree with those who say that executing a murderer will not bring his victim back to life, but I am convinced that it would serve notice on others who might plan to commit murders that the price is high, too high to make it worth the chance of being caught. I am one of those who feels that the death penalty would be a deterrent to premeditated murder.

I must add my voice to those who ask where our society is going. I join the chorus of those who ask how we could devote so much time and effort to securing the comfort and wellbeing of those convicted of murder and other violent crimes. It is obvious from the volume of mail which all members of parliament are receiving on this subject that the Canadian people are concerned about the kind of society this government is creating in Canada, and it is just as obvious that the great majority of Canadians are not prepared to accept that kind of society.

Much has been said about the manner in which the government should execute murderers, and I know that many people feel uncomfortable about even discussing methods of implementing the death penalty. I share that feeling to some extent, but I do not allow it to influence my thinking on the necessity for applying the death penalty. If anyone has such strong feelings about the inhumanity of hanging, then let us establish first of all that the death penalty will be retained and then seek an alternative to hanging as the method of applying the penalty.

I would like to say a few words about the study commissioned by the Solicitor General on capital punishment. Judging by the negative results the minister obtained from the report on that study, I suggest that the minister would like to forget the report. However, the fact is that the minister did commission a known abolitionist criminologist, a person who presumably came to Canada from Egypt and who quite obviously does not know very much about Canadians to make this study. This criminologist, Ezzat Fattah, who now teaches at Simon Fraser University, was apparently quite upset to learn that his own survey revealed that 70 per cent to 80 per cent of Canadians favour a return to the death penalty for all types of murder.

Mr. Fattah then proceeded to write in his report that these people are vindictive, bloodthirsty, unforgiving, uneducated, insecure, ignorant and harbouring right wing political sentiments. He had other unpleasant things to say about Canadians who feel that those who commit brutal and vicious premeditated murder should pay with their own lives. Mr. Fattah's bias destroys any credibility and any value his report might have had, and I simply put it down as a disgusting spectacle. I must add that I am appalled that the Solicitor General would associate his name and his high office with the report.

By way of contrast I would like to read into the record a few comments which I have received from constituents. A doctor whose son was killed by one of the participants in a fight wrote me a letter which will stick in my mind for as long as I live. The son was an innocent victim, was, in fact, almost a block away from where the fight was going on and was struck by a bullet meant for someone else. The doctor was on duty at his hospital and when his son was brought in hon. members can just imagine his shock at seeing that it was his son realizing that he did not stand any chance of surviving the gunshot wound. The son died in his father's arms, and it is very likely that the murderer will be back on the streets before we resolve this issue of capital punishment. The doctor said in his letter that he was afraid that many hon. members would vote on Bill C-84 according to their own consciences rather than

according to the consciences of the thousands of Canadians in their ridings.

Another letter, signed by 12 responsible and respected constituents, states that opinion polls indicate that the vast majority of Canadians want a return to capital punishment for capital murder as a deterrent to the rise in terrorism and murder. Another writer says that Canadians are not motivated by a wish for revenge when they demand the return of the death penalty, but rather because they realize that a law is only as strong as the penalty prescribed and imposed for infractions of that law. Still another writes: "I wonder how the Solicitor General would feel about coddling murderers if some of his own kin were murdered."

In conclusion, I would like to point out that there is a very great concern in our country that murder will become a status symbol among criminals if we continue to allow murderers to escape the consequences of their actions. As we lessen the severity of the penalties for violent crimes, and especially murder, the commission of murder is not the risky business that it ought to be. I am concerned about the evidence that already exists that cop killers are considered peers among the criminal fraternity. It is a sad commentary upon our government when it becomes a symbol of status in a segment of our society to be convicted of beating up a policeman, or even murdering a policeman.

● (1150)

We can remove this status symbol through the simple expedient of executing these people. It would not take more than one or two executions to eliminate this cancer from the side of our society. I say to this government that, while it would be an extreme measure, we cannot do any less than that if we are to live up to the mandate that we have been given by the people of Canada, a mandate from parliament is a mandate from the people. We cannot ignore them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the subject of capital punishment with mixed feelings. Even as a freshman member of this House I recognize that this subject has been debated by more members of this chamber than any other subject. It would seem from this that there is nothing left to be said; that any avoidable repetition is thereby also a waste of the valuable time and energy of members of this House. There are two reasons at least, however, why I feel compelled to contribute to this debate.

First, the nature of the subject is such that all of us are urged on by the sobering effect of its dimensions, as well as the strength of our convictions, to make personal representations. In this debate more than any other we recognize again that "no man is an island unto himself" and as we continue in this debate we become subtly aware that to some measure at least we are talking about ourselves as we recognize the possibilities for violence within ourselves. Perhaps that helps to explain why every thinking and feeling member of society yearns for a time when capital punishment will be no more. All of us cling to immortality and none of us embraces the prospect of death; therefore when someone else dies a part of me also dies. So, because I am inextricably joined to the subject I must participate in its discussion.

The second reason I entered the debate rests in the fact that I believe a number of arguments favouring the abolition of the death penalty have been based on false arguments or a false premise. One argument, which on the surface seems indisputable, is the fact that most convicted murderers come from the lower half of the social economic scale. Statistics would support this. It is an argument of inequality in our system of jurisprudence. There is no doubt that the rich can have legal counsel which is unavailable to the poor. There is no doubt, in my mind at least, that with the influence of money on the side of the accused he may be freed by means of trickery or by means of minor technicalities. In all too many cases legal counsel is just as interested, if not more so, in the legal fees as in justice. In this way justice becomes not so much blind as blindfolded. Caught in the act of winking, it sees only one guilty party and not the other.

But this argument is directed to the system, not the penalty. Do we take away or reduce the penalty for embezzlement because a few have been sharp enough never to get caught or, when caught, get off on a technicality? No, Mr. Speaker, if that argument, the argument of reducing the penalty because of inequality before the law, were applied to every level of criminal justice, there would be chaos in our entire system of jurisprudence. And, furthermore, it would remove the necessary incentives to remove those inequalities.

What the government needs to do, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that in our courts no one will have special advantages. Penalties must be based as much as possible on rightness and on justice, not on the identifiable and gross inadequacies of the system which we could improve if only we had the moral courage to do so. And it does no justice to logic to seduce the debate by talking of the wrongness of the penalties when all the while we are talking of the wrongness of the system.

Another argument which has been voiced here is that there is always the possibility that an innocent person will be convicted. We cannot take such a charge lightly; it has happened within our lifetime, although the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) says it has not happened in Canada in the past several decades. But, Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that the present law carries the death penalty only for those convicted of killing police officers or prison workers while in the line of duty. We are no longer talking about the death penalty for all murderers. We are talking about murders which take place under completely different conditions from former years, and about the kind of crime that completely rules out a conviction based solely on circumstantial evidence. The argument that innocent people might be convicted was no doubt valid at one time, but we can no longer accept that argument with the narrow terms of reference in the act now.

A third argument voiced frequently is that capital punishment is uncivilized and a holdover from a more barbarian age. Now to begin with, Mr. Speaker, that argument has an element of psychological blackmail in it. No one wants to be thought of as barbarian; all of us want to be, and want to be seen as, enlightened. So anyone with any kind

of self-esteem will shrink from any kind of belief or practice which could be labelled as barbaric.

But even those who argue that the practice of capital punishment is uncivilized would probably agree that the two most prominent characteristics of a civilized society are a pervasive sense of humanity and a sense of order. Historically, the sense of humanity in a civilized society could probably best be described as the "Good Samaritan" spirit. It is one of those curious ironies, however, that that particular story places no emphasis at all on the criminal. As a matter of fact, in that story the criminals were long gone—they got away and no attention was paid to them. Should we infer from that that we ought not to pay attention to the criminals? Hardly. The point of the story is that the Samaritan, considered a barbarian by his sophisticated neighbours, gave his total attention to the plight of the victim and his rehabilitation. And to this day, Mr. Speaker, the so-called primitive people of this world could often teach us something of humanity by the way that they care for the victims of distress.

We are barbarians, Mr. Speaker, not when we have a law calling for capital punishment; we are barbarians when we do so little for the victims of violent crimes. Where is the far-reaching legislation for the rehabilitation of the victims of rape, or the familites of those that have been murdered?

There is a man in my riding who was mauled by a bear which was attacking his fiancée. He saved her life but became permanently disfigured. They have spent all of their savings to pay for plastic surgery and now they have no more; but he needs more surgery. I have asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) for some help but have been refused. Meanwhile, there are hundreds of convicted criminals who are given every possible opportunity to appeal, at public expense, if necessary. And we continue to open rights of appeal. But what about their victims and others such as the one I have just mentioned. Do they even get scant attention? Perhaps the most appropriate opprobrium here is "These things ought ye to have done and not to have left the other undone". The Minister of National Health and Welfare will vote against capital punishment, probably because he things it is barbaric. I suggest to him that it is not the death penalty that is barbaric, but our lack of compassion for the abused in our society.

A young RCMP officer in my riding was shot several years ago. He was to have been married in a week or two. What about his fiancee who has to reconstruct an entirely new life? What about the mother of two small children here in Ottawa whose husband and the father of the children was killed in the line of duty? How do we measure the heartache and loneliness, the unanswered questions, the shattered relationships and dreams? Have we become so blindly passionate in our pursuit of justice for the criminal that we have at the same time forgotten the pursuit of equity? Somehow, we seem to have come to the place where we feel that, since we cannot measure intangible and personal anguish caused by crime and codify it accurately by statute, there is, therefore, nothing we can do. It is with this casual glance at equity that our barbarism really becomes glaringly obvious. No, Mr. Speaker, it is not our call for the death penalty that makes us uncivilized but, rather, the disproportionate attention given to the deliberate murderer, in relation to what we give his victim, that exposes our latent barbarism.

● (1200)

The second characteristic of a civilized society is a desire, even demand, for crder. It does not matter on what basis you become an apologist for government; it is not long until you appeal to natural law. I will have more to say on this later, but suffice it to say here that our restless search for order has caused us to give authority to governments to instigate laws that will preserve order as much as possible.

Now, the most fundamental right I have is the right to live unmolested and undisturbed. Murder is the ultimate violation of that right: it is anarchy, the annihilation of order. The murder of police officers or prison guards is deliberate rebellion against the right of the government to establish and to maintain order. In light of these two arguments involving the inadequate, and often misplaced investment of compassion and the destruction of order, how can we say that to retain capital punishment is to return to an uncivilized state? The fact is, when we reject capital punishment we, in the most real and tangible way, develop a more subtle barbarian condition.

A fourth reason frequently given in rejection of capital punishment is that it is not a deterrent. The argument is usually based on statistics and is probably the most specious of all the arguments, if for no other reason than that the argument of statistics is the most abused and hackneyed of all. Presumably, if statistics clearly and unequivocally proved that capital punishment was, in fact, a deterrent, the abolitionists would become supporters of capital punishment. Hardly! They know that the argument of statistics is, of all tools, most malleable, capable of being twisted to any design that is needed. But beyond that, the whole argument of deterrence has become a totally utilitarian one, in a very pragmatic sense. If something is visibly useful, use it. If not immediately and visibly useful, reject it. It is for this reason that statistics become so vital to the argument of the abolitionist. Statistics are supposed to establish value on the basis of concrete and irrefutable data.

I suggest that pragmatic arguments have been functional and useful in supporting technological advance on the American frontier. At that time pragmatism became popular. But it is hardly fair to apply philosophical arguments in support of technological advance to a moral question, and to use the argument of pragmatism in moral issues. It is the utilitarian philosophy which ushered in the whole array of arguments attempting to justify relative morality and situational ethics. I read, recently, a statement of a man justifying situational ethics by saying that there are times when it is much kinder to tell a white lie than to tell the truth. It sounds ever so sweet and understanding until you realize that if it ever happened to you, you would feel humiliated and embarrassed when you realized someone else's attitude of condescension toward you.

But it is much worse than that. All of us need reference points to guide us in life. We need absolutes. This is where the intangible dimensions of the utility of the law come in. If the reference points are continually shifting, we become

totally lost in our direction in life. Imagine, if you will, a ship setting out on a journey across the Atlantic. The captain wants to know where he is, so he measures his position by another ship, or by an iceberg or any other floating object. How absurd! He may get away with it as far as any accident is concerned. He may never flounder or shipwreck. But he will never know where he is, and he most certainly will not end up where he had planned to go. That is the way it is when we guide our lives by situational ethics.

That, too, Mr. Speaker, is the way it is with moral issues. If we are going to know where we are going, we must have some fixed reference points to let us know where we are. We need a law to warn us, long before we approach the danger zone, when we are headed for trouble. It is not simply a question of whether the death penalty has made an impending murderer stop to think of the consequences before he commits a capital crime. It is just as much a matter of a well-defined law, with its well-defined implementation, saying to every one of us, "This far, and no farther." Who knows how many people have stopped earlier in a life of crime because they began to realize what the ultimate penalties would be. Statistics will never measure that. It is easy enough to find out how many people have been killed by speeding, but we will never know how many have been saved because the speed limit sign or the radar trap was there. We will never know where we are going if we, at the same time, do not know how we are going to get there.

Another point that has been made frequently is that capital punishment is murder and that you cannot correct one murder by committing another one. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of oversimplification that, again, is supposed to intimidate the retentionist and frighten him from becoming involved with so-called legal murder. Usually, those who argue this quote one of the Ten Commandments which says, "Thou shalt not kill."

In every other issue, Mr. Speaker, we are encouraged to eschew the oversimplified generalization. It is no credit to any intelligent, thinking person when he participates in thoughtless repetition of any oversimplification. Man simply is not satisfied with that, which is why we have built universities and why the best universities inevitably have the best libraries. The libraries are one of the most important elements of any place of learning. It is no coincidence that the best libraries are those that have the most original manuscripts. If we are going to examine any statement, we must begin with what it says. To be sure of that, we must go back as far as we can to the original, to make sure that the statement is accurate.

When we check the earliest manuscripts of the Ten Commandments, we find that it does not say, "Thou shalt not kill"—that is inaccurate. It actually says, "Thou shalt not commit murder." Immediately, someone says, "That's the same thing." No, it is not. It cannot be. Linguists tell us that it is impossible for two words to mean exactly the same thing. If that ever happened, one would become redundant and pass into oblivion. Since both words have been with us since the beginning of time, there must be a difference between them. And there is. All killing is not murder, any more than all sexual intercourse is rape. Rape is the violent rejection of, and rebellion against, the institution of marriage. It is the rejection of order, and there is not a culture in the world that tolerates it. Murder is the rejection of order at an even more intense level. As I said previously, it is rebellion against the right of the state to impose and to maintain order. Capital punishment is not murder but, rather, the restoration of order.

Justice, historically, Mr. Speaker, has been pictured as a lady seated and holding a pair of balance-scales in exact equilibrium. Murder does violence to that equilibrium and throws it off balance. The death penalty restores the equilibrium and gives society the assurance that, to a degree at least, harmony and balance will be restored to our everyday lives. To illustrate further, frontier justice sometimes was enacted by way of a lynch mob. It may well be that the lynch mob condemned the guilty party; but that kind of retribution disturbs the balance-scales almost as much as when the guilty go free. It is the function of the state to deal in a non-emotional, non-vindictive way by basing convictions on fact and law and thereby restoring equilibrium to the balance-scales of justice in society.

● (1210)

There are some members among us who have said that they must vote by their conscience and this may mean that they will have to vote against the majority wishes of their riding. Who could argue against the right to vote by conscience? I would simply point out, however, that conscience, by itself, is not a dependable faculty. Our conscience depends, for its expression, completely and totally on the information fed into it. It is only an accurate and sensitive reflector of all we have learned about moral values. To illustrate, mothers in India for centuries threw the babies they loved into the Ganges River. They did it with the highest of motives because their conscience told them to. Meanwhile, mothers in other countries protected their babies from drowning, sometimes at the cost of their own lives. Again, for conscience sake. We must all vote according to our conscience; but we also owe it to ourselves to examine the reasons our conscience convinced us of a decision.

However, to vote against the wishes of the majority of the constituency is another matter. A number of speakers have justified this by quoting Edmund Burke who felt he had to do that. Edmund Burke, however, does not provide very good refuge in this case. He lived just after the high point of the age of rationalism, the time when man seemed to have an almost unshakable faith in the powers of reason. One of the spin-offs of that age was a very elitist attitude, on the part of leaders, toward the common people. For example, it led Burke to support the American revolution as an act of independence, but oppose the French revolution because it was an uprising of the commoners against the aristocracy.

The American ideal of this spirit was Thomas Jefferson, Burke's contemporary. Jeffersonian democracy is the hallmark of all that is good in a free society. But I would remind hon. members that while Jefferson championed the popular franchise, he also designed the electoral college. Why? Because he wanted all men to be free to vote, but he did not trust the masses to elect a president. So they elected an elector, one a little more sophisticated than the rabble, who could be trusted to elect the president. You see, both Jefferson and Burke were, in a real sense, elitists.

Hon. members, you had better not hide behind Burke when you vote against your riding, unless you wish to be seen as an elitist, far removed from the people you represent.

I took particular note of the remarks yesterday by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). He pointed out that as countries move more and more to a centralized government, there is a corresponding rise in the crime rate. At first there would seem to be no relationship between the two, but on closer examination there may well be. We do know, for example, that as governments become more centralized, by doing so they take away opportunities for individual decision-making. Since the ability to make decisions is one of our most human faculties, there is an irrepressible desire to make choices, even at the risk of making wrong ones. However, when those choices are taken from us, the process of dehumanization sets in. That, in turn, increases the frustration level for all citizens and the larger possibility of criminal activity. Could it be that the hon. member for Crowfoot is right; that the government's recurring determination to bring in capital punishment stems from an overriding guilt complex for dehumanizing man, perhaps helping to drive man to a life of crime, and now cannot therefore bring itself to punish man for becoming what the government itself has made him?

Related to this is another factor, however. Governments, by their very nature, devote their attention to material solutions of man. This is their mandate. However, as they do this they leave the growing impression that those are the only issues that matter. It is the growth of materialism. It begins with ignoring spiritual dimensions of man, and ends with denying spiritual dimensions in him. It seems to me that there is another correlation which may have been overlooked. There appears to be a strong correlation between the rising demand for abolition of the death penalty and a steady decline in a strong belief in immortality. What do they have to do with each other? Simply this: if you believe that all we have is here right now, if there is no more after this, then it follows that you must squeeze out every available minute in this that you can. It follows, also that if you are committed to this materialistic view, the worst crime you could commit would be to take away even a part of the remnant of time left to a criminal. That is what was at the heart of the Greek and Roman tragedies—not that a person might die in the prime of life, but that he would die and go into the black mystery of the beyond and no one would know where he was. It seems that our society has come almost full circle to that one.

Members may call me a medievalist if they wish, but I am here saying that there is more than just this life, that this life is just a preparation for, and in anticipation of, the life to come. The pronouncement of the death penalty may be the last chance the convicted murderer has to learn something about finality; to learn, without any equivocation, that there are inexorable consequences to our actions which we cannot escape. All our lives we spend looking for ways out. This is the one time we have to look ourselves squarely in the face, with no side-glances.

The former solicitor general said that religious convictions are not valid justification for retention of the death penalty. I wonder, would he accept religious convictions for building a hospital, or a school, or for the composition of some of our great music, or the design of great architecture, or art? I am not sure whether he is being a total materialist and would reject religious convictions on all grounds, or whether he seriously wants to isolate them only from this issue. Does he want only the pleasant and attractive elements of religious faith, and not recognize the features that are unattractive for him? It does not work that way. The evil that we see is not the effect of our faith, but the consequences of our behaviour. It is our religious faith that makes us confront that behaviour.

Again, the former solicitor general's statement is symptomatic of another problem we must face, the problem of our identity. There is no doubt that in private life we get ourselves into a pack of trouble when we try to deny our past, when we try to pretend we do not have the background we do. That is the way to mental illness, to a life of pretence, living in a world of illusions. Mental health involves a glad acceptance of who we are, our appearance as well as our family backgrounds. The same holds true on a national scale. We must, and I know we do, embrace our history, appreciate it, and then we can enjoy, as well as understand, our present.

I have, as I know all other members have, been thinking about this debate for many months. Several weeks ago, as I walked toward the parliament buildings, I saw inscriptions above the windows on three of the sides of the peace tower. Above the front entrance I read, "Give the King thy judgements, O Lord, and thy righteousness unto the King's son". On the one side entrance I read, "Where there is no vision the people perish", and on the other, "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea".

These are quotations from the Bible. Our founding fathers made certain that they would be eternally chiselled into our history. To deny our past is to deny our identity. One of the great and overriding problems we face as a nation is the fact that absolutes were accepted as a fact of life when our nation was founded. That concept was in the air and was part of a spontaneous thought-form which has become part of the fabric of the British North America Act. Since that time, however, and as John Donne once said, "The new philosophy calls all in doubt". The philosophies of relativism and existentialism deny the existence of any absolutes.

● (1220)

So we are in a state of constant ambivalence, living with a document based on one set of suppositions but debating legislation within the framework of that document from an entirely different philosophical base. That ambivalence leads us along a certain course of madness. We, as a nation, will sooner or later have to decide who we are, what kind of a people we want to be. Let us call a spade a spade and go on from there.

One of the premises on which the present bill is based is the suggestion that we are on a steady path toward an improved civilization, that things are getting better and better, and all we need is a little more time, a little more education, till we come to the great day when violent crime will be on the decline and this kind of a debate would be totally anachronistic. That, Mr. Speaker, is a delusion. It used to be the preachers who were the prophets of gloom and the announcers of Armageddon. Now, they are no

longer alone. The scientists, as well as others, are now the leaders. Let me quote William Butler Yeats:

Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
the blood-dimmed tide is loosed. And everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack of all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

That was said 40 years ago. Since then we have seen the Second World War, Korea, Viet Nam, four Middle East wars, Lebanon, Biafra, Bangla Desh, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Berlin wall. We have seen assassinations, terrorism, indiscriminate murder. On the local level, there is an increase in crime, murder and flaunting of the law and growing civilian fears. Surely, no one can say we are getting better.

A call for the death penalty is not an emotional cry for vengeance. It is, rather, a call for the self-preservation of the human race. All of us need boundaries for our behaviour. To institute abolition of the death penalty for calculated and premeditated murder is to remove those boundaries, to give the murderer an indefinite "maybe". Capital punishment is a clear statement to all of us, wherever we are, that says, "This far, and no farther".

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this is a serious debate that demands sober judgment. It has to do with life and death, justice and mercy, love and retribution, peace, orderliness, condemnation of evil, preservation of the state and the triumph of right. I have been impressed with the wisdom and the in-depth understanding that other members in debating this issue have shown. I have not always agreed with the premises or with the conclusions, and in some cases have disagreed with both; but for the most part it has been a high-level debate. The abolitionists have not been accused of being misguided do-gooders, and the retentionists for the most part have not been accused of being barbaric, sadistic or savage.

I intend, in the few minutes allotted to me, to put forth my own case, my own argument, not necessarily to rebut any particular member's point of view, but in doing so to let the debate fall where it may. In the spring-summer 1975 issue of *Inkhorn* was a quote that I think was very apropos to my remarks in this debate today. It is as follows:

Anyone with a facile pen and an axe to grind can write compellingly and exert much appeal. And since axe-grinding will always produce sparks, undiscerning readers will see only the flash of indignation.

In regard to this particular issue, as a lawmaker I must consider the fundamental task of government. Generally stated, the task of government is to uphold justice and to reinforce the freedoms of man; that is, of the body politic. It is important, however, to look at the historic perspective of other scholars and the contribution that they have made in dealing with the question: What is the purpose and the task of government? Since time will not allow me to make an exhaustive review of what other scholars have said, I am going to limit my comments to quotations from John Locke, Jefferson, Mill and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. John Locke, in his "Two Treaties of Government", has this to say:

And that all men may be restrained from invading others' rights, and from doing hurt to one another, and the law of Nature be observed, which willeth the peace and preservation of all mankind, the execution of the law of Nature is in that state put into every man's hands, whereby every one has a right to punish the transgressors of that law to such a degree as may hinder its violation. For the law of Nature would, as all other laws that concern men in this world, be in vain if there were nobody that in the state of Nature had a power to execute that law, and thereby preserve the innocent and restrain offenders—

Also, in the same essay John Locke has this to say:

In transgressing the law of Nature, the offender declares himself to live by another rule than that of reason and common equity . . .

By the same reason may a man in the state of Nature punish the lesser breaches of that law, it will, perhaps, be demanded, with death? I answer: Each transgression may be punished to that degree, and with so much severity, as will suffice to make it an ill bargain to the offender, give him cause to repent, and terrify others from doing the like.

According to Locke, wherever law ends, tyranny begins. My last quotation from John Locke in his "Two Treatises of Government" is this:

For laws not being made for themselves, but to be, by their execution, the bonds of the society to keep every part of the body politic in its due place and function; when that totally ceases, the government visibly ceases, and the people become a confused multitude without order or connection. Where there is no longer the administration of justice for the securing of men's rights, nor any remaining power within the community to direct the force, or provide for the necessities of the public, there certainly is no government left.

George Washington had this to say:

Towards the preservation of your Government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles.

He also said:

And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion.

I should also like to quote John Stuart Mill. I had occasion last Friday to quote John Stuart Mill, and unless some hon. members think that I am a disciple of John Stuart Mill, let me say it was coincidence of topic that led me to quote him rather than my discipleship to his theories. He has had this to say:

That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.

That quotation is taken from his 1859 essay on liberty. In speaking of representative government, John Stuart Mill pointed out that one of the most positive evils of the representative system is the danger that it may be influenced by an interest that is not identical with the general welfare of the community. Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural address, quoted the Bible as follows:

● (1230)

Woe unto the world because of offenses! For it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh.

I now want to quote from a book that I will be referring to often in this debate. It has been a good source of information to me. It is a book called, "The Bible and the Life of the Christian". This is what that has to say in respect of the purpose of government:

In Psalm 119 we are instructed that all things abide today according to the ordinances of the Creator (Psalm 119:89-91). There is nothing that is not taken up into that stream of power which preserves the whole world from collapse. Sin cannot halt God's providence nor arrest His omnipotence. Generations of men come and go, fill their time with

their works and their sin, and are called to account. God continually causes new creatures to appear. He prevents the total chaos and destruction that proceeds from the corruption of sin, because He is leading the world and humanity on to the consummation of His counsel. In this providential work of preserving and governing, the institution of the office of government is also included. Such an office is indispensable if there is to be a human society where justice and order still prevail and the Church is enabled to "lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity".

So, from these quotations I believe there is a commonality among the writers, and certainly not inconsistent with the principle of the scriptures, that it is the purpose of government to uphold justice and to reinforce the freedoms of man, that is, the freedom generally found in the body politic.

Studies of psychology and sociology have produced increased knowledge of human behaviour, resulting in mitigation of the death penalty. Modern theories of penology have questioned the social utility of capital punishment. The result has been that the death penalty is almost always debated in a judicial and psychosociological sense. However, it is ultimately a moral and theological question. Because it is a moral and theological question, I would discuss the mandate of government from the biblical perspective; that is to say, from the Christian ethic.

Is the Christian perspective relevant today and for this debate? By the mere fact that this is a moral question, the Christian ethic is certainly relevant in light of the basis of our western society, and, in fact, this government and this parliamentary system here in Canada. If God is, and if Christ lived, died and rose again in a redemptive way—and I believe so—then I have to reject Hegel's cyclic history and that postulation that history moves as formation of a thesis and anti-thesis which evolves into a new synthesis which becomes the thesis or accepted ideas, and you have a recurring cycle. I have to reject that, sir, and I have to reject, as well, those naturalists who believe that world history is not directed, that human history simply unfolds as it should and without regard to any exterior force or directed force.

Rather than those two, sir, I accept the lineal history idea, the truth that God is directing the final destination of history. I do not wish to quarrel with either the Calvinists or the Armenians, that those who believe that God works only as the free will exists within mankind, or the other side, the Calvinists who believe that God has preordained and has, in essence, programmed both man and the world. But it is suffice to say that notwithstanding the correctness or the applicability of either of those two schools of thought in theology, it is nevertheless therefore true that theology and God have something to say today, because God in the final analysis is directing the destination of history.

So it is important to look, when we are speaking of Christian ethic, at both the Old Testament and the New Testament, because the teaching of the scriptures, and because capital punishment is a moral issue, is not only relevant but constitutes the centricity of the issue. In times past there have been Christian scholars who have looked and studied and written about the principles of the scriptures and how they apply to human activity. One of those, Thomas Aquinas, in his book "Summa Theologica", along with other early Christian writers such as Tertullian and Athenagoras, clearly defends the right of the state in regard to capital punishment. Thomas Aquinas likens the malfactor to a limb of the body filled with gangrene. He suggests that amputation, or execution, is necessary for the good of the whole body, or the whole society. Aquinas says:

If a man be dangerous and infectious to the community on account of some sins, it is praiseworthy and advantageous that he be killed in order to safeguard the common good.

I could go on quoting other earlier writers of the Christian church, but probably the test of time and the test of the scriptures is in looking directly at the teachings of the Old Testament and seeing what in fact they have to say in relation to either the functions of government and, more particularly, the duty of government in respect of capital punishment. I refer to the Old Testament judicial procedure. For the most part in this debate, when I have heard other members pontificate on the Old Testament admonitions toward the issues, the principles have been misapplied and misunderstood. There were five characteristics of the Hebrew, Mosaic law in relation to capital punishment. It is important to understand these five principles and how they apply to capital punishment if you are going to at all use the decalogue, and particularly the sixth commandment of the Ten Commandments in basing any of your arguments on capital punishment.

In many cases, Hebrew law was superior to our Canadian criminal law. There were five essential parts and considerations in the Old Testament judicial procedure. One was the standard of proof. In our Canadian system we have to establish beyond a reasonable doubt in the conviction of one accused charged with murder. Not so under the Hebrew law. In Hebrew law you had to establish certainty. In Deuteronomy 17:4 it says: "You shall enquire thoroughly". Secondly, as an integral part of Hebrew law it requires the testimony of more than one witness. In the Canadian system, circumstantial evidence, or one single witness in conjunction with circumstantial evidence, can convict. It was not so with Hebrew law. Deuteronomy 19:15 provided: "On evidence of two or three witnesses a matter shall be confirmed".

The test, however, does not indicate precisely what these witnesses must testify to. That is, must they be eyewitnesses to the crime or merely corroborators of the physical evidence? The internal logic of the passages implies to me that eyewitnesses were intended. First it is difficult to think that circumstantial evidence, even if fully corroborated, could often amount to certainty. Second, the administration of the death penalty by stoning was to be begun by having the witnesses cast the first stones (Deut. 17:7); this would be an excellent form of psychological testing to pressure a lying witness to reveal himself at the last moment, before the irreparable act had been accomplished, but would seem unlikely to influence greatly the behaviour of merely corroborative witnesses. Third, the definitions of some crimes require information that only an eyewitness could supply. For example, Numbers 34:16-24 makes a distinction between murder and manslaughter partially on the basis of whether the victim was killed by an object held in the suspect's hand or by an object thrown or dropped. Other than an eyewitness, who could tell?

● (1240)

Third, under Mosaic law the punishment for perjury was execution. In our Canadian penal system if one is found guilty of perjury there is a fine or a term of imprisonment. In Deuteronomy 19:10-19 we read:

If a malicious witness rises up against a man to accuse him of wrongdoing . . . then you shall do to him just as he had intended to do to his brother.

Fourth, in Hebrew law we find that difficult cases were referred to judicial experts. We read, also, in Deuteronomy 17:18,19

> If any case is too difficult for you to decide, between one kind of homicide or another, between one kind of lawsuit or another, and between one kind of assault or another, being cases of dispute in your courts, then you shall arise and go up to the place which the Lord your God chooses. So you shall come to the Levitical priest or the judge who is in office in those days, and you shall inquire of them, and they will declare to you the verdict in the case.

A weakness in our Canadian system is that jurors sometimes do not understand the law well enough to apply the law to the facts at hand, and we arrive from time to time with hung juries which necessitates either a new trial or dropping of the charges. But under Mosaic law the referral to a judicial priest who understood the entire legal distinction between kinds of homicide assault, lawsuits, and so on, necessitated a verdict of guilty or not guilty. Under Mosaic law, presentation to the judge was to take place in a new location to avoid local prejudices. Fifth, under Mosaic law, once a verdict was returned—that is, a verdict of guilty—then the death penalty was mandatory. In Leviticus 27:29 we read:

> No prescribed person who may have been set apart among men shall be ransomed; he shall surely be put to death.

In the event that there was a murder of passion and the capital sentence was not to apply, in the testament under Hebrew law there were provided cities of refuge, and a person who was found to have certainly killed, but not on the basis of premeditated or paid murder, was then able to live in the cities of refuge and be free from the wrath of other people. But in our Canadian system, even though the jury and the due process of law have found a person to be guilty of murder, we have cabinet commutation and the whole area of reprieve. So it is very clear that the Hebrew law was much more thorough and, I believe, much more accurate and certainly contained a greater sense of justice and thoroughness than our Canadian law. Perhaps we ought to return to the principles and safeguards that were known and practiced under Mosaic law. Under Mosaic law there were 18 crimes which were punishable by death. I might very quickly go over them. They are as follows: 1, Murder; 2, Accidentally causing death of a pregnant woman or her baby; 3, Killing of a person by a dangerous animal that had killed before, yet was not caged. Both the animal and owner in that case were to be executed; 4, Kidnapping; 5, Rape; 6, Fornication; 7, Adultery; 8, Incest; 9, Homosexuality; 10, Sexual intercourse with animal; 11, Striking a parent; 12, Cursing a parent; 13, Rebelling against a parent; 14, Sorcery, witchcraft; 15, Cursing God; 16, Attempting to lead people to worship other gods; 17, Avenging a death despite acquittal by law. That is the killing of someone who was living in a city of refuge. Then 18, False testimony in murder trial.

Now the question would arise, having established some kind of explanation concerning the nature and characteristics of Hebrew law, are we under the Mosaic law? Notwithstanding the argument put forward by the dispensationalists, and notwithstanding the freedom we now have in Christ, it nevertheless must be recognized that we are in fact, under the New Testament, freed from all aspects of the Hebrew law except murder, because although murder was part of Hebrew law, it predates Hebrew law. It remains part of the Decalogue which is applicable to individuals and not to the functions and duties of the state.

The problem seems to emerge, in this matter, in discussing the New Testament doctrine: Did Christ replace, that is, fulfil, the law, hence freeing us from the law of Moses unto the law of love or grace? Yes, but Christ did not destroy nor contradict the Mosaic law. As a matter of fact, Christ had come to fulfil the law and not one dot of the law would be changed. The Ten Commandments apply to individual action and responsibility. The responsibility of the state regarding murder predates Hebrew law and, as I have said, is not part of that Hebrew law that was fulfilled by Christ. It remains within the jurisdiction of civil government and not the individual.

Christ replaced, not the role and duties of government but, rather, became the personal or individual mediator or Saviour between the individual man and his god. The functions and responsibilities of government remain. Romans 13 refers to the duties of the government as opposed to the responsibilities of the individual. There is not an inconsistency between the Old and New Testaments in relation to capital punishment. Of all early Christians, Paul surely had the deepest and truest insight into the essential nature of the Christian message. The inspiration of his writings is recognized, for example, by the Apostle Peter in I Peter, chapter 3, verse 16. In Romans 12, we find Paul writing:

> Be kindly affectioned one to another in brotherly love . . . bless them that persecute you . . . recompense to no man evil for evil . . . overcome evil with good.

But then, again, in the very next chapter, Romans 13, we find Paul saying:

> Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers—

That is, the government.

> —it is there by God's appointment. So those who refuse to obey the laws of the land are refusing to obey God, and punishment will follow. For civil authorities do not frighten those who are doing right, but those who are doing wrong. The government is the agent of God for your good. But, if you do evil, you should be afraid. For the civil authority does not bear and wear the sword for nothing. It is God's agent to execute His punishment and vengeance on the wrongdoer.

So, in Romans 12, the Bible speaks of love, blessing and forgiveness; and in Romans 13, of punishment, vengeance, and capital execution with the sword of government. How are the two sets of principles reconciled? Simply by recognizing that the first set applies to our personal, individual, relationships; that is, in the Decalogue the sixth commandment admonishes us not to kill, and this applies to the individual and not to the duties and responsibilities of the government. The second set applies to the relationships of the civil governments and its citizens. Individually, Christians are required to forgive those who trespass against them. Civically, the government is the agent of God to administer justice among its people. Its first essential duty, as such, is to administer the divine decree concerning the capital punishment of murderers. Originally this was written as early as in the ninth chapter of the Bible, the Gensis, and it is reaffirmed throughout the Bible in both the Old and the New Testaments.

● (1250)

I have attempted to establish a communality among writers from the Christian and non-Christian perspectives in relation to the duties and functions of government, and I have attempted to show that under the law of Moses it was the function and the duty of the state to carry out the capital sentence in violation of the sixth commandment of the Decalogue. Furthermore, I have attempted to show, by relating that to the New Testament doctrine, Romans 13, that it is not inconsistent with the New Testament in relation to the duties and functions of government to maintain civil order. Because if, in fact, the primary function of the government is to maintain law and order, to prosecute evil and to uphold righteousness and justice, and if capital punishment is a moral question, then we must look at the consistency of the scriptures in both the Old and New Testaments. We cannot deny what is written in Romans, chapter 13, in view of the fact that it is certainly not inconsistent with the Old Testament teachings and the fact that the sixth commandment predated the Hebrew law from which Christ freed us.

So I suppose that the quality of government or civilization has historically been judged by what we do with the poor, the dispossessed and the defenceless. The question is whether their life is worth as much as the lives of those who can find recourse in protection or retribution. I cannot but conclude that the principle of government applies to all and not just to policemen and prison guards. I suggest that justice dictates that the capital sentence must be applied to all those found guilty of premeditated murder or paid murder.

Furthermore, I believe it is sound statesmanship that in considering capital punishment we take into account the concrete reality of today. We must take into account the lifestyles of the people. There is no such thing as static legislation for all times. We must look at the reality of the mandate of the people. What is the real situation confronting the government and the real situation of Canadians today? From the theological point of view, sin abounds, there is lawlessness, murder, rape and wrongdoing of all kinds. That is the reality. Generally, it appears that the will of the people is that the government get tough, a term that is often used here. People want protection against those who would destroy, plunder and murder without regard for the rights, property or life of others.

People are fed-up with the overemphasis on the rights of the convicted. I would point to the remarks made by my colleague, the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen), with reference to the fact that there is overemphasis today on the rights of the convicted as opposed to the responsibilities of the government to the victims. I believe it is irresponsible on the part of the government to disregard those who are victimized. Governments are only addressing themselves to the rights of the convicted. However, the fact must be recognized that those who feel as I do do not lack compassion or love. We have a yearning for justice, as do others; but we simply place our emphasis not only on those who have been victimized, but also on those who are the potential victims, which by and large is the rest of the body politic.

I reject the views of the environmentalists and behaviourists such as B.F. Skinner, who recognize no human responsibility and who reduce all human action as the mere product of previous experience. They suggest that all that it takes to rehabilitate a person is to modify his behaviour and that, in a sense, it is society that is wrong, not the individual who transgresses the law. I reject that approach which disregards human responsibility. I believe in the biblical position that we are created in the image of God and with the knowledge of good and evil, and that we have the choice to do right or wrong. Because this is a moral question, to discuss capital punishment apart from morality is to miss the point entirely. How should the government react, in light of the reality and the will of the people and in light of the biblical mandate in Romans 13?

Mr. Speaker, the adjournment time is approaching, but I ask for the indulgence of the House to allow me to complete my remarks in a couple of minutes.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Whiteway: In conclusion, I should like to quote briefly as follows:

> The state is clothed with power for the sake of justice. Through God's preserving care the law for created life is still known to us even after the Fall (Romans I and II). In virtue of God's unchangeable Counsel that law has never been revoked. Everything is under the obligating force of the law, and nothing is indifferent. To wish to gain knowledge from the scriptures about the law is not arbitrarily to have the living, divine word at one's command; it is simply the obedience of faith. It is true that the will of God is infinitely wider and deeper than what has been revealed to us, but God's veracity guarantees to us that the revelation permitted us regarding it is trustworthy. When one places love higher than justice one contradicts the Cross of Golgotha where the Lord revealed his love and his justice. Zion is redeemed through justice. It is not even permissible to imagine a tension or opposition between love and justice in God. That would be in conflict with the simplicity of his being. In God love and justice are one. In our time-conditioned (temporal) existence, however, life branches out from the concentrated religious fulness of meaning of the love of Christ into distinct streams in its temporal orders or modes (ways) of being. Thus there is an order for the exercise of justice and also an order for the love of the neighbour. No true love toward our neighbour however is possible without justice (Ps.85:9-13). He who asserts that the maintaining of justice by the government is of a lower order than the love of the neighbour forgets that it is exactly through the existence of justice in society that the love of the neighbour can flourish. In a chaos of injustice and violence the love of the neighbour will be choked to death.

Mr. Speaker, as I live, I take no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way of life, as stated in Ezek 33:11. I want to see a Canada where our people are free from the terror of those who would violate the very freedoms they espouse in their own defence. I want to be part of a government that recognizes and acts upon the will of the people and its Biblical mandate. The very stones cry out for justice. We must maintain and re-establish the death penalty. We must strive for consistency with New Testament Biblical concepts. We have not the liberty to do otherwise.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the special order passed by the House on Monday June 7, it being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until the House resumes its proceedings at two o'clock.

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MANAGEMENT OF MARINE RESOURCES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. The declaration by Canada of a 200-mile fishing limit prompts attention to the provision of surveillance, patrol and rescue capability along Canada's vast coastline. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander):

That this House orders that the government make a statement on motions outlining its plans to carry out management of our marine resources and that the matter be referred to a special committee comprising External Affairs, National Defence, Environment and Fisheries, and Transportation and Communications.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING WITH MILK PRODUCERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion of pressing and urgent necessity.

Since the President of the Privy Council indicated Friday last during the oral question period that a meeting would take place today between the executive of the Quebec APU and some cabinet members in connection with the important matter of the Quebec dairy industry; since this problem is worsening every day and could provoke very serious consequences; and since it is urgent to clarify the situation and take the necessary steps, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House request the Minister of Agriculture to make public today, through a statement in this House, the results and the content of special discussions that have taken place, so that members may know where the matter stands.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There not being unanimous consent, the motion may not be put.

REQUEST FOR SIX MONTHS SUSPENSION OF APPLICATION OF NEW DAIRY POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion.

Considering the uncertain situation of industrial milk producers; considering that the decisions made last April by the Canadian Dairy Commission will force hundreds of producers to withdraw from the dairy industry and that in these circumstances many of them are already forced into bankruptcy, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner):

The unanimous consent of the House to ask the minister responsible to suspend, for a period of six months, the application of the new dairy policy announced last April, so as to give these producers time to reorganize their farms according to the new government measures.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

[*English*]

MANPOWER

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF PROGRAM TO PROVIDE SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the unanimous consent of the House under Standing Order 43 to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the government has eliminated its Opportunities for Youth program and by so doing has eliminated almost 30,000 jobs, or two thirds of its student summer employment and activities program, and in view of the fact that this loss of jobs, coupled with cutbacks in private spending, will cause severe summer unemployment among young people and students—for example, in the Maritimes the loss of 7,000 OFY jobs, coupled with cutbacks in steel, transportation and merchandising industries, will mean student unemployment in excess of 25 per cent this summer—and in view of the fact that recent unemployment figures show not so much that more people are finding work but that more people, especially in the 18 to 24 age group, are being driven out of the labour market by the lack of employment, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the government immediately bring in an emergency summer employment program to be functioning within two weeks and adminis-

tered through municipalities, and that the government immediately prepare a program which will provide grants to students who are either unable to find work this summer or are only able to find very short term work.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES FOUND TAMPERING WITH CLAIMS BUT NOT PROSECUTED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to propose a motion of urgent and pressing necessity concerning the Unemployment Insurance Commission of Canada. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That the Minister of Manpower and Immigration advise the House in regard to the number of persons employed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission of Canada and classified as agents 1 and agents 2, particularly in metropolitan Toronto, who were found by the commission to be tampering with claims in the past eighteen months and who were either permitted to resign from their employment or who in most cases received letters of reprimand only, rather than being prosecuted for such illegal offences.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 such a motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST OF REGIONAL PRODUCERS FOR INVESTIGATION OF TORONTO DOMINATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. On Friday, June 4, a large and responsible body of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation television producers from all parts of Canada called for the government to establish a royal commission to study the Toronto domination of the English network. Mr. Speaker, these people have been reluctant to express their concern outside of the family circle of the CBC, but because the problem is a long standing one and is not being attended to quickly enough, these producers from all parts of Canada have made the public call for action.

In view of the fact that the House has already given unanimous consent to have another matter similar to this referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, the matter being the elimination of regional farm broadcasts, and in view of the fact that these producers believe, with good evidence to support this belief, that the CBC's neglect to involve regional producers when promoting a national viewpoint is in fact a violation of its charter, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday):

That this House instruct the government to honour the request of the CBC television producers from all parts of Canada for a royal commission to study the Toronto domination of the English network.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A motion under Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR AID IN REBUILDING PORTION OF MAIN À DIEU DESTROYED BY FIRE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

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

On this past weekend, as the national news has recorded, there has been a significant tragedy in the historic fishing village of Main à Dieu on Cape Breton Island. Seventeen homes, plus the Roman Catholic Church in the area, were wiped out by a devastating fire. In view of the seriousness of the situation, I move, seconded by the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez):

That officials of the rural and native housing section of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, be immediately sent into the area to get new housing started for the families involved and cut the red tape to a minimum; also, that the Minister of State for Fisheries immediately implement the project for a breakwater extension in Main à Dieu that was to be carried out in the 1977-78 small crafts and harbour program.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon).

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my lead question is for the President of the Treasury Board who is not in his seat at the moment although he was here a few moments ago. Perhaps you would be kind enough to see me again when he returns from his journey.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR OUTLINE OF PRECAUTIONS NECESSARY BEFORE COMMITMENT TO COMMON FUND ESTABLISHED AT UNCTAD CONFERENCE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On May 27, his colleague, then the Acting Prime Minister stated at page 13882 of *Hansard* that Canada would make a contribution to a common fund for the purpose of stabilizing commodity prices as sought by various nations of UNCTAD IV, but he added "providing that certain very logical and I think reasonable precautions are taken". Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister what the reasonable and very logical precautions are that have to be taken before Canada is committed to this fund?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the conference at Nairobi established an ongoing mechanism for discussion and negotiations of the common fund. The position of Canada is that if these negotiations and discussions demonstrate that the fund will be effective in stabilizing the prices of individual commodities, Canada will make a contribution to it. Its usefulness and efficiency will be under our surveillance during those negotiations. If we are satisfied that it has those characteristics, we will contribute.

● (1410)

HABITAT CONFERENCE—SUGGESTED SUPPORT OF SWEDISH OR GROUP OF 77 RESOLUTION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question on a related matter to the Secretary of State for External Affairs? The Habitat conference has now before it draft resolutions from the group of 77 and from Sweden, the Swedish resolution calling for the implementation of the new economic order as a matter of urgency and the larger group of 77 resolution referring to the need for new priorities, new political initiatives and commitment to the new economic order. In light of the minister's own statement regarding the urgency of this matter, will he communicate with the official Canadian delegation at Habitat and urge them to support either the Swedish or the group of 77 resolution?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the Government of Canada's commitment to bringing about a new international economic order, because we have already made it clear that we would participate in efforts to bring about changes in the present international economic system. I would question at this point, without having received any report from our own delegation in Vancouver, the procedure of introducing into the Habitat conference the general subject of the new international economic order which was the subject dealt with by the UNCTAD conference and which is to be the subject of the conference on international economic co-operation. It seems to me that Habitat has a most comprehensive subject with which to deal and we ought to consider whether introducing a related, although important, subject already under consideration elsewhere is a good thing at this time.

Mr. Brewin: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to look into this matter again since I understand that draft resolutions on this important subject are at present being discussed before the resolutions committee, if that is its right name, and the absence of Canadian support might well be misinterpreted?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will, as the hon. member suggests, take a further look at the question. But my initial reaction still stands as valid in the present circumstances. I wonder how often we are to distort the purposes of particular United Nations conferences by bringing in other subjects, no matter how important they may be. I certainly will not insist at all on the Canadian delegation taking a position at Habitat against any particular subject matter which we would support in another forum.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—KNOWLEDGE OF PRESIDENT OF TREASURY BOARD OF VERBAL AGREEMENT ON FINANCING

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Yesterday I asked the minister if he was aware of the verbal agreement between the Department of National Defence and Lockheed and of the requirement of the Department of National Defence for $100 million to pay interest charges. The minister's answer was on an allied subject. I wonder if he could now tell the House, was he or was he not aware of the verbal agreement between Lockheed and the Department of National Defence for Lockheed to provide some $300 million of interim financing?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I answered that, when cabinet reached its decision on November 27, I was aware that a financing problem existed and that the program was going to need an additional amount of about $100 million in interest. In the course of the afternoon, Treasury Board authorized the department to start negotiating the contract with Lockheed.

[*English*]

Mr. McKinnon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are we to understand that the President of the Treasury Board and board members approved this project without knowing in any way where the $300 million was coming from?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we knew there was a problem since we knew that the program would eventually cost $100 million more. Later, during the month of December, we approved it so as to allow that amount to be incorporated in the program which is mentioned in the blue book which was tabled in the House.

[*English*]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY WHETHER MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE ADVISED TREASURY BOARD OF FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): The minister still has not told me whether the Minister of National Defence ever advised him of this bridging arrangement with Lockheed. Three hundred million dollars is an amount of money that would, with few exceptions, be beyond the capability of almost any corporation to raise, or to establish a line of credit for. Are we to believe that the Minister of National Defence was able to get by the Treasury Board without the President of the Treasury Board asking for details as to the source of such funds? The decision made was important enough to cost the taxpayers $16 million.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the question about the $16 million is entirely beside the point. We knew, at Treasury Board, that Orion would probably cost us more than anticipated, that there would eventually be interest of over $100 million to be paid. At a subsequent meeting held sometime last December, Treasury Board gave its approval.

[*English*]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY BY TREASURY BOARD OF NATIONAL DEFENCE AS TO SOURCE OF FINANCING

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the President of the Treasury Board. If the Department of National Defence was going to borrow, this would involve Treasury Board. If Lockheed was going to borrow, that brings up the matter of the assessments that were made by various departments of Lockheed's financial situation. Either way, someone must have stopped and asked DND where, how and when they proposed to get the money. Was this question raised by Treasury Board?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the questions are well known. I have answered them. The Minister of National Defence also answered a dozen questions concerning the internal discussions of Treasury Board, which is a cabinet committee; I am not at liberty to answer all questions on all the problems of the Treasury Board.

[*English*]

Mr. McKenzie: Did the President of Treasury Board seek no more assurance than that? Does he have no documentation? Are we to understand that Treasury Board authorizes the start of multi-million dollar contracts on nothing more than verbal assurance? Apparently all he received from the Minister of National Defence was a verbal assurance. Is this what Treasury Board and the cabinet are working on?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that on November 27 the cabinet had decided to buy that aircraft; that afternoon, Treasury Board authorized the departments concerned to start negotiating the contract. The rest of the story is common knowledge.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING WITH MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Last Friday, in his answer to a question put by my colleague the hon. member for Champlain, the Acting Prime Minister indicated that there would be today an important meeting between the executive of the Quebec APU and some ministers concerning the problems the Quebec dairy industry is faced with. Can the minister take stock of the meeting and indicate to the House whether new elements were added to this issue?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I understand the directors of UPA asked for and were granted a meeting this afternoon with some members of the cabinet. If they have any new proposals, we are willing to listen to them. I understand there are several topics they want to discuss with us. I do not know if they have a complete program. At least I have not been given one that is any different from what they presented to us last week.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary.

My question was quite simple but the minister did not answer it. I would like the minister to tell us whether he is prepared to make a statement to the House as soon as such a meeting will be held, and that both the results and the content of these discussions be made public.

● (1420)

[*English*]

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I think it is public knowledge that they wanted to discuss dairy issues at greater length with members of the cabinet than was the case last week. I know of nothing new that they are going to present to us, nothing that is not already public information.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

MEASURES TO RELAUNCH INQUIRY INTO BILINGUAL AIR-TO-GROUND COMMUNICATIONS FOLLOWING RESIGNATION OF MR. KEENAN

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transport. In light of the unfortunate resignation of Mr. Keenan and the consequent enhanced risk that a strike of air traffic controllers may occur, what steps has the minister taken since yesterday to open talks with those immediately concerned, namely our air traffic controllers and pilots, with a view to the appointment of a commissioner,

co-commissioners or a board of commissioners representing the interests of all those directly concerned in the matter with a view to relaunching without further delay the inquiry into the safety implications of the use of two languages in air traffic control procedures for visual and instrument flying in the province of Quebec?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have had some preliminary discussions with some of the parties and it is my objective to continue doing that with a view to satisfactorily settling this matter.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister would say what sort of timetable he has in mind for the completion of the inquiry.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would say that nothing has changed in that regard. The question of a commissioner's report always depended upon the successful completion of the simulation exercise, and we had set a time period after that. I do not know that anything has changed.

* * *

POST OFFICE

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THIRD-CLASS MAIL RATES—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF AMOUNT

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. It arises out of the statement that he gave in the House on May 21 in which he indicated that consideration of rate increases for third class mail was still being given by the department. May I ask the minister whether he would indicate to the House today the amount of those proposed increases.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his courtesy in giving me advance notice. I have just checked with my officials. We will be announcing publicly and directly to all members of the House, as well as to the affected industries, such as the Christmas card industry, the proposed rate increases before Friday.

Mr. Jarvis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has expressed his concern for those who suffered during last year's postal disruption. In view of the fact that the post card industry certainly suffered as much as any, I wonder whether the minister will play Scrooge and have the rate increases brought in before the 1976 Christmas card season, or Santa Claus and introduce them after the 1976 post card season.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, both Scrooge and Santa Claus are appropriate to the Christmas season.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS—NAME OF CANADIAN DELEGATE AND REASON MEETINGS ARE SECRET

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It relates to the secret conferences in London on nuclear safeguards. I understand that these meetings are now over and that there has been the third round. My question to the minister is simply this. Who were Canada's representatives at that conference last week in London on nuclear safeguards, and was it within the terms of reference of those representatives to assent to this silly, stupid charade of continuing meetings in secrecy when they affect the future of mankind?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the representative of Canada was an officer of my department, Mr. Fulford. The answer to the second part of the question, with all the surrounding verbiage removed, is yes.

Mr. Lawrence: Cutting down the verbiage then, may I ask the minister why?

Mr. MacEachen: Because the nuclear suppliers find this the most effective way to do their business.

* * *

MANPOWER

PROPOSED PROGRAM TO CREATE EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE—REQUEST FOR DETAILS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. He stated in his speech on the budget that it is intended to introduce a strategy for youth employment covering not only student summer employment but the more serious and pervasive problems of unemployed school dropouts and graduates. Given the fact that today's statistics reveal there is certainly a problem in respect of our young people who are not able to enter the labour force, and the fact that this matter will get worse in the next couple of months, can we expect full details on this strategy for youth employment very soon in order to effect the early implementation of the strategy, thereby relieving some of the pressure being placed on our young people, or are these details that will not be known until the fall?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my statement in the budget debate was clear. The program will be developed and made known in the fall.

REASON FOR DELAY IN STARTING JOB CREATING PROGRAM IN VIEW OF AVAILABILITY OF MONEY

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, that is not too much comfort for the thousands of young people who are seeking work now and will be seeking work this summer. The minister also indicated he has some $100 million earmarked for some type of job program to

commence this fall. Once again we have this fall deadline. In light of the serious problem now being faced by our young people, why can the minister not have a much earlier starting date than the fall in order to relieve some of this pressure? He has the money, the jobs are required; why can he not move now in this regard?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have announced the details of other programs for student employment in this House. The $100 million to which the hon. member refers is clearly earmarked for a local initiative type program in the fall similar to the one conducted in 1975-76.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand now that there are no programs and no initiatives on the part of the government to assist our young people who are crying for jobs now and will be to an even greater extent this summer? Is that the position of the minister at this particular time?

Mr. Andras: No, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member has been present when programs which are available for student summer employment have been detailed in this House. There are no additional funds available, but he is fully aware of those programs.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

GOVERNMENT ACTION IF PROGRAM DECLARED ULTRA VIRES BY SUPREME COURT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Today there is a great deal of speculation—

An hon. Member: It is for you, Pierre.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I know he is busy and I dislike disturbing him, but now that he is back from holidays I hope for an answer.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Do I understand from press statements made yesterday that the Supreme Court of Canada will render a judgment by the end of the month? In the event the judgment is to the effect that the parliament of Canada acted ultra vires, is it the intention of the government to bring in legislation prefaced, as I suggested on October 14 last, with a preamble by parliament declaring there is a state of national emergency? Will the Prime Minister have such legislation brought in, in order to ensure that the anti-inflation legislation will be upheld?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the event that the hypothetically pessimistic view of the right hon. gentleman is substantiated in fact, I would consider the suggestion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it was hypothetical in October last when I pointed out the need for the parliament of Canada to declare an emergency, which would have done away with most of the argument before the Supreme Court of Canada. I would ask whether the Prime Minister is still of the opinion that there was not a general emergency, and is that the reason he did not include that particular matter or declaration in the preamble?

[Mr. Alexander.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the legislation speaks for itself, and the right hon. gentleman should know that is the way you interpret a statute.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister refers to us as being a bunch of hyenas. All I can say is that it is apparent we have got his goat. I would ask him this simple question, hypothetical as he stated it to be, although the press is already problematically determining what the majority judgment of the Supreme Court will be, will legislation be brought before this session which already has ambled on for 19 months?

● (1430)

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question, as I answered in the first place, is hypothetical in its form. I have no cause to know what the answer to that hypothetical question would be. I do not have the advantage perhaps the hon. gentleman has of having phoned a judge.

* * *

[Translation]

ENERGY

INQUIRY WHETHER MINISTER WILL INTERVENE IN CONFLICT IN EASTERN CANADA OVER ELECTRICITY

Mr. Bernard Loiselle (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Can he tell the House whether one or several provinces asked him to intervene directly in settling the hydro issue which is now developing in the eastern part of the country, and whether he will intervene through the federal authority with respect to the inter-provincial trade, and if so, within which schedule?

[English]

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have received no formal request from either of the two parties, the province of Quebec or the province of Labrador-Newfoundland, to intervene in their dispute. However, I did have an opportunity to discuss with the ministers of those two provinces and the premiers of the three maritime provinces the concept of an Atlantic pool system. I think we made some important advances in looking at the power problems, particularly electrical power problems, of Atlantic Canada and in seeking an Atlantic solution for them.

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF INTRODUCING PROGRAM TO PROVIDE MILK FOR STUDENTS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the powdered milk surplus is building up by some 10 per cent in the month of April, and in view of the fact that there is a well known nutritional deficiency among many young people in this country, may I ask the minister whether or not he is planning to introduce in this country ways and means to finance in the schools of Canada a school milk program for all students?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of National Health and Welfare has said that he would consider that program and discuss it with the provinces. It is under provincial jurisdiction. The province of Nova Scotia has such a program which allows students to buy milk at five cents for eight ounces, and it is a very good program.

* * *

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF FINANCING PROGRAM TO PROVIDE MILK FOR STUDENTS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. I should like to ask the minister whether or not he on behalf of the federal government can make a financial commitment to finance a school milk program for the students in this country?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we have set out the fiscal framework for the current fiscal year and I do not see any prospect of changing that.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ALLEGED LACK OF DISCUSSION OF FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that no small businessman would think of entering into a business deal involving financing unless the details of that financing were set out on paper and understood well by both sides, would the Prime Minister outline to the House how his government could possibly discuss for many months a deal involving $1 billion with $300 million of financing without one single word about that financing being set forth on paper?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of National Defence and other ministers have repeatedly said, it was our understanding, as a result of verbal agreement, that the bridge financing would be furnished and supplied by the Lockheed Company. The hon. gentleman talks about small business. In small and big business alike, there sometimes are such things as gentleman's and verbal agreements.

Mr. Hees: Well, Mr. Speaker, can the right hon. gentleman think of any business of any size about which he knows or about which he has heard which has entered into any kind of business deal of any size without getting the details of the financing on paper, because without the financing no business deal that requires financing can possibly go forward. Is this not the height of irresponsibility on the part of his government?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I point out to the hon. gentleman that we are not talking about the contract itself at this point. The contract was signed later and put under escrow in circumstances of which the House is aware. At this time we are talking about a preliminary agreement. Very often agreements are entered into on the force of a gentleman's word and he would know more about that if he were a gentleman.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

RUSTING OF FORD MOTOR VEHICLES—POSSIBLE INTERVENTION BY MINISTER AND INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In so far as further class actions are being taken on behalf of Ford owners who have been affected by a very serious rust problem, and in so far as thousands of Ford owners have registered complaints both with the government and the Ford Motor Company, may I ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on behalf of the consumers whether he has intervened with the Ford Motor Company in this regard relating to previous complaints and has he anything further, on their behalf, to report to the House this afternoon.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been several class actions taken against Ford, under provincial legislation not under federal legislation, for alleged rusting of their automobiles. I have discussed the matter with the Ford Motor Company of Canada and with the Automobile Protection Association to the extent that I think there are grounds sufficient for mediating their dispute.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, in view of what has now become an extremely serious problem, especially in the Canadian climate, is the minister considering legislation which would oblige the automobile companies to rust-proof parts before final assembly?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, we are investigating this whole area of whether the problems related to rust are due to climatic conditions or the type of chemical used on the roads in the winter time or whether they are peculiar to a particular automobile or certain design of automobile. When we have completed that study I will announce what the government's intention would be in this regard.

Oral Questions

ENERGY

PROPOSED FEDERAL REGULATION OF INTERPROVINCIAL TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRICITY—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It relates to his statement made last Sunday at Chatham, Massachusetts in which he said that it might be necessary for the Canadian government to regulate interprovincial transmission of electricity in much the same way as it now does oil and gas. Given the reaction this statement has occasioned will the minister furnish the House with the specifics of this new government proposal and will he say what consultation there was with the provinces prior to this statement?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I was not making any particular proposal. I was making an observation which I think is a very important observation. My concern—and I am sure it is the concern of many of the hon. member's colleagues—is that power policy, particularly electrical generation and transmission within the maritimes and Atlantic Canada generally, has been held back by balkanization and there is a very good chance that if very narrow provincial views are the dominant views we will not find any solution for Atlantic Canada on a bigger, more efficient scale. I made the observation that I thought the federal government has the constitutional power to move in if necessary in the transmission of electric power in the same way—the principle is very much the same—as it has in respect of oil and natural gas transmission.

● (1440)

Miss MacDonald: My supplementary question is to ask the minister again what consultation he had with the provinces prior to his statement, and since his proposal has been interpreted by several provinces as an attempt to intrude on the natural resources field, what clarification did he subsequently give to the provinces to relieve their concerns as to the constitutionality of his proposal?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, my predecessor tells me that the same point of view that I expressed at that time was raised with the provincial premiers, or some of them, as long as a year ago. I had some discussions prior to this meeting with some of the premiers—I was not able to reach them all. You may recall that one of the provincial premiers, as a matter of fact, was in Europe at that time. But I did have occasion to meet with each of the premiers or their ministers before we sat down at the public session, and we discussed these questions specifically.

Miss MacDonald: After you made the statement.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ALLEGED BREAK-IN OF QUEBEC NEWSPAPER OFFICE BY MEMBERS OF THE FORCE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. In addition to co-operating with his provincial counterpart and as the minister responsible for the RCMP, will he indicate whether or not he is prepared to give this House a comprehensive report into the circumstances involved in the break and entry by the force and by other police into the premises of L'Agence de Presse Libre du Quebec, and fulfill the commitment he made in the House to give as much information as possible on this matter?

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): As hon. members know, there is an allegation that a criminal offence was committed in the break in of the L'Agence de Presse Libre du Quebec. The Solicitor General of Quebec, in his capacity as chief law enforcement officer in Quebec, is investigating that matter and has asked for our full co-operation. I have spoken to the commissioner of the RCMP and he said he would make available to the Solicitor General of Quebec all information relevant to that particular incident, and the Solicitor General of Quebec will take action in due course. Whether he lays charges or not will be for him to decide as the person in charge of administering the Criminal Code in the province.

Mr. MacKay: I would hope that, regardless of what happened in Quebec, the minister, as the minister responsible, would indicate what the circumstances were. Whose specific responsibility was it to make certain that proper legal authority existed for the RCMP to enter the premises of L'Agence de Presse Libre du Quebec, the purpose of which such entry was obtained, and assure the House that, as one former RCMP officer described such operations, it was not "a wholesale ransacking and appropriation of papers", or a fishing expedition?

Mr. Allmand: At this time I only have the side of the story presented by the RCMP. I do not have the reports of the Quebec provincial police or the Montreal city police. After the Solicitor General of Quebec makes the decision to act or not to act in this case, of course, we may have more to say and may take action ourselves. It would appear from the information I have that this was a joint operation with the three forces involved, and it is unclear at this stage who had complete authority for the operation. There is some difference of opinion at present among the forces as to who had the final say on this, and that is part of the investigation that is going on.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

AIR PASSENGER SERVICE FOR ATLANTIC PROVINCES—POSSIBILITY OF EARLY ACTION

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It has to do with the air passenger service in Atlantic Canada. In view of the desperate need for this service, and in view of the support by the Council of Maritime Premiers recently of the bid of Eastern Provincial Airways Limited to provide this service, could the minister indicate to the House what is the disposition of his department to ensure the quickest possible implementation of this service in Atlantic Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would not want in any way to prejudge the consideration which the CTC will be giving to the applications. The exact question regarding further facilities, when it arises is, of course, one which we have to take under consideration having regard to our total priorities and available funds. I can assure the hon. member, however, of a full and sympathetic examination of specific problems in his area.

* * *

POST OFFICE

ALLEGATION BY UNION DEPARTMENT VIOLATING TECHNICAL CHANGE PROVISION OF CONTRACT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): My question is directed to the Postmaster General, and I have given him prior notice of it. In view of the fact that the minister has told the people of Canada in the past that the agreement between the Post Office and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers concerning a contract clause dealing with technological change would solve many of the problems in the Post Office, and in view of the fact that these problems have not been solved as in several centres the union has complained that the government has not lived up to its part of the contractual clause dealing with technological change, specifically article 29.03(b) requiring a detailed description of the technological change, and in view of the fact that the chief adjudicator of the Public Service Staff Relations Board, Mr. Ed Jolliffe, ruled in his presentation that the Post Office Department is in breach of article 29.03(b), can the minister assure the House that he will instruct his department to honour the technological change provisions of the agreement between the Post Office and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the written report of the adjudicator has still not been made available to both parties. The hon. gentleman is basing his premise on a verbal declaration of the adjudicator last week. What he said in effect, and the hon. gentleman is quite right, is:

> . . . it is my opinion that the onus was on the employer and not on the union,—

in refusing advance information. He also said:

> . . . but it is also my opinion that it would have been reasonable on the part of the union to specify the kind of information needed,

In other words, it can hardly be deduced that the adjudicator is blaming the employer any more than the employee. However, the more important thing is that if they want this particular section to work, I would be quite pleased to meet with the leader of the union in order to clarify any ambiguities in the section.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister that a meeting between the two groups would certainly be most helpful, but the fact of the matter still remains that the minister is responsible for his department—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Oral Questions

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

REASON MOUNTED POLICE NOT PATRONIZING CERTAIN GASOLINE STATIONS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Supply and Services and ask him on what basis local service stations, which in the past have supplied gasoline and oil for vehicles used by the RCMP detachments, are not being patronized now by the RCMP, even though the price of these service stations might be as low or lower than the price at service stations which are supposedly on the department's priority list for purchases?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I will surely check the facts mentioned by the hon. member and answer him as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE PRIME MINISTER KNEW OF VERBAL AGREEMENT ON FINANCING

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister stated in the House on June 3 that he would check the cabinet minutes to determine the date when he learned that the deal with Lockheed was proceeding on the basis of a verbal commitment by that company to provide interim financing. Now that the Prime Minister has had a chance to check his records, would he tell the House when and how he learned that the verbal arrangement with Lockheed was truly a verbal one?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did have the sequence of events put on the record for me. Unfortunately, I do not have the record with me today in the House. I will make sure that I bring it with me tomorrow. But in so far as I can recollect, it is the same as I heard the President of the Treasury Board say it a few minutes ago.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh; we are really in trouble now!

Mr. Trudeau: Late in November, I believe on the 27th, there was a meeting of the Treasury Board at which cognizance was taken of the fact that DND could not finance this particular deal, that we needed more financing. At what point the knowledge of a verbal contract came to my attention I am not certain. I will have to check the date.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF COURT ACTION IN VIEW OF ALLEGATION COMPANY BREACHED AGREEMENT

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister this question. If Lockheed misled the government and in fact reneged on the verbal agreement, as often stated by the Minister of National Defence, will the Prime Minister say why there is any legal commitment to pay $16 million or any other amount to Lockheed? Will the Prime Minister say why

there is any legal commitment to pay $16 million or any other amount to Lockheed? Will he say whether the government has sought legal advice, and will he personally take the initiative to see that Lockheed is taken to court to recover the amounts which have been paid?

● (1450)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. If there is any legal commitment to pay $16 million or $14 million, whatever the figure is, it is because on December 2, the government in order to keep the option open, told Lockheed to begin the work and that we would be liable for any work Lockheed did if the contract were not finally signed.

Mr. Bawden: They reneged on their verbal agreement.

Mr. Trudeau: If the hon. gentleman wants to hear my answer, perhaps he should stop shouting. If he wants to ask a supplementary, I will gladly sit down and then answer.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Well, I think I am finished.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REGIONAL PRODUCERS' REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State. Over two weeks ago the president of the CBC went to Vancouver to meet with an unofficial group known as the Committee of 100 to discuss their concern about the lack of regional involvement in production. Two weeks later the CBC television producers felt compelled to make a public call for a royal commission on the subject. Can the Secretary of State inform the House of any of the substance of the president's discussion and why the producers across Canada had to resort to this public call for a royal commission?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the president of the corporation met with that committee. I myself met with some members of the committee two weeks after his meeting. There is a problem which arises out of the success of our regionalization.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Faulkner: That may appear paradoxical, but I would like to explain it. The fact is that we now have in Vancouver a facility for production which we never had before. We will be developing one in Regina which really did not exist before. Now there is a degree of tension, obviously, between the producers in a place like Vancouver, who would like to have much greater autonomy over program production than they had before, and I think this is a problem the president of the corporation is looking at seriously. It is one I am concerned about, but I am sure that problem would not be resolved by a royal commission.

Mr. Friesen: Would the minister push his luck a little and try to be even more successful by looking on decentralization as more than just putting buildings across the country and allowing some individual decision making across the country? Would he push his luck and take care of that matter before he is shuffled to the oblivion of the government backbenches this summer?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte.

* * *

FISHERIES

POSSIBILITY OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS CONCERNING MARKETING AND PROCESSING—SUGGESTED COMMITTEE MEETING TO INFORM MEMBERS

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, recently the Minister of State (Fisheries) has been involved in negotiations of an international nature in respect of fishing quotas and marketing. Would the minister advise the House whether any contracts have been entered into for the marketing of fish which might be caught in Canada and be surplus to the processing capacity in the area in which the fish are caught?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if a contract proposal has been signed. I have been out of touch because I have been travelling in the fisheries areas in Newfoundland and Iles de la Madeleine over the past few days. I know it was one of the options which was being considered. The price offered for herring in one part of the east coast, the Bay of Fundy, which was mainly used for fish meal, was so low that we looked at alternative markets, and I know the possibility of some sales over the side for a part of that quota was one of the options considered. I have no firm knowledge at the moment whether a possible contract has been finalized, but certainly it necessitates a permit to be issued by the minister responsible, and I have not yet issued such a permit.

Mr. McCain: In view of the negotiations and considerations which have taken place in all respects with regard to the fishing industry, would the minister call or arrange to have called a meeting of the Fisheries Committee which he would attend and advise the members of that committee as to just what has been accomplished as well as what can be expected from future negotiations, which we understand are to take place?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): I certainly have no objection to informing hon. members either in the forum of the committee or in other ways. I understand there was a full session on this very issue, mainly with regard to the Bay of Fundy herring, but what information I have is obviously available, and I will make it available to the hon. member.

PUBLIC WORKS

AUTHORITY OF MR. GALLACHER TO SERVE EVICTION NOTICES TO PROPERTY OWNERS IN PICKERING AREA

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. Can the minister advise if Mr. E. J. Gallacher, an employee of the Department of Public Works, was acting under authority granted by the Governor in Council and the minister when he served eviction notices which were worded "immediate surrender" to those owners whose land the department wishes to expropriate in the Pickering area?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to ascertain whether he was or was not.

* * *

HEALTH

REASON FOR FAILURE TO ADVISE ONTARIO OF CONDITION OF FISH STORED AT GRASSY NARROWS RESERVE

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare concerning the fish problem on the Grassy Narrows Reserve. In view of the fact that Mr. David Eckhart, an environmental health officer with the minister's department, visited Grassy Narrows Indian Reserve on May 18, found the fish stored in the freezer not in good condition and advised the Indians not to eat them, why did the department not advise the Ontario ministry of natural resources of the problem, since that department is responsible for the maintenance of the freezer?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misinformed. First, the visit in question did not take place on May 18, but on May 17. During his visit the inspector realized that the fish were not kept under proper conditions and he gave instructions that different methods be used to keep the fish in that freezer. At that time there seemed to be no indication that the fish was unfit for human consumption, even though the refrigerating conditions under which it was kept were not adequate. I have no indication that the official advised the Indians at that time that the fish was unfit for consumption. A further inspection of the fish was carried out later, around May 25, at which time the conclusion reached was that the fish was unfit for consumption, but not on May 17 or 18 as the hon. member's question indicated. It would appear that certain developments occurred in the meantime.

* * *

[*English*]

POST OFFICE

FINES ASSESSED UNION MEMBERS WHO DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN STRIKE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Postmaster General, and it is with regard to last fall's postal strike. In view of the fact that the Postmaster General gave a number of post office locals written assurance that they would not be subject to pressure tactics or harassment, does the minister now approve of the fact that those members of locals which were suspended from the union are still having union dues subtracted from their pay cheques, plus an additional $10 per person this past month?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I do not approve of it. The question of union dues, however, comes under the Rand formula, and that means that a non-union member who, however, wants the protection of the union must pay the regular dues. In so far as the $10 fine per month levied by that union is concerned, I think this practice, frankly, is despicable.

* * *

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

ALLEGED FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH PROVISIONS OF ACT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State (Fisheries). It has to do with the matter I brought to his attention on several occasions in this House. It has to do with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act Part III, section 23(2). Could the minister now tell the House whether he has consulted the Solicitor General and whether the Solicitor General will proceed with charges because of the obvious violation of the law with reference to that section of the act?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into the file to see what point this matter has reached.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF TARIFF PROTECTION FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA FRUIT AND VEGETABLE GROWERS

Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. There was a tragic waste of hundreds of tons of cauliflower and other vegetables produced in the Fraser Valley last year. Is it the intention of the government to protect the fruit and vegetable industry of British Columbia through the imposition of adequate tariff structures during the current production season?

● (1500)

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the tariffs that are in effect in Canada during the crop production year are agreed upon by the producers organizations through consultation with the Canadian Horticultural Society and then in consultation with the federal government. I have had no representation that I can think of so far this year concerning the crops that the hon. member mentioned.

Point of Order—Mr. Blais

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY WHETHER MINISTER ASSURED BY NATIONAL DEFENCE BY DECEMBER 2 OF FINANCIAL CAPACITY TO HANDLE

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services and I am sorry I was not able to ask it while he was in his seat. I appreciate the minister returning to his seat. My question is designed to try to elucidate events that occurred on December 1 or 2. At page 14106 of *Hansard* the Minister of Supply and Services said that the Department of National Defence "assured me that problem could be solved and the financing was assured". Later, in answer to the hon. member for Victoria at page 14153, the minister indicated that the Department of National Defence "gave no indication whatsoever that it could not meet its financial obligations". What is unclear is whether there was a concrete undertaking given by the Department of National Defence as to the financial capacity of that department on this matter. I wonder if the Minister of Supply and Services could tell the House specifically whether information was given to him on that date by his colleague, the Minister of National Defence or by officials of that department. If so, could he tell the House specifically what that information was or was all that happened that the Department of National Defence did not draw attention to the fact of some financing problems? Was there a specific undertaking and if so, what was it and who gave it?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, as I often said to the House, the questions of financing are obviously the responsibility of the Department of National Defence. As for me, I carried out my mandate according to my obligations, that is to say DND had given the assurance they would look after the financing.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Presenting Reports from Standing or Special Committees.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege. In reply to my supplementary question the Prime Minister today indicated that he thought I was being ungentlemanly in asking such a question. As I know the Prime Minister only gives such rude answers when he is frustrated and does not want to answer the question, I want him to know that I completely forgive his rudeness in making such an ungentlemanly remark.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it never would have crossed my mind to suggest that the hon. gentleman was not a gentleman. That would be a non-tautology; on the contrary I know he is a gentleman. The fact that struck me is that perhaps he is more of a country gentleman than a business gentleman. Any gentleman engaged in business of any size knows that there are hundreds of millions of dollars of transactions that go on every day on verbal assurances without any contractual writing. This is something that the hon. gentleman does not seem to know about.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order relating to Standing Order 43. I am sure Your Honour has noted as other hon. members have, that the practice has developed whereby members of the opposition have been using motions under Standing Order 43 in order to attempt to make political points.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: I did say "attempt", Mr. Speaker. My intention would have been to rise at the time motions are presented in order to object except that I am mindful of Your Honour's previous statements regarding points of order during question period. The point I wish to make is that I do not believe that your rulings do affect motions under Standing Order 43. However, being a fair man—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blais: I would offer to hon. members opposite the full opportunity of debating the point because I am confident it is one on which Your Honour will rule in my favour. I would therefore invite Your Honour to perhaps set aside some time in the near future so that this matter can be seriously debated and discussed and a proper ruling made on it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear my hon. friend characterize himself as a fair man.

An hon. Member: Just fair; that is all.

An hon. Member: He is the member who always says no to motions under Standing Order 43.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): He is not being unduly modest, Mr. Speaker. In any event, I think Standing Order 43 has never been used by us for any political purpose.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp: Not successfully.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Except, Mr. Speaker, when the dictates and circumstances of our country have required us to bring to the attention of the House the shortcomings of the government—which are legion—and important matters of public interest, the nature of which we would expect members of the House to consent to unanimously.

What is of concern to us, however, is that throughout this session there seems to be a presumption on the part of the government that all matters under Standing Order 43 ought not to be considered. In fact, when the history of this time is written the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) will go down as having made his greatest parliamentary contribution by uttering the word "no" before the motion has been fully put to the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): As I recollect the way that motions made under Standing Order 43 have gone it seems to me that Your Honour has seen fit to indicate whether motions made under Standing Order 43 are in fact on a matter of "urgent and pressing necessity" to use the

words of the rule. You, sir, ought to make that decision and ought to continue to make that decision.

What I should like the government to do is not to make the decision that unanimous consent ought to be rejected to all these motions before the motion ever has a chance to be considered by you on the one hand or even put before the House on the other hand. It is to that point that there could be some objection before this House or before the committee. The Standing Order is certainly not one to be abused. It ought not to be abused by any member of the House in advancing a motion under it and it ought not to be abused by any member of the House by rejecting the substance of the motion out of hand. If we are to direct our comments to anything with respect to this matter they ought to be directed to what I think is the impropriety that has occurred during this session particularly and other sessions that has brought Standing Order 43 into disrepute.

Standing Order 43 is one of the few instances where private members of the House—not opposition parties as such, not cabinet, not parliamentary secretaries but private members of the House—can bring to the attention of the House and the country matters of urgent and pressing necessity falling within the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada. Because it is assumed that all such motions should not be put, the rule has fallen into disrepute. That should not have happened. I hope those considering this rule will bear in mind that it is necessary for private members of this House to have the opportunity to bring to the attention of the House in this manner matters of great concern to the member's constituency, region or the country as a whole.

● (1510)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais), I submit that it is not a valid point of order and that Your Honour should take no notice of it. The fact is that before Easter, 1975, the House and the Chair had a great deal of trouble with motions moved under Standing Order 43. There seemed to be no time limit for moving them; there was, admittedly, abuse and the occupant of the chair, both yourself and Mr. Speaker Lamoureux, encountered a good deal of difficulty.

The procedure and organization committee which recommended rule changes which came into effect after Easter, 1975, attempted to resolve the problem by putting in the orders of the day a time limit. Motions under Standing Order 43 can be moved only in the time between the end of prayers and 2.15 p.m. I submit that since that change was made, there has been little abuse. Your Honour on a number of occasions refused to put certain motions, because you felt they went beyond the rights of that particular opportunity. But when a member on the government side, who thinks that politics is all right on his side but not on this side, argues that we should have some discussion on the motions moved, he is intervening where he has no reason to intervene.

I submit members may stray a bit on occasion, but Your Honour stops them. On the other hand, you run into situations like those of today. My hon. friend from Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan) knew he would not be recognized in the question period and used Standing Order 43 to bring to the attention of the House the plight of persons in his constituency who have been burned out of their homes. If that is playing politics, if that is an abuse, I suggest my hon. friend opposite does not know what he is talking about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member opposite said no. I think that is politics at its worst. The hon. member of my party raised the issue. That was politics as it ought to be. I submit that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization did a good job when it resolved the problem before Easter, 1975. If I may say so—I hope I will not be misunderstood—Your Honour is policing the matter quite well. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) should find other fields to farm.

Mr. Paproski: He needs a holiday.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order raised by the Parliament Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) concerning Standing Order 43. This is a most important point. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) just stated, there has been a time when members could introduce an indefinite number of motions under Standing Order 43. This could be a very long process and made for unending debates. Therefore, Standing Order 43, was changed on a unanimous vote.

But as far as this party is concerned, Standing Order 43 was very often the only way to raise an urgent point, and explain our request or proposition. The government felt this was too lengthy, because in their view we always waste too much time. They would rather have no opposition, but it does not matter much anyway because they act as if they were alone.

Before Easter 1975, there was work to be done and it was decided 15 minutes would be allocated each day to motions under S.O. 43. The main result was fewer and fewer Social Credit members could raise urgent matters, because the 15 minutes were distributed among all opposition parties.

Something else happened at the same time, and I would appreciate it if the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council would listen, as we listened to him. There was a time when Liberal members put questions during the question period. Today, with the goodwill of almost everyone in this House, they are allowed to put questions. So, there has been a reduction of opposition opportunities under Standing Order 43, and at the same time the government overtook another portion of the question period, which should normally belong to opposition members.

I shared the views of those who favoured greater participation by the so-called government backbenchers. It has come to the point where we are now the target of the parliamentary secretary's irony for using Standing Order 43 on occasion, although I respectfully submit that oftentimes the Chair recognizes only one question by one member only in our group.

Point of Order—Mr. Blais

Mr. Speaker, this is the point of no return. Either we shall make full use of the Standing Orders to have our party recognized in this House, or the business of the House will be systematically obstructed. It is abnormal that in wanting to cooperate with the Chair, we should get only one question and one supplementary, and furthermore that we should have to take the abuse of the parliamentary secretary. There will have to be a lot more latitude in this House, that is more honesty for each parliamentary group, or I am advising the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) that he will no longer get those unanimous consents in any way.

Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to wanting to muzzle the opposition, particularly smaller parties. That is why I find entirely out of order the point raised by the parliamentary secretary because it does not consider the members of this House, and I ask him respectfully as well as you, Mr. Speaker, to respect our rights and requests as much as we accept that backbenchers of his own party ask questions.

Mr. Speaker, when they come to us to ask for our cooperation to allow a Liberal member or two to ask questions, we say: Okay, we want you to do your work just as we are doing ours. So we are asking you today to give us the same right and to respect that right without taking away the little participation in democracy to which we are entitled in this House, that is Standing Order 43. It will be remembered that one day, about Standing Order 43, when the Chair at that time allowed only one motion per day all members presented in turn two or three motions under Standing Order 43. I say this simply to bring to the attention of the House the fact that we were muzzled. And it was immediately after that that Standing Order 43 was changed so motions could be introduced from two o'clock to 2.15 and we agreed, provided we would be recognized during the oral question period. In concluding, I say to the parliamentary secretary that no respect was shown for us by both his party and the Chair—not you, Your Honour—in the oral question period as a whole. Furthermore, we will not tolerate being muzzled with respect to Standing Order 43.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Representatives of each of the parties have contributed to the point of order with respect to Standing Order 43 raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais). I do not think further contributions on the point are required at this time.

It is important to make one or two brief observations. I suggest, initially, that the assessment of Standing Order 43 made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was correct. The Standing Order has given the Chair difficulty for some time, a difficulty which arose by virtue of the fact that the order paper called for motions under Standing Order 43 to be raised each day after the question period, which meant that there was an open-ended period of time during which members could attempt to introduce such motions.

At the beginning of the present parliament I began to examine very carefully such motions moved pursuant to Standing Order 43. Since the period of time in which they could be introduced was open-ended, it was incumbent on the Chair to exercise diligence in ascertaining whether they conformed to the rule. A difficulty arose early during the present parliament, in that since such motions are almost exclusively introduced by opposition members, it appeared as if the Chair was constantly interposing itself between opposition members who introduced such motions and the actual bringing of the motions to the floor of the House with unanimous consent. That was an unfortunate appearance which did not make the life of the Speaker of the House easier.

• (1520)

I think in very large measure that was corrected by the rearrangement of our proceedings from which a very strong self-policing feature has evolved in that motions under Standing Order 43 have a limited life each day. If they are spurious on a repetitive basis by either a member or a caucus, surely that will become a self-policing factor because, on a constant basis, they cut into the time for posing questions which is generally regarded as the most important daily device in this House.

Therefore, the self-policing feature has enabled me to take a much more relaxed attitude toward the content of Standing Order 43 motions. However, I do on occasion refuse to put motions which are frivolous or do not seem to have anything to do with the jurisdiction of this House. Beyond that, as long as they relate to a matter of some importance and urgency, whether it even be in the narrow parochial lines of an individual constituency, that is a matter which might be considered.

That is not the end of the difficulty. There is a difficulty on the other side as well. When there is refusal to give unanimous consent to such a motion, there is often the impression that there appears to be some sentiment expressed contrary to the merits of the motion. That is an unfair interpretation, indeed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: As all hon. members know, motions put forward pursuant to Standing Order 43 seek unanimous consent only for the introduction of the motion. If unanimous consent is given, once the motion is introduced it is a debatable motion which becomes the priority order of the day. Therefore, the question is not so much the merits of the motion involved, but whether the House wishes to give its unanimous consent to set aside the business of the day to debate something else. Often, the putting forward of such a motion seems to carry with it the spirit that if only hon. members would give their unanimous consent the motion would pass without debate. That is a great spirit, but all of us know there is no guarantee of procedural equanimity on all sides. Therefore, there is difficulty with interpretation of the rule, regardless of whether it is an opposition member who wishes to put the motion or government members who refuse to set aside orders of the day in order to debate it, or the Chair with regard to interpreting it.

Bearing in mind all those difficulties, I have only two remarks to make. The self-policing features do not eliminate all of the problems, but certainly most of them. The manner in which we have been dealing with Standing Order 43 seems to be about the best we have been able to find so far. Second, if there are improvements for further

refinements, rather than their being raised here for further discussion, perhaps they ought to be suggested to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization which might give them further consideration.

There are other members seeking the floor on a point of order. I will first recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie), then the hon. member for Regina Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I know that you are trying to discourage any further intervention on the point of order with regard to Standing Order 43. However, there is another aspect of this subject that has been mentioned very rarely, if at all, since that order has become part of our rules. There are two aspects, one of which was briefly mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot prevent the hon. member from raising the point of order. However, I sought intervention from all parties and made a ruling on the point of order. I cannot prevent any hon. member from raising it as a separate point of order. I would prefer to think that the subject is closed at the moment, but I cannot prevent the hon. member from raising it.

Mr. Benjamin: Most of the time I am not disagreeable. However, as a private member in this chamber I feel there is an aspect of Standing Order 43 that has not been taken into account by private members on both sides of the House. My understanding is that if any member of this House wants to move a motion that requires unanimous consent, he should at least have the courtesy to state in advance what the motion is and when he intends to move it. This is the procedure in the standing committees when members wish to move amendments. They have the courtesy of passing out copies of their amendments. This also applies to the various House leaders when they are arriving at agreements as to procedures to be followed or what the business of the House will be.

When a private member rises to move a motion under Standing Order 43, which I rarely do, he is not playing around. He is genuinely interested in obtaining unanimous consent, not the Pavlovian reflex of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais). Similarly, an hon. member should be able to obtain unanimous consent without there being debate or, if in the course of obtaining advance notice in discussion with the other parties to obtain agreement for unanimous consent, that may or may not be put with debate. Surely that should be the responsibility of each member who wishes to move a motion under Standing Order 43.

It is nonsensical for a member to move a motion under Standing Order 43 when he is just playing around. Similarly, it is nonsensical that when a member moves a very good motion under Standing Order 43, which he does not want debated, not to obtain the unanimous consent of the House to put the motion and have it passed. The knee-jerk reaction of members opposite is surely a perversion of the rule. The efforts of Your Honour to rule out those motions which just "play around" have been excellent. However, there is a great deal more responsibility on each individual member with regard to how he words his motion under Standing Order 43 and how he proceeds with it.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) seeking the floor pursuant to the point of order with regard to Standing Order 43?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have found, strangely enough, that this is one of the corners of the House that is under the blinkers. Having been a member of the procedure committee, and having considered this matter, I share some of the concerns expressed by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). I recognize some of the problems faced by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) who, frankly is under instruction to make an automatic block. His predecessor was known for that. It is a sort of knee-jerk reaction. I believe that in many instances the House has been guilty of abusing Standing Order 43. Standing Order 26 used to be the vehicle for giving expression to private members' concerns.

● (1530)

I am not going to criticize the hon. member for Nipissing, nor others, nor the Chair; I am here to suggest very strongly that the Chair should request the committee on procedure to take another look at this matter to see whether or not there is some other formula which will give greater liberty to individual members to advance certain points of view. We have done this with the ten o'clock show, and perhaps this should come at six o'clock; but we have done some other things, too. However, I earnestly suggest—and this is something that has to come from the Chair to the government House leader—that this be made a matter of priority with the committee on procedure, since I would say that we are, unfortunately, in a situation where the chairmanship of the committee of procedure is under the government House leader. That should not be, Mr. Speaker, since procedure is a matter for members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: If I may now finalize the representations made on Standing Order 43, the last two members who have spoken have raised different points. Dealing firstly with the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), I was at the point of suggesting that this matter might be taken before the procedure committee. I have nothing to say, of course, respecting the chairmanship of that committee.

With respect to the point made by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), the hon. member raises a separate difficulty that is inherent in the remarks he has put forward; that is to say, that an hon. member who puts forward, as he described, a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 is persuaded that the motion is so worth while that it ought to be put without debate. That, in itself, is a proposition which most hon. members find questionable. Often, these motions are rather complex and touch very important subjects. Often members find it is incongruous to debate motions in this chamber for many days, yet the House is expected on a daily basis to accept a proliferation of motions without any debate or possibility of amendment. Usually, insistence on debate is the only motivation for refusing unanimous consent. I only add that comment to indicate that the problem of either getting or

withholding unanimous consent is much more complex than meets the naked eye.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CANADA BROADCASTING CORPORATION

TABLING OF TECHNICAL AND COST PROFILE OF TELEVISION COVERAGE OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), a technical and cost profile of television coverage of parliamentary proceedings prepared by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,615, 5,258, 5,276, 5,306, 5,307, 5,373, 5,497 and 5,522.

[*Text*]

GRANTS PROVIDED BY MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL TO PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

Question No. 4,615—**Mr. Whiteway:**

1. For the years (a) 1973-74 (b) 1974-75 (c) 1975-76 were grants provided to the Province of Manitoba by the (i) Medical Research Council for medical research (ii) National Research Council for physical sciences research (iii) Canada Council for research in humanities and social sciences and, if so, in each case, in what amounts?

2. For the year 1974-75 how many persons were employed in medical research in the Province of Manitoba and, of these, how many will have their jobs terminated due to the recent freeze in funds provided by the Medical Research Council?

3. For the year 1974-75, were projects funded by the Medical Research Council in Manitoba and, if so (a) what were they (b) how many, if any, such projects will be affected due to the recent freeze in grants provided by the Medical Research Council?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Medical Research Council, the National Research Council and the Canada Council as follows: 1. (i)* $2,395,442; $2,253,839; $2,282,664. (ii) 1973-74, $2,261,130; 1974-75, $2,323,537; 1975-76 (Forecast), $2,628,863. (iii) No grants were provided.

*NOTE: Figures refer to grants provided to researchers in the Province of Manitoba.

2. Information not available.

3. Yes; (a) In 1974-75 the Medical Research Council supported 90 projects, 1 MRC Group and 2 special projects, and provided general research grants to the deans of the schools of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy, and 7 grants for the maintenance of research equipment. Details of the projects supported in 1974-75 are recorded in the Report of the President of the Medical Research Council for 1974-75, tabled in the House on June 17, 1975; (b) Thirty-nine of those projects have been completed or terminated during the intervening period. Of those which are still continuing in 1976-77, 32 projects and the MRC Group have been subject to a 3 per cent reduction in approved operating funds for 1976-77, and the general research grants have been reduced by one-third for the year 1976-77. Seven projects which would normally have been assured of support for the full year 1976-77 will receive only 8 months support and 2 additional ones will receive 3 months rather than 12 months support. These figures, of course, do not take account of additional funds of $2 million recently made available to the Medical Research Council. It is expected that the decision as to the disposition of these extra funds will be made by Council at its meeting of June 8-11, 1976.

FARM IMPROVEMENT LOANS PROGRAMME—LOANS TO FARMERS IN TÉMISCAMINGUE CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 5,258—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since the implementation of the Farm Improvement Loans Programme, what was the total amount of loans granted to the farmers in the Constituency of Témiscamingue?

2. (a) How many farmers in the Constituency made applications for such loans (b) how many received such a loan (c) what are their addresses?

3. For each loan, what was (a) the name of the lending institution (b) the rate of interest charged (c) the period for repayment?

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Under the Farm Improvement Loans Programme the government provides guarantees for loans made at the discretion of private lenders. Statistics concerning such loan guarantees are not maintained on a constituency basis.

OUTFITTING OF SENIOR OFFICIALS' OFFICES WITH APPLIANCES

Question No. 5,276—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Since the present Deputy Minister of Health was appointed, what major appliances have been installed in his office and at what cost?

2. Are there any government regulations issued by Treasury Board or the Department of Public Works covering the outfitting of senior officials' offices with appliances such as stoves, refrigerators, dishwashers, and the like and, if so, what is the general purport of such regulations?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Health and Welfare, Public Works and Treasury Board as follows: 1. No major appliances have been installed in the Deputy Minister of Health's office. However, an amount of $1,006 was spent to buy a dishwasher, refrigerator and stove when the Health side of the Department moved to new quarters. These appliances are adjacent to the Executive Conference Room and are at the disposal of Departmental Officers utilizing the Conference Room.

2. Although there are no Treasury Board regulations governing the outfitting of the offices of senior officials with electrical appliances, deputy heads are responsible for exercising and maintaining a high standard of probity and prudence in all aspects of the management of their departments and for ensuring that any acquisitions are appropriate to their needs.

SELECTION OF CENSUS COMMISSIONERS

Question No. 5,306—**Mr. Cossitt:**

To the knowledge of the government, were appointees as Census Commissioners, for the Constituency of Leeds, for the 1976 Census members or supporters of the Liberal Party and, if so (a) is the government officially aware that Mr. Edward Lanigan was the provincial candidate for the Liberal Party in Leeds in the last provincial election (b) is the government officially aware that Mrs. Elsie Wilson of Smiths Falls is the Secretary of the Leeds Liberal Association (c) are all such appointments made on the basis of politics rather than on the basis of public competition and merit and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: With respect to (a) and (b) Statistics Canada has no knowledge of the background or political affiliation of those individuals who are referred as Census Commissioner Candidates. Statistics Canada recommends for appointment only qualified candidates irrespective of their political affiliation. With respect to (c) the recruitment procedures for Census Commissioners are outlined in the answer to 2(a) of Question No. 5,307. It must be reiterated that candidates must pass both a personnel selection test and personal interview administered by employees of Statistics Canada. Statistics Canada does not recommend unqualified candidates to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for appointment.

SELECTION OF CENSUS COMMISSIONERS

Question No. 5,307—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What constituencies are included under the jurisdiction of Mr. Robert L. Potvin, a regional director of Statistics Canada?

2. (a) What is a detailed description of methods used by Mr. Potvin or his representatives in selecting census commissioners for the 1976 Census (b) what is the name and address of every person contacted in regard to such appointments in each constituency (c) were Members of Parliament contacted and, if so, which ones and what is their political affiliation (d) in constituencies not represented by a Member of Parliament who is a member of the Liberal Party, were any members of Liberal Party executives contacted and, if so, what are their names and addresses?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: 1. The constituencies included in the jurisdiction of the Ottawa Regional Office of Statistics Canada (Mr. R. L. Potvin, Regional Director) follow: (See table)

2. (a) The appointment of commissioners for the 1976 Census of Canada falls under the authority of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce as contained under Section 5 of the Statistics Act. The same procedure for recruiting and appointing Commissioners has long been established several censuses ago. A local contact is appointed through the Minister's Office for each constituency for the purpose of identifying potential Commissioner candidates to Statistics Canada regional officers. All Commissioner nominees are subjected to a qualifying test administered by Statistics Canada; they are also interviewed by Statistics Canada employees. Those candidates judged by Statistics Canada to be qualified are recommended for appointment to the Minister; (b) The attachment lists the names and addresses of all local contacts provided to the Ottawa Regional Office of Statistics Canada. In addition, several Canada Manpower Centres were also contacted; (c) Question 2(b) above, indicates those constituencies where the Member of Parliament acted as a local contact for his/her own constituency; (d) In all constituencies the name of the local contact was provided to Statistics Canada by the office of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Statistics Canada has no information as to whether or not the local contacts are members of Liberal Party executives.

Ottawa Regional Office area of responsibility

Federal Electoral District	Name and Address of Contact
1. Abitibi	M. François Godbout 6 rue Principale N. Amos, Québec.
2. Gatineau	M. Gaston Clermont (M.P.) Thurso, Québec
3. Hull	Mme. Claudia Deslauriers 61 rue Corbeil, Hull, Québec.
4. Pontiac	Mr. Fred Metcalfe P.O. Box 401, Bristol, Québec.
5. Témiscamingue	M. Jacquelin Bergeron Nédélec, Québec.
6. Villeneuve	M. Lionel Brochu 663-3e avenue, Val d'Or, Québec.
7. Algoma	Mrs. Mary Gillis 211 Hunter Street, Espanola, Ontario.
8. Cochrane	Conrad Stewart 38 Kimberly Drive, Kapuskasing, Ontario.
9. Frontenac, Lennox and Addington	Mrs. Grace Stalker R.R. * 1, Bath, Ontario.
10. Glengarry-Prescott-Russell	Alvarez Laliberté 503 rue Laurier, Hawkesbury, Ontario.
11. Grenville-Carleton	Mrs. Pat Beaudry 1339 Meadowlands Dr., Apt. 911 Ottawa, Ontario.
12. Kingston and The Islands	Mr. Bob Little 346 Clarence Street, Kingston, Ontario.
13. Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton	Jim McGregor Douglas, Ontario.

Order Paper Questions

Ottawa Regional Office area of responsibility

Federal Electoral District	Name and Address of Contact
14. Leeds	Hugh Hart, 61 King St., East, Brockville, Ontario.
15. Nickel Belt	Mrs. Susan Kitchener, 10 Balsam, Copper Cliff, Ontario.
16. Nipissing	Mr. Fernand Remillard, P.O. Box 70, Lavigne, Ontario.
17. Ottawa Carleton	Tom Lamothe, 2 Seguin Street, Ottawa, Ontario. K1J 6P6
18. Ottawa Centre	Mr. Louis Tarte, 42 Primrose Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario.
19. Ottawa Vanier	Mrs. Earla Charlebois, 196 Marlborough Street, Ottawa, Ontario.
20. Ottawa West	Mrs. Joyce Erskine, 1230 Major Street, Ottawa, Ontario. K2C 2S2
21. Renfrew North-Nipissing East	Mr. Wilfred LeBarr, 262 Catherine Street, Pembroke, Ontario. K8A 1V7
22. Sault Ste-Marie	Mrs. Cathy Gernon, 152 Arden, Sault Ste-Marie, Ontario.
23. Stormont-Dundas	Mr. Ed Lumley (M.P.) 302 Baldwin Avenue, Cornwall, Ontario.
24. Sudbury	Sirio Bacciaglia, 902 Charlotte Street, Sudbury, Ontario. P3E 4C4
25. Timiskaming	Mr. Dan Kilbride, 6 Wood Street, Kirkland Lake, Ontario.
26. Timmins	Conrad Carrière, 224 Spruce N., Timmins, Ontario.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—MR. VICTOR FISHER, MEXICO

Question No. 5,373—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. On what date was the Department of External Affairs first contacted regarding the Victor Fisher case?

2. What was the first time that anyone from the Canadian Embassy in Mexico talked or visited directly with Mr. Fisher?

3. What are all the dates and times that anyone from the Canadian Embassy had direct contact with Mr. Fisher?

[Mr. Roy (Laval).]

4. (a) Who in the Canadian Embassy gave permission to talk directly with the Judge involved in the case (b) on what date did Embassy officials talk to the Judge?

5. Was anyone at the political level contacted by the Canadian government and, if so, what was the name(s) of the official(s) contacted?

6. Has the Canadian government ever acted as an intermediary when bribes or pay-offs were made to Mexican officials?

7. (a) How many complaints were received at the Canadian Embassy in Mexico during the years 1974 and 1975 (b) how many of these involved persons in jail (i) what are their names (ii) how long were they incarcerated?

8. Does the government advertise to warn Canadians of the special circumstances they can get involved in while in Mexico if they are accused of violating Mexican law?

9. Are there any negotiations going on with Mexico at the present time to set up special courts for Canadian tourists?

10. Are any negotiations going on between the Canadian and Mexican governments that would allow Canadians to post bail if they are arrested in Mexico?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. January 29, 1976.

2. February 16, 1976.

3. Records show that Mr. Fisher was directly contacted by the Embassy on February 16, March 25 (twice), April 9, 12, 21 and 22. In addition, there were several contacts with Mr. Fisher's lawyer and with his cousin, Mr. Arnold Fisher.

4. (a) Head of Consular Section of the Embassy; (b) February 26, 1976.

5. Yes. The Governor of Colima, the Office of the Deputy Attorney-General of Mexico and H.E. The Ambassador of Mexico to Canada.

6. No.

7. (a) Assuming that complaints mean requests for information or assistance, the Embassy received between 200-300 per month; (b) 61; (i) Information of this nature is considered to be confidential and is therefore not released without the consent of the persons concerned. (ii) The length of detention varied with the nature of the charge and; as applicable, with the length of sentence if found guilty.

8. No. There is no specific warning regarding Mexico. However, the pamphlets "Information for Canadians Travelling Abroad" and "Bon Voyage, but..." which are included with all new passports, contain general information on local laws and regulations abroad and on the type of difficulties which travelling Canadians may encounter.

9. No.

10. No.

ANNUAL SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Question No. 5,497—**Mr. Herbert:**

How many government employees are presently receiving an annual salary (a) between $20,000 and $30,000 (b) more than $30,000?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): Of the government employees for which the Treasury Board is the employer (PSSRA, Schedule 1, Part 1, plus PSSRB): 18,918 receive an annual salary of between $20,000 and $30,000 and 4,652 receive an annual salary of more than $30,000.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AUTHORITY—CARGO

Question No. 5,522—**Mr. Forrestall:**

In the best estimate of the government, would any cargo be diverted from the St. Lawrence Seaway if rates were increased to $1.65 per ton of bulk cargo and to $3.70 per ton of general cargo and, if so (a) what commodities would be diverted (b) in what quantity (c) to what modes and to what routings?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority advises as follows: Some cargo would be diverted from the St. Lawrence Seaway if the present tolls on the Montreal-Lake Ontario section were increased to $1.65 per ton bulk and $3.70 per ton general. Given the many variables that affect this traffic, it is not feasible to predict the commodities or the alternative routings that would be involved. There are, however, indications that such a toll increase would have adverse effects upon the low value bulk products which comprise some 90 per cent of Seaway traffic. A considerable amount of Quebec-Labrador iron ore could be diverted to U.S. East Coast ports and thence by unit train to the interior or, alternatively, to overseas markets. This ore presently provides a backhaul for grain moving eastward. If much of the ore traffic is diverted, the lack of a backhaul would affect substantially the cost advantage currently enjoyed by Seaway grain movements.

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

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cossitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I draw the attention of the parliamentary secretary to question No. 5,141 which was placed on the order paper on March 31. That question asks for details concerning the fact that operators of Bell Canada, under instructions from the Department of Communications, listen in at intervals of approximately 40 to 45 seconds to telephone calls made by members of parliament in incoming government Watts lines. My question also asks for the reason this is done, why these instructions were issued, who issued them, and for a guarantee that this was not being done for the purposes that one might hope are not the reason, namely, to gather information for political purposes.

It seems to me that this is a simple and straightforward question, and it is one to which members of parliament are entitled to have an answer. The information is no secret. It is contained in the question. It is obtainable from any Bell operator operating for the government under communications. It is obtainable from supervisors on duty. I have obtained it from four supervisors and at least five operators.

I think it is about time that the members of this House had an answer to a question almost 2½ months old asking why operators of Bell Canada, paid by the government, are listening in on calls of members of parliament. This is a

pretty serious business. They say that the equipment is outdated, that they have to listen in to see if we are still talking in order to disconnect the line. If the equipment is outdated, I suggest that it is time something is done about the equipment.

Certainly, we ought to be told these things, Mr. Speaker, since it is always a possibility that some listening-in would be done for political purposes, and this would go beyond all bounds of decency and what should be permitted in the House. I recall that at one point Your Honour said that this matter would be looked into, along with other points of order raised by my colleague sitting to my left and, I believe, by the hon. member for Yukon, and that subsequently a meeting would be held to reveal the results and the findings. As yet, I do not believe that meeting has taken place. If we cannot have some indication from the parliamentary secretary as to when the question will be answered, perhaps I can ask the Chair for some indication when the promised meeting will be held, so as to clarify the situation which seems to me to be quite out of order.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have had a question on the order paper since July 25, 1975, question No. 3,072, which is almost one year old. It asks several questions respecting the Post Office Department and their annual report concerning employees in the various categories. As I said, the question has been on the order paper since July 25 last, and I think it is absolutely ridiculous that this government has been unable to answer the question in almost a year. I think they had better get about their business and give answers to these questions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stevens (page 13901).

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I continue the remarks I started the other day, on June 3, as reported at page 14147 of *Hansard*, when I had to call it ten o'clock. At that time I was expressing concern that the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development had indicated that of 12 countries that appeared on a chart showing percentage expenditure of gross national product spent on research and development, Canada was tenth. I was trying to express some concern about the small amount of money that Canadians spend on research and development.

In order to show the concern that many people in this country have about this fact, may I just read an extract from a letter written to me by a constituent, a company that started a year and a half ago with four people, four

founders, and which has now grown to the extent of employing 19 people. In its second full year it looks like its billings will amount to half a million dollars. Let me quote as follows:

● (1540)

We have had one government assistance program in that time, a defence industrial research program, with the government's share being $35,000. We have invested approximately $95,000 of our own funds into R&D to date and have received IRDIA assistance of approximately $19,000. We do not know what our chances of success to date, or even survival, would have been without IRDIA.

IRDIA is the only government assistance program that gives support to a new business and is one of the very few that gives capital equipment assistance at any time.

Apparently the firm is not in a DREE area. The letter continues:

The 25-cent on the $1.00 that IRDIA grants, in many cases, enables a small business to take that small step in expansion that they might otherwise not: i.e., new venture incentive.

Small business does not have the large corporate back-up to perform their own R&D. We must exist and expand on our smaller level of profit.

We feel that the underlying reason for the government action in repealing IRDIA was to reduce the enormous amount of assistance to large corporations, many of them multi-national, in which most research and development is of a small r and d nature and generally not even that, but is really product improvement.

Small businesses in Canada, which we would think are almost 100 per cent Canadian owned, initially do not have established products to offer, but do have very good ideas with which we believe we can do something. We must perform research and development in a manner so as to reach our goals as economically as possible. We are, therefore, not spending our limited funds recklessly and therefore do not indulge heavily in IRDIA assistance.

Rather than "throw out" IRDIA in its entirety, we suggest the act should be revised and limited to small business. For this purpose small business should be defined as a total corporation, not a division of a corporation, with less than 100 employees and billings, or sales, of less than $2,500,000. Once this plateau in size is reached, a company should be able to operate without outside assistance, or at least be in a position to contribute a large share of a cost shared program, i.e., PAIT. Such an approach to IRDIA would provide the incentive that new Canadian ventures require to continue in existence.

I would recommend that suggestion in the last paragraph I read, or an alternative to that, to the ministry. The ministry has said it intends to come out with something, but as yet it has not done so. Perhaps it should be pointed out at this stage that we have a growing balance of payments problem in this country, yet we have a growing domestic market of unused labour, high unemployment and a skilled labour force. We also have the raw materials. The reason we are going in the wrong direction and that we are lacking in proper research and development in industry is that we seem to have no direction, no national goals and no strategy of any kind. There certainly is no direction or any goal pertaining to an industrial strategy evident in this budget or in any other government proposal.

With the repeal of IRDIA there is, in my view, little or no government encouragement to small or medium-sized industries in the field of research and development. Unless we take some decisions in co-operation with the provinces in the immediate future, our industrial base will continue to erode, imports will continue to increase and our balance of payments will continue to be in a deficit position, with unemployment continuing at a very high level.

[Mr. Dick.]

Most industrial research is carried out by the multinational corporations in the countries in which the head office is established, and not in Canada. It is time this government took a hard look at industrial research in our own country with a mind to encouraging Canadian research and development. Unless the government changes its attitude we will lose, in the end, the talents of many of our valuable industrial researchers who no doubt will continue their research and inventions outside Canada in countries that appreciate the value of their work. Once these people have left, it will be very difficult to persuade them that the government has changed its mind and they are really welcome back at home.

It is important that the government consider the last paragraph I quoted from that letter, as I think it is a fair indication of the concerns many people have in technological and industrial companies in this country. This is the reason for great concern on the part of us all. Indeed, if we do not come up with an innovative, technological industrial base, which can only be arrived at through continuing research, development and innovation, employment in the future is doomed indeed.

I have already indicated that many people in this country who have PHDs and BAs or other college degrees, as well as engineers and other professionals, cannot find employment. Unemployment among youth in this country is alarmingly high. This is probably due to the fact we do not have the right mixture or industrial base. That is partly to blame.

As a parting comment, perhaps not directly related to the other matters about which I have spoken, I would urge this government to consider and actively put into place a "Buy Canada first" policy. The United States federal government and various state and municipal governments all have a preference in respect of government contracts there. The government awards contracts to American companies which employ American citizens in various parts of that country. Unfortunately, in Canada it has appeared over a period of time that a Canadian firm cannot get a contract with the government of this country unless it has proven itself by selling to some foreign industry or government. Only then will the Canadian government consider it to be of a certain quality.

The Canadian government should bend over backwards, to a greater degree than it has in the past, to make sure Canadian established companies employing Canadians are awarded just about every contract for which the Canadian government calls tenders. This, indeed, would encourage Canadians to carry out research and development and would encourage Canadians to be innovative. It would supply Canadians with jobs and would, in the end, encourage the employment of young people in this country as our industrial base gathers steam.

With that parting comment, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of speaking during this budget debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I recognize the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. (Mr. Jamieson).

An hon. Member: This should be good.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I begin on a

note of bitter disappointment. I looked across the chamber and saw the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) present, and thought for sure he had come in especially to listen to me. I only discovered a few minutes ago that he is following me, and that is probably the only reason he is here. However, even though it may be accidental, I may be able to teach him something.

Mr. Clark: I will stay, if you will stay.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition has said that he will stay if I will stay. May I apologize to him in advance.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Jamieson: I would be delighted to stay, but it so happens, as the hon. member knows, that I frequently listen to his learned discourse but unfortunately, I have another meeting immediately afterwards. I thought it might be useful this afternoon to take advantage of the budget debate to touch on a few of the more important aspects of trade position as it exists at the present time, and on various other matters which come under my responsibility in the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Of necessity, because of the time constraint it will not be possible to go through these in detail. Nevertheless, I think I can, in the 30 minutes available, indicate to the House that there are encouraging signs in terms of the performance of the Canadian economy and the outlook for both international trade and trade generally in this country.

● (1550)

For example, in the first instance it is interesting to note that the GNP in constant dollar terms, actually increased in the last three quarters of 1975, and that the seasonally adjusted index of real domestic product was up by .07 per cent in the first quarter of 1976 over the four quarters of 1975. Therefore, I think the prediction of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), which he acknowledges is not lavish but which nevertheless is to some degree satisfactory, of a 5 per cent growth in the GNP, is one which we will see borne out during the current year. I am also happy to tell hon. members today, on the basis of the performance records we have for the first part of this year, that I believe it is now reasonably safe to say that we will have a slight surplus in our trade account this current year.

This, of course, is quite a turn-around from what it was a year ago. For instance, we expect now that the $800 million deficit we had last year in commodity trade will be turned to a surplus. Exports are up by more than $1 billion in the three-month period, February to April, of this year, compared to 1975. Averaged out over the year, they will amount to more than $4 billion. Imports are also up, which is to some degree a worrisome statistic although it reflects the health of the Canadian economy. Fortunately, our exports are up more than our imports, and this gives all of us reason for confidence in predicting that the commodity trade to which I have referred is already back into what might be described as equilibrium and that there will be a surplus which at this time is impossible to forecast with precision, but which will certainly be of the order of several million dollars in the current year. This, I emphasize, is a significant turn-around from what occurred in 1975.

There is another encouraging statistic in which I think members will be interested. Export sales have increased in all commodity areas except energy materials. Right across the full spectrum of our exports there has actually been significant improvement in the first three months of the current year. It also should be borne in mind that in terms of the reduction in energy-related exports—and this is by a conscious decision, I believe, supported on all sides of the House—that in the current year those exports will probably decline by something close to $1 billion from what they were a year ago. I think this deliberate action also should be taken into account when looking at our total balance of payments in the situation.

Except for energy-related commodities, there has been an encouraging improvement throughout the whole spectrum, including—incidentally I might add—value added or finished products which, of course, is one of the things we are still most interested in because in basic terms, if one looks at our exports, it has to be acknowledged that they depend, in volume terms at least, to a very great extent on raw materials, on the auto pact and related things of this nature, and that we would be very foolish if we did not recognize that in terms of manufactured and processed goods we still have a very unhealthy total situation. I think it will take a lot of combined effort by labour, management and government—and all of us—at this time to correct and improve this situation. In a few moments, Mr. Speaker, I hope I will have an opportunity to refer to the question of productivity which has such a direct bearing on that particular objective which, I emphasize, is one of the main objectives at the present time.

May I also, in this connection, say a word about the generally subscribed to objective of getting greater value added for our raw materials in this country. If one looks at it realistically, it seems to me that we cannot anticipate or expect that for every ton of raw material or for every pound of special metal we have in this country we can achieve value added right across the board. Inevitably, for the foreseeable future at least, there will be the necessity for, and probably there will be some wisdom in, the continuation of the export of raw materials. In other words, there are commodities with which we are not wholly or solely endowed in Canada in terms of competing countries, so therefore, in that sense at least, we will have to match the competition. By the same token of course if we wish to increase our trade with, for example, the European Economic Community or some of the other major trading blocs in the world with highly industrialized economies, then it is obvious that if they are to take finished products from us, we must also at the same time give them some assured access to the raw materials they will need.

In that connection, again, if there is time I will refer to this subject when talking about the multinational trade negotiations. Perhaps the biggest single item, in terms of commodities—if it is appropriate even to use that word—affecting our Canadian trade and the international trade is, of course, the auto industry and the so-called auto pact and many matters related to it. I have already indicated to the House on previous occasions that at the present time we are in the process of negotiating with the United States

and discussing with them potential changes in matters relating to the auto pact.

There are two separate studies going on, one in Canada and one in the United States, with regard to the future of the auto industry in general which, of course, is being significantly affected by the energy shortage and by a whole variety of new factors which have emerged in the last three or four years. Once these studies are completed and the United States authorities and ourselves have agreed that we ought to seek to do it during the current year, then we will put these studies together to see what kinds of additional changes may be necessary in terms of achieving more equitably the original goals and aims of the auto pact.

In the meantime, some statistics which have just recently come to hand will, I am sure, interest hon. members, and in a totally non-partisan sense I expect they will be encouraging to hon. members. The auto industry will probably sell one million cars this year. This will be the first one-million car year in Canadian history. That is perhaps in some respects—as I suspect some would say—a regrettable trend if one is talking about conservation and the like. Nevertheless, if one is talking in trade terms exclusively, of course it makes a very substantial difference. To the end of May, for example, sales were 338,122 units, which is up substantially over last year. The totality of our manufacturing sector within Canada is now working at full capacity with the exception of the Chrysler truck plant, which I was pleased to open officially two or three weeks ago. It, too, will be going on a second shift at the start of the 1977 market year, which I believe is almost a full year earlier than had been previously anticipated.

These indicators show that in the current year the auto industry will be very much on the upswing and that the deficit which we had last year on the so-called auto account, of $1.9 million, will be halved at least in the 1976 year. I should emphasize, again, as I know hon. members on both sides of the House are already aware, that a good deal of the problem continues to exist in the auto parts sector. I have had many discussions with the various parties concerned, both the auto parts manufacturers and the auto companies, as to how that particular segment of the auto industry can be brought into better balance. I believe progress will be made.

The mere fact that business is improving is bound to have its beneficial effect for the auto parts manufacturers, but there are other incidental, although very important, contributors as well. To use the auto industry as an example, one of these is the development, in the so-called less developed countries, of a growing capacity and a capability for the manufacture of a great line of parts and accessories of one sort or another. So it is not only in some of the more sensitive areas, such as textiles and footwear, that we are encountering this resurgence or emergence of the less developed countries, but it is now starting to spill over into what perhaps we considered to be almost exclusively the domain of the developed countries and, in terms of Canada-U.S., something which we kept within the North American continent. So that is a factor we will have to keep a very close eye on.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

● (1600)

I made these references in relation to the auto pact, but the same is true, of course, of a very wide and increasing range of commodities where less developed countries are acquiring greater confidence and competitiveness every day. In any event, I think it is important to note that in this current year—assuming that everything goes as is now projected—we will see, for the first time in our history, the sale of one million passenger cars. This will result in halving the deficit and virtually all of it will be on the side of the auto pact.

I said I would say a few words about productivity. Of course, this is at one and the same time one of the most obvious problems facing the Canadian economy, and particularly manufacturing and processing today. It is also one of the most complex ones, because one has to begin by seeking a definition, to which everyone can agree, of what constitutes productivity. In the manufacturing and processing sector, in the work we have done—incidentally, I would be more than pleased, as we have done on other issues, to make it available to members of the standing committee or to any others who may be interested—it is shown clearly that you can determine with a fair degree of precision what your productivity gains are, because they are based on the simple measure of output per man-hour. You can figure that out, as I said, relatively easily.

The same is basically true of the extractive industries—forestry, mining, etc.—where, once again, you have a firm and fixed product line to which you can attribute the cost of turning it out. Where the big difficulty comes, and where, as I said a moment ago, we need some clarity and agreement on definitions is, first of all, in the service sector. To the best of my knowledge, in the service sector there is no unanimity on whether or not there is a measurable productivity factor, and indeed the tendency has been for the most part to regard it as being neutral or flat, in productivity terms. In other words, you do not regard it as having had any input or output in so far as growth in the economy is concerned.

Obviously, this is an oversimplification, and yet at the same time it is something about which, it seems to me, we do not have enough knowledge at present to judge what measurements we should be using in this country to determine precisely how productive we are. I might say, also, that another area for which a more detailed study and one on which there is bound to be a good many points of view expressed, is whether or not, in terms of measuring productivity, for instance, we really ought to give it the overriding emphasis that has tended to be the case for most of us, including myself, until fairly recent times.

For instance, when you look at the statistics and the calculations, it is clear that there are countries in the world with a much higher rate of productivity, given the yardsticks I have mentioned, than Canada has. Among them, as I recall, are Japan, for example, and Italy. But whether or not we in this country would want to have the same kind of economies that have generated these levels of productivity is another matter and one which I think is a very real basis for debate.

The other point in relation to productivity—and I am simply touching here on a whole range of issues which certainly deserve much more thorough examination by all

of us—is to question the accepted wisdom that greater productivity automatically means greater economic benefit and, therefore, greater employment. It is open to question, because when one looks at how you achieve major breakthroughs in productivity, in the first instance at least it generally tends to be through a transition from a very large, labour-intensive element in a particular industry or sector to mechanization and modernization where you have a substantial amount of job displacement by machines. So in straight productivity terms, you could conceivably have a situation in which, through a very strong thrust toward rationalization, modernization and various things of this sort, you could be turning out more goods per man-hour but you might not necessarily, in the short run, be improving employment in relation to productivity.

Therefore, it seems to me that a productivity policy has to go hand-in-hand with a whole series of other measures which would relate to job displacement, to alternative types of employment and to a whole range of other social issues or related economic issues. I have no doubt that the theorists are probably right in the long run when they take the view that eventually high productivity, which means excellent economic performance, will lead to jobs in other sectors and generally to a higher level of employment. I believe that is true all the time. But I think we have to accept the fact that there is, as we have seen, probably, in most of our constituencies, evidence that there is an interim period and that when you have productivity perhaps you have problems of dislocation in terms of the jobless or the unemployed.

The other related question for those of us who are interested in this immensely important subject of productivity is that a country like Canada has to pay a price for being what it is, and I do not think any of us should in any sense of the word regret that. For example, if one were being totally theoretical and were looking at it completely devoid of human terms or even of nationalistic terms, you would have to say that in economies of scale the problems of reducing transportation costs and the like would probably dictate, as I said, in this coldly impersonal way, that everything be located within a relatively short distance somewhere in the centre of the country. That is where you will get the greatest productivity at the lowest cost.

So there is a price for having a Canada that goes from sea to sea. Regional development, various developments in the northern part of the country, investments of this kind, either public or private—all of these things are a necessary part of nationhood, of national development. But at the same time we have to understand that invariably they cause a reaction in the productivity figure which we ought to take into account when measuring our performance, for example, against that of some other countries.

These are just a few of what I would describe as random thoughts on productivity, but I hope they demonstrate to hon. members that my ministry and the government are working very hard on this issue. I repeat that I would be more than pleased to make a presentation to the House on what we have learned to date, so that we can get the benefit of other people's judgment on this issue as well.

Since my time is moving very quickly, let me touch on another matter relating to trade and to the general economy, that is, the whole issue of capital formation. I had the Business Advisory Council—of whom I believe hon. members are aware, which represents some of the leading figures in the business, economic and financial picture in Canada—come to a special meeting on capital formation a little over two weeks ago. The conclusion of these business leaders, was, first of all, that in terms of the capital formation issue, inflation is clearly the number one problem, which surely suggest that we must continue our effort to get inflation under control, because as long as you have this uncertainty created by inflation, capital formation will be exceedingly difficult. Of course, given our needs over the next decade or so, that clearly looms as an immense problem for us in this country.

There are estimates—and I have not been able to challenge them effectively—that in terms of capital formation we will probably need something in the order of $800 billion in the next decade, given a year or two on either side. As near as we have been able to calculate from our assessments, some $500 billion of that will have to be provided in the private sector or for the private sector. Therefore, a real challenge to us in Canada is to figure out the most effective means of generating that capital. Incidentally, there was unanimity in the business community that there was no serious problem with regard to finding that amount of financing, but there were questions raised as to how we might be able to give special priority to particular projects so that there would not be an assault, as it were, by everyone on the market at precisely the same time, which the banking representatives present agree would be difficult to deal with.

● (1610)

So once again we have this communication going with the business community as to how this kind of thing may be managed, and I know that my colleague, the Minister of Finance, is aware, as I am, of the fact that when one looks at that huge amount of capital which is going to be required, it is equally clear that a substantial portion of it is going to be for either public enterprises of one form or another or for quasi-public enterprises such as public utilities and the like, particularly those in the energy field, either for the generation of electricity, pipelines, or various things of that kind.

An hon. Member: Petro-Can.

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member says "Petro-Can." I do not know whether we calculated Petro-Can into the picture, but certainly the figures I am putting forward now are really not related in terms of the amount needed. The issue is not whether it is going to be public or private. It is purely a question of whoever does it. Those are the levels of investment which will be necessary.

Mr. Woolliams: And it doesn't matter how expensive it is!

Mr. Jamieson: I believe I heard the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) say "Cut down on expenses." That is part of the exercise, and I hope we will have the support of hon. members opposite in doing just that.

I might also say that the biggest single demand is likely to be from the provinces in terms of capital formation and in terms of foreign markets. Actually, if one looks at the record over the past several years, the federal government, by and large, has managed to deal with its financial requirements within the country. The provinces, by and large, with some exceptions, have gone offshore; so therefore there is a necessity for federal-provincial consultation as well.

Just moving quickly to one or two other points in the few minutes I have left, because I do not wish to intrude on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) who, as I understand it, follows me, the last thing I want to say is with regard to the somewhat cavalier way in which some hon. members of the opposition have dismissed the whole idea or the whole effort with regard to energy conservation measures introduced in the budget and in various other ways. It is most interesting to note that over the past year or so we have established a government industry committee covering all, I think, the main sectors of industry, and some of the objectives and commitments which have been made known by industry will interest hon. members in the sense of what really can be achieved in energy conservation. For instance, the chemical industry in this country is aiming for a 17 per cent reduction in BTU's per pound of product by 1980, compared with 1972. If they achieve this, and they believe they can, this will provide savings equivalent to 11 million barrels of oil annually. I am told that that is enough to heat metropolitan Toronto for one year.

Though it may at some stage seem like a relatively minor point when we talk about energy conservation measures as contained in the budget and elsewhere, the savings are potentially very significant. For instance, the pulp and paper sector is the largest energy-consuming sector, which may surprise some hon. members. I did not realize that until I saw the figures for myself. It accounts for one-quarter of the manufacturing industry's energy consumption, and the goal of this industry, as stated by the Pulp and Paper Association and its membership, is a 12 per cent reduction in BTU's per ton of product by 1980. The saving is about the same: 11 million barrels of oil annually.

I will just mention two other sectors: cement and steel. Both sectors are intensive users of energy and have already made, and are continuing to make, substantial savings in energy use. Both industries are already acknowledged to be more energy efficient than most of their world competitors. Additional projected annual savings per ton of product in the next four or five years will amount to the equivalent of one million barrels of oil for cement, and two million barrels for steel. If we put these all together and we assume that world prices will reach $15 per barrel by 1980—and nobody really knows that with any precision—the projected saving of $30 million for the steel industry alone by way of conservation will aid immeasurably in keeping Canadian manufactured goods competitive on world markets.

As I said at the outset, these are just a few comments with regard to the trade picture. I am pleased to be able to report to hon. members that there is a buoyancy present now. Quite honestly, I do not understand why some hon. members opposite would discredit our enthusiasm for the improvement in the economy of the United States. Clearly, if you are in the selling business, and that is what we are, the health of your best customer has to be a source of joy and satisfaction, and I am glad that that is happening.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: I, along with the Minister of Finance, have every confidence that the projects of the various sectors which I have outlined today will come through with a satisfying performance in 1976. It will not be as good as all of us would like, but nevertheless it will be significantly better than it was in 1975. The trend generally will also be upward for the years beyond that.

I thank hon. members very much for listening with such attention.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in hearing the remarks of the minister, and I regret that he has to be away at an engagement later on. I should say that the only buoyancy any of us here has noticed is the unfailing optimism of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) in the face of the worst possible circumstances. He would have been an ideal choirmaster on the *Titanic*. We at least congratulate him on his unfailing good cheer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I found it significant that as he was concluding the minister found it necessary to comment on the comfort we can take from the health of the economy of the United States, as if that were some substitute for very serious problems we face in Canada. If credit is due for the health of the United States economy, that credit is certainly due to the government of that country. What is lamentable is that most of the gains predicted by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the immediate prospect for this country will also be attributable to the government of the United States and not to the government across the aisle.

In a parliament which has been dominated by games of pass-the-buck and pass-the-blame on the "Orion," conflicts between ministers on the question of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, desperate attempts in committee to repair legislation respecting gun controls, and a government which has for the last couple of weeks indicated that it has no higher goal than to get out of here as quickly as it can, it is easy to forget that we have a budget—and I think it is particularly easy to forget this particular budget.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I share one distinction with the Minister of Finance, who is temporarily out of the House. This is the first budget he has introduced as minister, and it is the first to which I have had the privilege of responding as Leader of the Opposition. The minister and I, of course, differ in our attitude toward our predecessors. He is at pains to ignore his predecessor, John Turner, even while he presents a budget strictly in the Turner tradition, while I am deeply aware of my privilege in following, as Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1620)

Mr. Clark: I should say that is particularly so on economic matters, because any honest, objective review of events in this House during the period of his leadership of this party indicates that he has been the singlemost creative source of economic policy in this chamber. Whether the matter has been indexing which was derided and then adopted by the government opposite, or whether it was an incomes policy which was reviled and then adopted by hon. members opposite, the hon. member for Halifax has set the pace, has indicated the foresight and courage that would have made him an outstanding leader of the country and made him an outstanding leader of this party and leader of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Have to say, not to overstate the case, that this is a deeply disappointing budget, not just because it fails to give the leadership that Canada now requires on economic matters, but also it is a budget that is so much less than many of us have expected from the new Minister of Finance. I particularly regret that the minister is absent at the moment because I want to say one or two good things about him that he might not have expected.

An hon. Member: He may come in.

An hon. Member: That will bring him in.

Mr. Clark: I think most of us who have had dealings with the Minister of Finance in his previous incarnations have disagreed with him often, but we have always recognized and respected him as a combative partisan in a place that requires combative partisans. We recognize him as a competent and fairly tough minister who is generally willing to rise to challenges. We often disagree with the challenges he saw or how he responded, but he was generally willing to rise to them. That is what has been doubly disappointing about his performance here. He faced a great opportunity to bring economic leadership to the country, to respond to the challenge of drift which is, unfortunately, characteristic of this government for most of its mandate. He did not respond to that challenge.

I have noted his self-assessment outside this chamber; that he would prefer to be called unimaginative rather than foolhardy. I can assure him and his colleagues that daring is not an adjective that leaped to our minds on budget night when we heard him read the words that had been prepared for him. If this minister said anything encouraging about this budget, it is that he will seriously consider bringing in another budget before too long.

Of course, there were some good proposals in the budget—good, but minor. Measures to encourage energy conservation—although they will not have the impact that was suggested by the minister who spoke before me—higher income deductions for day care costs, some revision of the unemployment insurance program, and a reintegration of UIC operations with federal Manpower services. These are all measures which our party has advocated for some time and which we support in principle.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I should like to emphasize that a budget in Canada at any time, but particularly at this time, should do much more than just tinker with taxes. It should be a document which gives direction to the country. There is an obligation, particularly now, to give Canadians economic leadership.

[*Translation*]

At that stage, the country was entitled to expect a budget which would have spelled out policies. The last budget dated back to eleven months ago. At that time, the former Minister of Finance had resigned and turned his back on his party, presumably following a major disagreement on economic policies. Furthermore, the government which had won the last election by fighting controls turned around and put forth a control program which was imposed without consultation with its economic partners and whose basic rules were altered at least three times. Later, the Prime Minister caused great concern by referring to "a new economic society" and kept it alive by denying Canadians the opportunity to participate in the making of the post control policies which were secretly entrusted to a technocratic elite controlled by the Prime Minister.

Those three events: the minister's resignation, the policy reversal on controls and the apparent discard by the Prime Minister of the essential elements of the Canadian economic system, all of these created a climate of anxiety in this country. Therefore, the government had the obligation to dispel this anxiety by indicating in the budget the direction it plans to give the Canadian economy but that obligation was ignored like so many others.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, there are ominous aspects to that budget because it is a budget that is more dangerous than simply not doing what it should in setting directions that it should set. It has raised some very real questions about government policy, as indicated in the budget, plans for the other partners in the Canadian economy.

Changes have been introduced, again, to the Anti-Inflation Board. This is not the first time that major changes have been introduced to the terms of reference and the powers of that board in a way which has created uncertainty and added to administrative difficulty. The changes themselves would be serious enough, but the point I want to make is that this frequent tinkering with this very powerful mechanism indicates that this government has no understanding that the business community of Canada can accept tough rules. There is no problem with tough rules; the problems of the business community in Canada occur when the rules keep changing, when there is no certainty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: It would be one thing if it were rare that the government would consciously create uncertainty in the economic climate of Canada, but unfortunately this has become a pattern. It was a pattern with the northern land regulations which were brought down not long ago after six years of delay, and it has clearly been the pattern with the competition policy. It is a pattern that goes back through the life of this government and indicates a fundamental failure to understand the necessity for a climate of

certainty if there is going to be progress by the free enterprise regimes in this Canadian economy.

The government has raised some very serious questions in its proposals, of which we have only half the bundle so far, regarding unemployment. It has indicated that it intends to make some changes regarding eligibility for unemployment insurance and has held out the prospect of some other changes yet to be specified. Frequently in this House, however, the minister responsible for providing jobs and for ensuring that Canadians will have some place to go other than to unemployment insurance has admitted that he will not have, at least until this fall, any concrete programs to present which will help people who, particularly as unemployment insurance claimants, might need to have recourse to the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I would call the attention of the government to a recommendation of an excellent agency which it all too frequently ignores, the Economic Council of Canada. This agency has made some excellent reports, but unfortunately under this government has had them dismissed and not heeded. The Economic Council of Canada, in its most recent report entitled "People and Jobs" said, in connection with the whole subject of unemployment insurance and job creation in Canada, that regulatory changes alone do not, and will not, send people back to work if there are no jobs available.

● (1630)

The greatest deficiency in the budget presented by this government on the question of jobs is that there is no attempt by public policy to encourage the private sector to create jobs, and there is no frankness, no indication that the government itself has any public programs in place which will create some kind of public employment. That is a serious failure and indicates that there is little regard, little compassion, on the part of those on the government benches for Canadians who need work and are willing to work if jobs can be found or created.

Once again, this budget introduces very real uncertainty, sir, with regard to the role and problems which provinces of this country are to face. May I refer again to the unemployment insurance program. We know that, for better or for worse, that program has been used for purposes other than its original intention, which was that of providing income support. If that program is tightened, particular if that tightening occurs without any kind of substitution of new job-creating programs, there will be imposed new policies on the provinces of Canada and that imposition will be particularly harsh on the poorer provinces which are particularly incapable of dealing with it. We have seen previously this kind of playing around with the capacities of the provinces. It is worth noting that this particular measure which will impose new financial strains on the provinces of Canada, particularly on the poorer provinces, is being introduced at a time when the government itself is introducing a certain proposal, not in the way it should, with a bill, but by sneaking it in the back door with regard to Loto Canada. That lottery, after the expiration of any obligation we might assume toward the retirement of Olympic debt, will become a federal source of revenue drawn from a field which should properly belong to the provinces.

[Mr. Clark.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: On the one hand, we have this government imposing new costs on the provinces. On the other hand, we have the government undertaking initiatives which will deprive the provinces of potential sources of revenue which ought to be theirs.

Finally, and generally, the budget contributes to uncertainty in that it is silent on the most important question facing Canadians now in terms of economic policy. There is no indication at all in the budget of the Minister of Finance as to what is to be the nature of the so-called post-control society. The government has told us that it will think about what it is going to do this summer; perhaps in the fall they will tell us what they think we should know. That, Mr. Speaker, is an unacceptable approach to public business in this country.

[*Translation*]

The Prime Minister seems determined to get rid of the controls the same way he established them, that is without consulting anyone—through the secret planning of an élite of technocrats in Ottawa and with the passive approval of a Liberal majority in Parliament so as to impose a new program to Canadians. That would be disastrous. The controls are not a solution by themselves. They can only give us the opportunity to look for more basic solutions which will not succeed if they are forced upon us. In such a complex country as Canada, in order that a national policy may succeed, it must have the support of the other government partners in the society. And the unions, the businessmen, the farmers and the provinces will not support any policy which they consider as irrevelant.

[*English*]

This budget, Mr. Speaker, simply ignores the basic economic problems of Canada. Worse than that, it undervalues the potential of this country. There are many places where we part company with this government and this budget, but there is none more fundamental than on the question of basic economic priorities. The minister's position is that as long as we continue to have inflationary pressures in our economy, we cannot seek to maximize our potential for sound economic growth. Whatever his words may be, the minister's actions make it abundantly clear that his first-line anti-inflationary policy is slow growth. Mr. Speaker, we on my side of the House completely and totally reject that proposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Sir, we see sound economic growth not as a contradiction to the control of inflation but as a prime requisite for the control of inflation in the long term. Indeed, sir, I have no hesitation in suggesting to you that until and unless we have a government which accepts that elementary fact, we will continue to suffer from serious economic problems in Canada.

One is tempted to ask whether the minister and his colleagues, in their understandably extraordinary effort to forget everything they said in the spring and early summer of 1974, have blinded themselves completely to what has occurred in Canada in the intervening two years. They have been years of economic stagnation on the one hand, and very high levels of inflation on the other. Do the

minister and his colleagues not recognize the connection between these two factors? Do they not realize that much of the economic confrontation which has contributed to our inflationary problems is linked directly to our lack of sound economic growth in the Canadian economy? Can the minister and his colleagues not see that when our national wealth is not expanding, gains made by any group in society are seen as coming at the direct expense of other groups and that this breeds social and economic tension which leads to confrontation? Rather than being afraid of growth, we desperately need a new commitment to sound economic growth in Canada. That, of course, cannot be an end in itself, but must be seen as a key to the more meaningful goals and aspirations we all hold for this country.

Sir, we have a highly skilled and highly educated young population in this country. Are we educating them to collect unemployment insurance or welfare, or do we owe them the opportunity to pursue meaningful careers? We have hardly begun to make worth-while progress in the area of regional disparity. The Economic Council of Canada suggests that with current programs it will be at least 75 years before the Atlantic region of Canada is able to approach the national standard of living. Is the best we can do simply to transfer resources within the country, to make progress by lowering standards everywhere? Or can we not emphasize regional growth within a growing Canada? That, sir is the preference and policy of my party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The Minister of Finance had an opportunity in his budget to face some basic, economic problems. Instead, he ducked those problems. At best they have been postponed; at worst they have been compounded. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce spoke about productivity. His productivity policy consists of defining the problem. Sir, that just is not enough. He put, in his buoyant way, the best possible face on our productivity problems. The Minister of Finance himself set out the dimensions of our balance of payments problems. By his own figures he has admitted that, while every other western country has absorbed the full impact of world energy prices and still reduced its balance of payments deficit, this country's position has seriously deteriorated. That is the scale of the problem by the minister's own admission. What did he do about it? He has a very exciting program in this regard! He said he would welcome cards and letters in relation to improving our productivity from all across the country.

● (1640)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): With the mail situation he cannot even be sure they will get there.

Mr. Clark: My colleague points out that one of the deficiencies in this approach is that the minister cannot be sure they will get there, with the mail situation. That was only half of his program. The other half is that he hoped the United States recovery would pull us out of our problems. In short, he confessed that this government is bankrupt of both ideas and leadership.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Let us be very clear, Mr. Speaker, of the dimension of this problem on which the minister virtually turned his back. In 1970—a year, I stress, of serious world recession—Canada showed a surplus of some $6.6 billion in trade in processed and manufactured goods. In 1975—a year when the world began to recover from recession—Canada recorded a deficit of $5.8 billion in shipments of processed and manufactured goods. Not only did we fail to achieve any significant progress in export markets; we continued to lose ground to foreign manufacturers in our own Canadian market.

The hard reality is that we are keeping our head above international water only by continuing to sell off the raw resources of this country. Last year our trade performance would have been another $3 billion worse had it not been for shipments of natural resources. Yet this government offers not a single concrete initiative to reverse this trend, not a single positive policy to strengthen the competitive position of our processors and manufacturers. If it has a policy, it is to look to Washington—and perhaps to pray!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the first to be hit by this budget will be Canadians looking for a job. There is no provision in that budget for the creation of new jobs. Instead, the minister counts on economic recovery in other countries to get 250,000 new jobs in Canada. It is already bad enough that the government says to workers that they will have to rely on other countries to have new job, but even worse, figures advanced by the minister do not match the number of people who will enter the labour market for the first time.

Last year, 353,000 Canadians joined the labour force and were looking for a job. This year, it is anticipated that about 315,000 individuals will invade the labour market. The situation is such that with his estimate of 250,000 new jobs, the minister has merely devised a new way to increase unemployment. At the same time, his colleague the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) recognized that the government has no plan to generate new jobs here.

In short, it is the budget of a government which could not care less for unemployed Canadians.

[*English*]

Nowhere is the need for constructive leadership more pressing, or more lacking from this administration, than in the area of spending restraint. The fact is that this government has been on a continuous spending binge since the day the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took office.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: In 1968, federal expenditures were in the area of $9 billion; this year they will exceed $40 billion. That is an increase of more than 400 per cent. Having put that kind of squeeze on everyone else in the economy, on the private sector and on the revenue sources of other levels of government, this administration now turns around and asks these same groups to bear almost the entire brunt of the current restraint program. Hypocrisy is probably the kindest description I can apply to this government.

In our view, the time has come for governments as a whole to halt their rising claims upon our national income—not simply by juggling their books for a year or

two, but by adjusting in a very fundamental way the pace of growth in their demands upon available resources. In 1950, governments at all levels claimed about 20 per cent of our gross national product. This year the figure will approach 42 per cent. By any standard, that represents a massive shift in the allocation or our national resources.

I and my colleagues believe the time has now come to halt that trend, not as a cosmetic exercise but as a firm commitment to stimulating renewed strength and growth within our economy. Let me emphasize that I am talking about a gradual reduction in governments' share of our total national income and a reduction in their percentage share of GNP. The reality is that if we can attain our realistic growth potential in this country the amount of resources available to governments will continue to increase even while their over-all share of GNP stabilizes and declines.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Only our national government can exercise the kind of leadership necessary to achieve this basic adjustment in spending priorities. The provinces, to give them credit, have moved in that direction during the current year. On the whole, they have managed to hold their spending increases well below the anticipated rise in the GNP. That has not been easy for them. Nor has it been easy for local governments who have had to deal directly with the impact of these cutbacks at the senior levels, But these levels of government are trying. They have had the courage to face up to economic reality. It is time they and the people of Canada saw some courage in Ottawa.

If this government will make a serious commitment to self-restraint, perhaps it can exercise national leadership in what will certainly be a difficult and demanding process. But Ottawa simply cannot preach restraint to others and practice none itself. Above all, it must face up to its own lack of fiscal control and begin to come clean with the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I see the Minister of Finance is back in his place. I have noted the pronouncements of the Minister of Finance in this budget. If words were all we needed, we would welcome his conversion to the need for fiscal restraint. However, unfortunately for him, governments still are judged on their actions. When it comes to restraint, this government frankly has shown a lot of sleight of hand and very little real commitment. How can we take this government's promises seriously when its record in this area is one deceit after another? It started last December when the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) and the Prime Minister, on television, told us in anguished tones how they had scraped and scrimped to reduce government spending. But then we looked at the record, and what did we find? More than half of the supposed reductions were not reductions at all; they were merely decisions to drop proposed programs or departmental spending requests that were not even in effect at that time. One of the largest items of so-called savings involved nothing more than the transfer of borrowing responsibility from the government itself to agencies like the CNR and the Export Development Corporation which, of course, represented no reduction in public sector demands.

[Mr. Clark.]

● (1650)

Now this minister comes along with his first budget, and again we are given all kinds of verbal commitments to restraint and the same kind of deceit we had six months earlier. This minister wants to hold the year-to-year increase to 14 per cent, so what does he do? Does he reduce this year's spending? No. He simply tells us that last year's spending was higher than originally reported. Does the government make any serious effort to reduce its demands on the economy? No. Instead, it plays games, like the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) reneging on more than $100 million in committed payments to the provinces. This government, Mr. Speaker, is so caught up in double-talk and half-truths that it has forfeited any credibility whatsoever in the area of fiscal restraint.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The minister, in one of the remarkable conversions of this parliament, has been talking about the need for more openness in the budget process. I concur in that need—and I want to come back to it in a moment. But if he is serious about openness, surely the place to start is with some truth about government spending. If we cannot have information or, worse still, if we cannot believe the so-called information we are given, how does the minister expect to be taken seriously in any discussion he may want to enjoin?

As I have said, sir, I concur fully in the need for more openness in the budget-making process. Indeed, several weeks before this budget I proposed that, as one step in that direction, the government place its options in regard to a post-controls program before a parliamentary committee and invite discussion of them with the major groups in our society. Without the co-operation of these groups, any such post-controls program simply will not work; and without genuine consultation and participation in decision-making there simply will not be co-operation.

But this government simply cannot bring itself to have that kind of consultation or to introduce that kind of openness to the process. There is no partnership in this administration's approach to government. For the Prime Minister and his colleauges, it is an "us and them" proposition; "us", the government, with all the answers, and "them", the poor people, with a choice to like it or lump it. In that attitude, sir, lies a great deal of the problems which face this country, not simply in economic matters but in a range of other matters as well.

It is an approach which creates uncertainty when Canadians need reassurance. It is an approach which encourages confrontation when we need honest compromise. And it is an approach which emphasizes unilateral power when we need genuine partnership. It is, sir—and I use this word very deliberately—a very unCanadian approach which is dangerous in a country where there are divisions enough without the government of Canada, by its conduct, exacerbating those divisions. I say to you, sir, and to the House that we intend to reverse that process and to rebuild a partnership in Canada which is the Canadian approach.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Let me say a word about my concept of openness as it applies to budget-making. It is based on a number of premises. The first is that much of the current secrecy surrounding the budget flows as much from bureaucratic convenience as from any genuine need or concern for security. There is, of course, a certain comfort to planning in private; one's decisions and arguments are spared any real outside test. The problem, of course, is that they are more likely to be wrong than if they are checked against the experience of people whom those decisions affect.

A second premise is that much of the government's present attitude is based on a highly defensive position in regard to forecasts and estimates. There seems to be a feeling that because economic forecasting is something less than a finite art, the minister and his advisers cannot risk exposing their assumptions and their estimates for fear of being proven wrong by subsequent events. To that I say simply, first, that other governments seem able to share much more economic information with their parliaments and their people without undue embarrassment; and secondly, in so far as being wrong is concerned, secrecy of information does not eliminate that problem, it merely compounds it. That is one fact of life I would have thought this government might have learned by now.

My view, sir, is that there is much we can do to make the budget process a more meaningful one without any risk to anyone's security. I would like to see, for example, an established procedure whereby a parliamentary committee holds prebudget hearings on the economic setting of the day. The prebudget papers could be referred to such a committee; most certainly we need to find a procedural mechanism to ensure that important reports of the Economic Council, to name one agency, stop being simply one-day wonders that are presented to the government and then go into limbo. I would like to see the government make public, as part of the budget process, its longer term forecasts both in terms of economic performance and in terms of its own fiscal position. Other governments and other countries do this. Among the benefits is that the publication of such a longer term framework requires the government itself to justify its own budgets within that wider context.

If this minister's economics are faulty, Mr. Speaker, his sense of social justice is abysmal. Are the only adjectives which concerned him when he spoke outside the House a choice between "unimaginative" and "foolhardy"? I ask the House, what about the word "committed"—committed to the potential of this country, a country of unparallelled potential. This is a government which continually sells Canada short, a government that unfortunately has no higher aspiration than to fall somewhere in the middle of an OECD average, a government too ready to leave the economic fate of Canada in the hands of other governments and other countries.

We in this party continue to believe in the potential of Canada. Not even this government and this Prime Minister can dim the promise of that star. This remains a country of vast resources, both natural and human. It is a country which not only has a right, but a very real responsibility to expect more than average performance. It is not Canada that is lacking, sir; it is this government that is lacking and that is failing the promise of Canada.

● (1700)

If the Minister of Finance is unable to work up any enthusiasm for Canada, one might have hoped he could at least have shown some interest in its people and some compassion for those in economic difficulty. Instead he sits as Minister of Finance who dismissed 760,000 unemployed Canadians virtually as a throw-away line, and whose own optimistic forecast was to create enough new jobs to hold that figure to 800,000. That is some "Thumper".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: We have a Prime Minister preaching the need for passionate love on a world scale. I say to him, Sir, why not start at home? Where is the passion or the love in this government and this budget? Where is there any evidence that this government cares about its own people? Where is the concern for hundreds of thousands of Canadians who want an opportunity to work? Where is the love for the people of Atlantic Canada who, thanks to this budget, face the prospect of even higher energy and electricity costs on top of the heavy burden they are already carrying? Where is the passion for Canada?

This is not a government of love; it is a government of smug complacency. This is not a government that challenges Canadians; it is a government which day after day by its action, inaction, and incompetence alarms and depresses Canadians. This is not a government that encourages faith; it is a government which breeds fear and confusion. This, Sir, is not a government which can offer anything to the world; it is a government which on its record and in this budget offers nothing to Canada. The sooner this government is gone, the better for all of us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to deal with the contradictions of the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark). However, I thought I could spend my time a little more usefully in dealing with some issues that have been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition dealing with secrecy in the budget and some of the procedures that are being followed, and the question of media coverage of the budget speech of the Minister of Finance. I should like to begin by congratulating my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), who raised these questions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: He understands the importance of procedures that are now followed, and the necessity of some changes in traditional budget secrecy. He raised those questions, and also the question of media coverage. I think this is typical of a minister who is characterized by a forthrightness I can only commend.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: I think we are very fortunate in this country to have a man of his integrity and his ability undertake this great responsibility.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: Some ten years ago I was Minister of Finance, and like my predecessors and my successors I was very much aware of the tradition of budget secrecy and of the limitations that this imposes upon the freedom of action to discuss proposed tax changes with anyone outside the close circle of closest departmental advisers, the Prime Minister, and ministers who are, of course, sworn to secrecy by their Privy Council oath.

Before discussing whether or not there should be budget secrecy, I think it is important to understand what is the principle of budget secrecy to which reference is made so often. What it means, I submit, and this is borne out—

An hon. Member: Don't go away, Joe.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Stick around, Joe.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: The reason for budget secrecy, I submit, and this is borne out by the precedents both here and in Westminster, is that knowledge of fiscal and monetary proposals before they are announced in the budget by the minister could enable those who have access to the knowledge to profit therefrom. The Leader of the Opposition referred to budget secrecy in a rather different context, and I find myself wholly in agreement with him, that there ought to be the most open possible discussion of economic policy, but budget secrecy relates only to questions relating to the fisc, as my friend the Minister of Finance said after his budget speech.

For example, advance knowledge of a change in the sales or excise tax or customs duties could enable someone to purchase or import goods before the change came into effect, thus cheating the revenue as well as profiting himself or herself. Similarly, advance knowledge of a change in the corporate tax could enable the insider to speculate profitably on the stock market. It is possible too that advance knowledge of the general fiscal and monetary policy of the government as enunciated in the budget could be turned to advantage on the stock or bond markets, or even in the foreign exchange market.

The tradition of budget secrecy, therefore, as my colleague the Minister of Finance said in the House when a question arose about the announcement of changes in the Unemployment Insurance Act, relates to the fisc, and does not necessarily relate to other matters of government policy which the government may see fit to authorize the Minister of Finance to announce or refer to in his budget address.

Hon. members will recall that in this particular case of the proposed changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act there is no way by which advance knowledge could profit anyone who knew in advance what was to happen. As the minister himself pointed out, there has been a great deal of public discussion, pro and con, in recent years about the desirability of amending the Unemployment Insurance Act, and the government made no secret whatever of the fact that it had been consulting its own supporters in this House on the subject.

The Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister, other members of the cabinet, and certain officials do have knowledge of the contents of the budget before it is delivered in the House. This is unavoidable. The tradition of budget secrecy applies to them in a peculiar way. Not only are they bound not to reveal the contents of the budget before it is delivered, they are bound to act in their private affairs as if they were not aware of its contents.

This is probably the principal reason why Ministers of Finance, past and present, do not burden their colleagues with knowledge of their intentions with respect to tax changes very far in advance of budget day.

● (1710)

When I was Minister of Finance I consulted with the Prime Minister a couple of weeks in advance on proposed major tax changes, gave a broad indication of the alternatives to my colleagues a week in advance, and then in as short a time as I could just before budget day I told them what my final proposals would be. My successors in office have followed very much the same pattern.

Needless to say it is not an ideal sort of consultation, but it seems unavoidable if the Minister of Finance is to save his colleagues from the burden of knowing for some time before the budget what tax changes will come into effect on that day. Most of them, I am confident, would prefer not to know much in advance, so that they do not have to fear that their behaviour would be subject to misinterpretation or misrepresentation. When the Minister of Finance raised questions in his speech about the applicability of the tradition of secrecy to modern budgets, I had a fellow feeling arising from my own experience.

For example, what about changes in the rates of personal income tax, one of the most important sources of revenue and one of the most important instruments for effecting individual spending and saving, and the distribution of revenues between the provinces and the federal government? Does it matter whether the government's intentions with respect to changes in the personal income tax are known in advance of the budget presentation? I doubt it very much. There is no way I can think of whereby advance information on the subject could enable a taxpayer to profit or to cheat the revenue. One comes to the conclusion that the tradition of budget secrecy, which originated when governments raised their revenues primarily from customs and excise taxes, has been extended in a rather meaningless way to the personal income tax, to which it has little if any relevance.

There is a strong case for limiting the tradition of budget secrecy to the areas in which it has relevance, and to permit the Minister of Finance a great deal more latitude in discussing personal income tax changes and matters of a similar kind which do not have market or speculative significance.

The minister should be free, moreover, I suggest, to discuss changes in the structure of taxation without being found guilty of breach of budget secrecy. What should be secret is the government's final decision on tax changes where advance information could be profitable to the insider. This does not mean necessarily that the Minister of Finance would have an obligation to anticipate his budget proposals in any field. He should not be in the

position, however, where he cannot discuss changes of the kinds I have mentioned outside the closed circle of his departmental advisers and cabinet in preparation of his budget proposals for fear of offending the principle of budgetary secrecy.

I have only one suggestion to offer, which is that the best defence the Minister of Finance could make would be to make it abundantly clear that he was having such consultations, and to have them as open as possible so that everyone knows the consultations are taking place.

I should now like to turn to the question of implementation of the fiscal proposals of the budget. This procedure, the business of ways and means, is a most complicated matter for it is not only part of the foundation of parliament but also it is of immense importance to everyone in the country. In a parliamentary system the government must take full responsibility for fiscal matters; if parliament cannot be induced to accept the government's proposals on taxation, the life of the government must come to an end. Since taxation policy is so fundamental to the retention of office, we have developed the rule concerning the financial initiative of the Crown, that is, a rule preventing any member of parliament, except a minister, from initiating a measure to impose a tax, to increase the rate of an existing tax, or to extend the incidence of an existing tax.

The second principle governing taxation matters in parliament is that fiscal measures must be introduced in the first instance in the House of Commons. We have never even conceded to the Senate the right to amend such proposals.

If we look at the United States we see quite a different procedure. While the President of the United States may communicate his proposals on tax policy to the Congress, they are put into a tangible form not by the administration but by a committee of the House of Representatives. Tax bills usually undergo many metamorphoses on their way through Congress—the United States Senate can and often does amend such measures—and when ready for the President's signature, very likely are quite different from his original proposals.

Taxation measures in the Unites States, however, are not normally retroactive; they come into effect on a given date which occurs sometime after a tax bill becomes law. This is also true of some of our provinces, such as Ontario. In our parliament, however, we have adopted the British practice of making most tax proposals effective virtually immediately they are announced. This requires, of course, some sort of formal notice to persons or corporations whose taxes are changed so quickly. For this reason we have arrived at our procedure concerning Notices of Ways and Means.

A Notice of Ways and Means has two effects. First, as I said, it provides notice of tax changes to those affected. In this function it should be in as much detail as possible. Its second effect, however, is to protect the financial initiative of the Crown.

Only a minister may table a Notice of Ways and Means, and a motion to concur in it cannot be debated or amended. Tax bills, however, must be based on one or more Notices of Ways and Means, and since their pith and substance must be the same as that of the Notices of Ways and Means they become most difficult to amend. Before 1969 the Notices of Ways and Means were considered in a committee of the whole, as many members now in the House will recall, and could, within the limits of the financial initiative of the Crown, be amended. In other words, if the government could be persuaded to make changes, our procedures lent themselves to amendments. The tax bills that followed the ways and means resolutions became, except in the case of the most controversial proposals, exercises in detail for the House.

Under our present procedures, however, the government itself cannot even propose amendments to a tax bill that would increase the rates or extend the incidence of the proposed tax. Since the Notices of Ways and Means, in order to provide as much information as possible, tend to be so explicit that they appear almost as bills, the scope for amendments to bills based on them is even more restricted.

Our difficulty is that if we provide maximum information to the taxpayers at the earliest possible time by making the Notices of Ways and Means explicit, we also thereby limit most severely the scope for amendments to the bill. If, on the other hand, we make the Notices of Ways and Means more general in order to expand the scope for amendments, since the bills based thereon cannot be introduced until the budget debate is completed, for several weeks the taxpayers may be denied the detailed information they require in order to make their plans.

I do not suggest, however, that we revert to the old committee of ways and means procedure. That merely imposed a redundant stage to the fiscal procedure. Debate tended to repeat the formal budget debate and to anticipate debate on the bill. My suggestion is that we endeavour to find a procedure whereby from time to time a sort of Supplementary Notice of Ways and Means could be brought down in order to permit specified amendments. We have, in fact, done this on occasion, but only with unanimous consent. Perhaps now we should provide for such a practice in our rules.

One other part of our ways and means procedure that we ought to consider is the rule that requires all tax measures to be referred, after second reading, to a committee of the whole. This one is perhaps a more doubtful proposal, but one which I think should be examined again. The theory behind this rule is that taxation is of such general interest and importance that every member should be on the committee considering the bill. Experience, however, does not square with this theory. While committees of the whole on tax bills are reasonably well attended because of possible votes, most of the speeches seem to be made for reading by constituents and should really be made in the budget debate or at third reading.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is not really criminal.

Mr. Sharp: No. I am just being factual. Only a handful of members on either side of the House really participate in the process of explaining and refining the bill. One cannot help but wonder whether tax bills, or at least most of them, ought not to be referred to a standing committee.

● (1720)

This brings me to the procedures which have evolved in recent years relating to the handling of the budget speech in the House and outside. These procedures evolved essentially to ensure the necessary secrecy while at the same time enabling the various media to give adequate and speedy coverage to the contents of the budget.

I have not been able to consult the records but I have been told that the special procedures for media coverage of the budget began either during the Second World War or shortly thereafter. As I recall it, at the beginning, at the time when as a civil servant I was concerned with these matters, the special procedure consisted of giving the media the first part of the speech which did not contain any tax changes when the minister rose to speak, and the remainder when the minister reached that point in his speech. This gave the press an opportunity of putting the story on the wires of the print media somewhat more quickly than if it had had to report the minister as he spoke. Radio stations were able to broadcast the tax changes more or less simultaneously with the minister's speech.

The next development was the locked room, which was aimed at giving the media an opportunity of doing a more thorough job of analyzing the budget proposals while preserving the necessary secrecy. It meant, of course, that those privileged to be locked up were in a position to wire and broadcast the contents of the budget just as soon as the doors were opened and even before the minister had uttered a word of his speech in the House of Commons.

To me, the resulting situation is deplorable and has made a mockery of this House and its membership. What made it even more disturbing, I regret to say, is that the minister himself appeared this year on television screens on a pretaped interview, recorded during the lock-up, talking about a budget he had not even finished delivering, and his critics who had also been in the lock-up appeared on the same screen replying to a speech they had not yet heard.

I understand how this deplorable situation evolved and I am not being critical of either the minister or the other MPs. One thing led to another, each logical and defensible in itself to meet a particular problem. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come to put an end to a procedure which I believe is an affront to this House.

What is the problem? It is that the people of Canada do not have an opportunity of seeing and listening to the Minister of Finance delivering his speech. If they could do so, a substantial change in the procedure now being followed to meet the requirements of the media, print or electronic, would be possible and would eliminate most of the odious results.

Fortunately it is now possible for everyone in Canada who is interested to be able to watch and listen to the budget speech and the replies of the opposition. All we have to do is to broadcast our proceedings by radio and television, just as my colleague and his critics broadcast their commentary outside the House while the minister was speaking here in the House, making us all very uncomfortable.

It will be astounding, Mr. Speaker, if we members of parliament will ever again be content to sit listening to the

Minister of Finance read his speech, waiting for him to reach the point where he announces the proposed tax changes while the reporters on radio and TV, with the document in their hands, talk confidently about what the minister will say before he concludes. It is an affront, and I trust that come next budget there will be a demand from all sides of the House that this farce will not be permitted to recur.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: When our proceedings are broadcast—and I say when rather than if, because I see no alternative to the present procedures for lock-up and advance knowledge, except broadcast—I am sure that the minister will also want to deliver his message in a form more suitable to the electronic media—a shorter speech which he can supplement by a written document to be appended to *Hansard*—and that the opposition critics will want to make their comments the same evening so that they can be broadcast directly from the House. Not only will this be good for the broadcast, it will also make the House a more lively place on budget night.

The timing of the budget speech should also be reviewed when our proceedings are broadcast. It is accepted that the contents of the budget should not be revealed until the markets are closed. That is why the budget speech is delivered in the evening rather than in the afternoon. An eight o'clock starting time is rather late, however, for the print media if the morning papers of the following day are to carry a full account of the budget. While it would be unusual for the House to sit say between five and seven o'clock, or between six and eight on budget day, some such special arrangement should be considered. This kind of arrangement would also afford the electronic media plenty of opportunity to fill the rest of the evening with commentary from observers across the country who would already have watched and listened to the budget speech being delivered.

In the interests of adequate coverage there could continue to be a lock-up, the doors being opened for the reporters when the Minister of Finance had concluded his speech which, if my suggestions were adopted, would be either at seven or eight o'clock. It would also be suitable, I suggest, to include in the lock-up the spokesmen for the opposition who would be expected to follow the minister in the House debate. They are included now, they could be included in the kind of changed circumstances that I have outlined. These MPs could be released from the locked rooms when the minister rose to deliver his speech so that they could hear it, on the understanding that they would not bring a copy of the speech into the House or reveal its contents to anyone in advance of the delivery of the minister's speech.

There is on the order paper a resolution seeking approval of the broadcasting of our proceedings. Because of the press of other business it is not the intention of the government to call that resolution for debate before the adjournment. I have today, however, tabled a document giving an estimate of the costs of installing broadcast equipment and of annual operating costs so that there can be some further public discussion of the proposal.

The arguments I have put forward for broadcasting the budget apply with equal force to the whole of our proceed-

ings. The people of Canada should see parliament in action, and not have to be content to read about it or watch others talking about it. If we believe in parliament, as all of us do, then we should be proud to have it broadcast. A limited number of Canadians—very limited today—are privileged to watch from the galleries. It is now open to us to have the whole of the population observe our proceedings. When that happens then the various media can fulfil more effectively their respective functions. They will still be privileged to interview MP's in room 130-S or elsewhere. They can still comment. But the interviews and the commentary will no longer be a substitute for parliamentary democracy in action on the floor of this House.

It is my hope that early in the new session we will take the decision to broadcast our proceedings and bring parliament to the people. We should cease the farce of the kind of proceedings we had this year on the budget, which are completely unnecessary and an affront to the House. I hope everyone in the House will see that it never happens again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks in the budget debate by coming down from the huge statistics that we heard this afternoon from other speakers, statistics which relate to the country as a whole, and begin my brief address by simply referring to the city where I live. I think this somehow sets the tone for the entire budget, at least from the point of view of those of us who sit on this side of the House.

I have here a clipping from the June 5 edition of the Brantford *Expositor* which states that the number of jobless continues to rise in Brant county. In Brant county the present unemployment figure was 4,954 persons in May, chasing approximately 200 job vacancies. Yet there are people in my constituency who say that those on unemployment insurance are lazy, that they will not get out and hustle for a job. We are talking in terms of 9 per cent unemployment, or almost 5,000 unemployed registered at Manpower chasing 200 jobs in an industrial city which has many small industries and three or four large industries. I think this is indicative of many parts of the country because if it is that bad in Brantford, which is in southern Ontario, I wonder just how bad it is elsewhere. Of course we know how bad it is in places like Cape Breton Island, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, northern Ontario, parts of Quebec and parts of the west and northwest.

● (1730)

Much of the press reported that the finance minister faced a dilemma in trying to bring down a budget which would tackle the dual problems of high inflation and high unemployment. A few days after the budget speech it was generally conceded by many that the minister had done little or nothing to solve either of these critical problems. In fact his budget will make them worse.

There were no provisions in the budget which will do anything about our disastrous unemployment rate, nor were there any measures introduced which will increase productivity and, generally speaking, put our economy back on the road to recovery. For these omissions criticism is demanded from all members on this side of the House, or from as many as possible who can speak during these few short days in the debate.

Criticism is also warranted for the fact that even if the goal of less than 9 per cent inflation is attained next year, inflation will remain unacceptably high in this country. The finance minister patted himself and the government on the back with a statement on page 11 of the budget speech which reads, and I quote, "the actual rate of inflation has slowed noticeably since the introduction" of the prices and incomes program. He went on, "This sharp reduction in the rate of price increase is very welcome." What this overlooks is that the drop in the rate of increase in the consumer price index is occurring in areas not controlled by the Anti-Inflation Board. For instance, food costs declined at an annual rate of 5 per cent to 6 per cent, but are expected to rise considerably in the next few months, particularly this autumn.

The recent increase in the price of oil and petroleum products will also seriously affect the rate of inflation, and prices will continue to increase.

In the areas of inflation and unemployment I would certainly agree that this was a do nothing budget. What is deplorable, however, is the fact that action was sorely needed on both these fronts and, as one newspaper columnist pointed out, the minister, and I quote, "administered a placebo budget, hoping to keep the patient"—that is, the economy—"quiet until things get better by themselves." Things will not get better by themselves.

I have mentioned the fact that the Anti-Inflation Board, by and large, is useless in trying to control rising prices. In this connection I was interested in the public relations campaign the board has launched which outlines the kinds of increases it cannot control. Among some of the items the Anti-Inflation Board claims it is not responsible for are tobacco, alcohol, hydro, gas, water rates, public transit rates, rents, medical insurance premiums, and heating oil. In other words the inflationary pressures will not be halted on goods and services which are a daily necessity, not a luxury, to all Canadians.

On the unemployment side we find that in April of this year Canada showed the highest unemployment rate since June of 1961, and there are strong indications that it is unlikely to decline during the rest of this year. The minister's own Economic Review in April had this to say:

> During the recession firms engaged in substantial labour hoarding. The number of persons employed did not decline in line with cutbacks in output. Average hours were reduced . . . Much greater use was made of part time employment. Thus during the initial period of recovery firms can obtain increases in output without any increases in the number of workers by simply using them more intensively, while underutilized plant and equipment are pushed towards better operating rates.

In view of this it was absolutely crucial for the minister to have addressed himself more closely to the unemployment problem. At one point, on page 19 of his speech, the minister offered hope that some employment programs would be offered. Instead, all we got was a statement to the effect that direct employment programs can have broad social value and are not simply make work, but no proposals were made. The government even did away with OFY this year despite many thousands of unemployed young people coming on to the labour market.

I gather that the government is resigned to going through the rest of this year with unemployment at about 7 per cent of the labour force, hoping that the 7.4 per cent rate recorded in April was a fluke and not a real upturn. The finance minister's economic plan, if we can call it that, is based on the fact that the Canadian economy will generate more than 250,000 new jobs this year. This sounds impressive until we take into account that the labour force has been growing at well over 300,000 per year for the last three years. If the 250,000 jobs the minister talks about are added to the present employment level, we shall still be left with 747,000 people out of work by the end of this year. That is not what I call real performance.

The minister vainly tried to soften the impact of the current unemployment level by citing the study on the unemployed of the Economic Council of Canada, which said that much of today's jobless figure is accounted for by the young, by housewives, and by people dissatisfied with their former jobs seeking contentment in other kinds of work. I ask, why should this make any difference? Should a housewife feel any less discontented at being unable to secure work because her husband is currently drawing a salary? Should a young person feel any less distressed after having completed training for a particular job and being unable to find one, just because the finance minister says hers or his is not a kind of unemployment? I suggest that no government should be so complacent that it can afford not to provide jobs for those who wish to work, and by far the greater majority in this country want to work.

Therefore on two major fronts, inflation and unemployment, nothing has been done. As I mentioned, as a result of the omissions, both may be exacerbated.

Turning now to the specific measures which were introduced, it seems to me that it was totally inappropriate to cut $300 million in insurance benefits from the unemployed. On the one hand the minister says that today's unemployment does not carry with it the hardships it once did because of programs such as unemployment insurance, while on the other hand he announced that eligibility for benefits would be substantially cut back. It is a good thing we have some of these social transfer payments because I suggest that if we did not we would be in the grip of a revolution in this country today, for Canadians will not accept breadlines or soup kitchens any more. As a result of the cutback, some 330,000 individuals will not be eligible for unemployment insurance.

The manpower minister in his speech to the House on June 2 tried to dispel this figure with convoluted logic. He said that the figure of 330,000 did not mean that at any moment of time in the year 330,000 people would be affected. He said, and I quote, "Because the average duration of benefits extends only for a portion of the year, at any moment in time, only about 100,000 individuals would be affected." Before pursuing this argument further I must say that I find it absolutely appalling that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) would use the phrase "only about 100,000". That is 100,000 Canadians—100,000 individuals who live in this country. Nevertheless he continued this line of thought, and said that of this 100,000, 50 per cent will be able to find instant work for an additional four weeks. This means, and again I quote from the minister's speech, "only about 50,000 individuals would not be able to receive benefits and of these 80 per cent have no dependants". He has got it down to almost zero if you follow his line of thinking.

● (1740)

The minister, like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), has introduced the idea of degrees of seriouness for the unemployed. If you are single and unemployed, the government is of the opinion that your problem is not all that serious. Only this government, Mr. Speaker, could show such callousness. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration's manipulation of figures prompted one journalist to quip, "Mr. Andras leaves us wondering why we need an unemployment insurance scheme at all, until we realize that his entire rationale is a piece of statistical hocus pocus."

The proposed changes in the Unemployment Insurance Act are simply others in a line of changes introduced by this government which show how incompetent and impotent the administration is in dealing with unemployment. The last changes in Bill C-69 were a clear admission by the Liberals that they could not bring the jobless rate down, and consequently they were not about to pay for their inadequacies either.

The new proposals which were introduced will have disastrous effects on marginal workers, particularly those in Atlantic Canada, the northern part of Ontario, parts of Quebec, and parts of the northwest. There are thousands of people in this country who are employed in occupations where they cannot have a job that lasts for more than eight weeks. By raising the eligibility requirements from 8 to 12 weeks the government is essentially saying to these marginal workers that it is their fault that they cannot find lasting jobs. I suggest it is the government's fault for not providing jobs for them.

Why was such a move contemplated, Mr. Speaker? The leader of my party suggested last Wednesday that part of the justification for the changes rests with some of the myths that are held about unemployment insurance and the unemployed. The member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) cited the notion held by many in this country that there are plenty of jobs available for all those who want them. Yet, as has been stated, there are more than 12 men and women available for every one job across the country. I relate this to my own constituency, Brant county. If all the jobs were taken that are available, there would still be 700,000 people in this country out of work. Those are the facts; surely the government knows that also, but instead it reacted to the myth with a totally irrational proposal.

There are other myths about unemployment insurance and the unemployed. Some believe that benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Commission Act are too generous and that this leads to a disincentive to work. Yet we know that last year the average weekly benefit paid was $84.64. How many family bills, how many mortgage payments can be made on that amount of money? The very study that some have used to show that the UIC Act provides a disincentive to work, done by the Economic Council of Canada, also said that most surveys show that the vast majority of Canadians prefer work, not unemployment insurance.

Probably the most outstanding comment made in the Economic Council of Canada report on the unemployment insurance system was the following: "Notwithstanding how the effects of the 1971 changes—have been interpreted, one point is unquestionably clear: regulatory changes alone do not, will not, send people back to work, if there are no jobs available." This is what the New Democratic Party has been saying for quite some time.

The costs of unemployment insurance in Canada could be brought down if the government could manage the economy of this country in such a fashion that jobs would be provided to all those who wanted them. I said at the outset that the Minister of Finance had absolutely no intention of dealing with unemployment. Instead of dealing with the problem itself, the minister decided to take a crack at those who are unemployed.

In this regard I would like to make passing mention of the comments made by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) last Wednesday. In his concluding remarks he said, as reported at page 14097 of *Hansard*, "The NDP want people to rely on unemployment just as the government does, and this—we object to most strenuously." The member for Hamilton West made this statement, or used it as the main reason why our party's amendment was unacceptable to the members to my right. I should clarify for the hon. member that the NDP has never wanted people to rely on unemployment. As a matter of fact our party, the socialist party, is a work oriented party, not a party oriented to living off the avails of someone else just because of laziness.

We want to put people to work. If you look at other countries in the world that have social democratic parties in power you will find in most cases that unemployment is very low. However, we are adamantly opposed to any measures which would restrict the eligibility of any person who is out of work for some reason totally beyond his or her control. Let me reiterate that the only acceptable way of reducing the cost of unemployment insurance in this country is to provide the required jobs. In other words, put people to work.

We in this party feel that certain steps could have been taken to alleviate some of the unemployment facing Canada. The Canadian economy is presently functioning at approximately 80 per cent capacity. What this means is that there is room for expansion in our economy. Tax cuts could have been provided without fuelling inflation. An increased demand for goods would have stimulated the economy, and consequently manufacturing industries would call back men and women who needed the jobs. As I said, Mr. Speaker, this stimulation for the economy would not have caused further inflation; it would if we were operating at full capacity, but this is not the present case.

Let me address myself briefly to some of the other budgetary measures introduced on May 25. I wish to deal specifically with two matters—the increase in deductions for child care expenses from the old maximum of $2,000 per family to a total annual limit of $4,000, and increasing to $3,500 the maximum annual amount deductible by employees and employers in respect of a registered pension plan. Also, if an individual is not a member of a pension plan, the maximum contribution limit will be increased from the present $4,000 to $5,500.

I should like to emphasize that I am not personally opposed to people being able to increase their tax deductions if they are able to save. If they have money that they can save without paying further tax, through registered retirement savings or the registered home owners' savings plan which is being made more flexible, I am not critical of them. If they earn around $18,000 or $20,000 a year and wish to set aside tax deferred savings until they are older, that is fine. But what I most strenuously object to is the fact that this is considered to be a very liberal attitude in a budgetary form for the people of Canada. We are talking about a very, very small number of Canadians. They are the only people who get a break at all in this budget because the vast majority of people in this country have no chance of saving $3,500 or $4,000 every year, or even $5,500 for a retirement savings plan.

Why did the Minister of Finance not bring in tax cuts for low income people to balance things and make it a much more equitable budget? These tax changes have been referred to as a hidden welfare system by Reuben Baetz of the Canadian Council on Social Development. Actually the government's tax deferral schemes are exactly that. Mr. Baetz was referring to such measures as well as to measures introduced in the last several budgets, one example being the $1,000 interest income deductible from income for income tax purposes. Such measures help people in higher income brackets. One must seriously question whether spending $60 million—which is what the deductions actually cost us—to aid those with incomes of $20,000 a year and more, really met one of Canada's socially pressing needs. I am convinced that the measure did not fill a pressing need felt by most Canadians.

● (1750)

With respect to deductions made in connection with registered retirement savings plans, I suggest that in order to reach the former ceiling of $4,000 a taxpayer had to earn $20,000 a year. The new ceiling of $5,500 per year means a further tax saving of almost $700 for a single person earning $27,500, but not a penny of saving for the average Canadian. We had become used to seeing the former minister of finance redistribute income in this fashion. I hoped the present minister would change the pattern. Unfortunately he did not.

The measure to increase deductions for child care expenses has been lauded by many; again, would it not have been more equitable if the $15 million, the estimated cost of this measure, had been given as a flat rate credit? Since deductions provide higher benefits to those in top income brackets, the child care deductions will obviously benefit those who need them least.

The government's record of income distribution is abysmal. For instance the share of total income going to the bottom 20 per cent of income earners was less in 1974 than in 1951. Not only has income distribution not changed substantially in the last quarter century, but successive ministers of finance, the present minister included, have introduced measures like those I referred to which have made the income tax system much less progressive.

I do not know how much longer we must wait for an equitable tax system. I suggest to the Minister of Finance, the cabinet and colleagues on my right, that unless we put

people back to work in meaningful jobs with security of tenure, correct the inequities in our tax system, improve the lot of the 20 per cent to 25 per cent of our population living in abject poverty, give young people more incentive to study and qualify for meaningful jobs, correct the deplorable situation in which thousands of our qualified nurses who could not find work in this country went to the United States for work, and give incentives for young, middle aged, and older Canadians to look for meaningful work, this country will be in great trouble in two or three years.

We saw what happened the other day on Parliament Hill. The violent behaviour of the few troublemakers in the large crowd disgusted us. I suggest that if the Anti-Inflation Board continues to be unfair we shall see more violent demonstrations. There will be more violence in this country. There will be an even greater division between those who possess some wealth and those who possess none. The members of this House are obliged to make sure this does not happen. What other assembly in the country, what other elected council has power to make the vital decisions which will bring about more economic and social equity in this country?

Mr. Balfour: Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I address my remarks tonight to the failure of the May 25 budget to deal significantly with the problems facing industry in this country. A columnist for the Montreal *Gazette* in commenting on the government's new budget, or non-budget as it should be called, described the government's effort most accurately when he said, and I quote:

> Economy, heal thyself: having studied the symptoms for nine months, Canada's new fiscal physician has decided he does not know what to do, anymore than John Turner did when the chills of high unemployment came at the same time as the fever of inflation.
>
> So he has administered a placebo budget, hoping to keep the patient quiet until things get better by themselves. Perhaps the Yankee medicine of export demand from the United States will help.
>
> Perhaps the private sector—written off by the Prime Minister only a few months ago—will deliver the right goods and services to the right place at the right time and the right price. We had better hope so.
>
> The Minister of Finance can expect criticism for bringing down, in the midst of multiplied economic problems, the kind of drifting, dreamy budget which might have been produced by a Finance Minister afraid to change anything because things were going so well.

But things are not going all that well, Mr. Speaker. The minister will live with a deficit of about $4.5 billion for another year, an amount which points to the government's failure to control its own spending.

Furthermore, the budget does little or nothing to fight unemployment, increase productivity, restrain growth of government spending, reduce Canada's high interest and exchange rates, or promote business investment. In short, the budget exemplifies the government's obvious ineptitude in coming to grips with our real problems and needs.

The budget makes no significant effort to tackle the four major problem areas facing the Canadian economy inflation, unemployment, productivity, and the current account deficit.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has termed this do-nothing budget "a very anti-business budget", and so it is. The industrial and business sector of this country does not need government apathy. Rather, business and industry in Canada need the incentives that government can provide to improve plant efficiency, re-equip, improve the supply of goods and services, and compete effectively on the international market.

One area where the government could have helped improve the well-being of Canadian industry is the field of research and development. On March 12 of this year the Council of the Academy of Science of the Royal Society of Canada made it clear to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that a serious situation exists, and promises to become more serious in the future, as a result of the government's non-policy for the support of scientific research and development. The society, in its brief to the Prime Minister, said:

> At no time in our history have we been confronted with so many problems needing science-based solutions. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of the decisions that confront Canada in such areas as resource management, energy options, health care, food supply, pollution, transportation, and so on.
>
> Furthermore, the choices that we, as a nation, make in these areas will be dependent on the maturity, knowledge, versatility and statute of contemporary Canadian science and engineering. Canada cannot afford to depend on the scientific and engineering skills of other countries to solve its problems.
>
> Even choices as to the best kinds of technology to be imported and adapted to Canadian conditions . . . must be made on the basis of sound scientific and engineering knowledge, which can only be obtained from a community of highly competent and active Canadian scientists and engineers.

Having said that, the Council of the Academy expressed a great concern with the unfortunate deterioration that the government has allowed to take place, a dangerous deterioration in the public support of research and development in Canadian industry, in government laboratories and in universities.

The government has a bad habit of ignoring the sound advice of those sectors of society which specialize in a given field of endeavour, and it therefore comes as no surprise that the government has made a failure of its limited efforts in this area. Although the need for a well funded Canadian industrial research effort is recognized by most, the government has, as usual, headed in the opposite and wrong direction.

A statement on science policy put out by the offices of Bell Canada illustrates this point. I quote:

> We refer to the government decision to freeze research expenditures, to repeal the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act

(IRDIA) and to reduce the money available for the Program for the Advancement of Industrial Technology (PAIT).

● (2010)

While the sums involved are not great (we are led to believe that the annual grants through IRDIA do not exceed $30 million) they were often essential for the initiation and continuation of the research programs of some companies.

Money allotted to research and development at the best of times could only be described as minuscule. The fact of the matter is that Canada's expenditures on research and development peaked in 1966, and Canada has never spent more than 1.2 per cent of its Gross National Product on research. Other industrialized nations such as Japan, West Germany, France, the United States, and Britain, have all committed much larger amounts of GNP to research and continue to do so. It must be said that if this nation expects to expand industrially, to become a major international trading nation and to continue the improvements in its internal social well-being, then this country cannot afford not to have research. The fact of the matter is that Canada will be outpaced by other industrial countries and will end up purchasing technology and scientific expertise from elsewhere.

As one who takes more than a passing interest in the economic climate of this country I recognize, unlike the government, that there is a real economic value attached to increased efficiency, better products, and increased trade. If that sounds like a cold view of the matter, then just remember that better medical care, improved housing, superior consumer goods, less work, and increased prosperity are also attributable to scientific and technological advancement. It would seem that the government views research and development expenditures as a luxury which can be done without. This is one area, however, where continued and increased government support is required. Research and development is not an expense; it is an investment in the future of this country.

Canada has problems quite peculiar to its own development. There is little to contest the precept that Canada's economic future largely depends upon its ability to enlarge its position as an international trader. Industrial research can undoubtedly be one key to securing and advancing a position in international trade for this country. Certain facts of Canadian economic life must not be forgotten when we discuss this subject.

Over the past few years wage levels in this country have risen at a rate much faster than those of competing nations and nations to which Canada hopes to sell. Unfortunately at the same time the level of productivity in Canada has dropped in relation to that of such countries as West Germany and the United States. And so it is that we are handicapped from the word go in trying to compete in many foreign markets.

To compensate for the higher wage levels and decreased productivity in Canada, research and development can bring innovations to products and manufacturing practices. To ignore research and development at this time can only lead to further deficits in the Canadian balance of trade in the future, as Canada fails to make inroads into foreign markets. It must be stressed again and again to the government that Canada's trade position is unhealthy. Canada in reality had a current trade deficit of $8 billion in 1975. We covered it by selling a net of $2.9 billion in raw resources, borrowing $4.7 billion from foreign sources, and letting our exchange reserves fall by $400 million. With a current account deficit of $5.1 billion in 1975, even after the trade surplus of $2.9 billion in raw materials, it is difficult to conceive of our trade deficit being any more ominous.

Quite apart from the likelihood of our 1976 trade performance being little better than in 1975, however, the composition of the 1975 current account balance is a source of even greater alarm than the deficit figures would indicate. The sale of raw materials is, of course, a basic element in the economic picture of this country. Increased sales of raw materials may be one way out of our current trade problems. However, most of us, except the government, realize that this attitude is pure folly. Exporting crude materials provides considerably less benefit to the Canadian economy than exporting fully or partly manufactured goods. There is far more value added to a manufactured product, in terms of labour, capital investment, and research, than to a raw resource. But in addition to this standard criticism of increased exports of raw materials, there is also the fact that our exports of non-renewable raw materials can only be, by definition, finite.

Recent developments in the petroleum and natural gas situation make very clear the full force of this basic truth. Non-renewable resources are Canada's capital assets, and to continue to export them in a totally unrefined state is to sell off fixed assets to relieve a current expenses deficit. What this means is that the government should, above all else, be encouraging new industry and established industries in this country to grow and compete effectively at home and abroad. Unfortunately this budget before us illustrates the government's total lack of foresight and initiative in this area.

It is an economic fact of life that industrial and commercial expansion requires capital, Mr. Speaker. The Economic Council of Canada, in its 12th annual review, estimated that the nation's capital needs between now and 1985 will total between $800 and $860 billion dollars. By comparison, total investment expenditures over the past decade were around $200 billion. Thus a four-fold increase in capital outlays will be needed to increase productive facilities in line with the growth of Canadian markets, to develop and upgrade our energy and other natural resources, and to achieve the improvement in our productivity performance so urgently needed as a prerequisite for long-term price stability.

The pre-budget submission of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce states some of the needs of Canadian business quite succinctly:

Historically, 60-70 per cent of our investment has been financed by corporations through retained earnings and depreciation allowances.

Neither source is expected to advance in the future at the rates required. Depreciation allowances, based on original costs, are seriously inadequate to cover the replacement value of facilities. Profits, and hence retained earnings, are limited under the wage and price control program.

The submission continues:

It is therefore, in our opinion, imperative that the federal government continuously monitor the impact of the profit controls and provide, wherever possible, assistance to industry in the financing of productive capital investment.

Measures such as the deduction of inventory valuation adjustments from taxable income, or the provision of depreciation at the replacement value of assets, have been recommended before by the chamber . . . and are still needed.

In summary, the situation for industrial expansion in this country can be termed discouraging. At a time when the economic health of the country could be improved through such measures as research and development funding, tax reform for industry, lower personal income tax rates, and efforts to encourage public savings in order to increase available capital for investment in Canadian industry, the government has responded with a do nothing budget whose only significant message is that the government itself still refuses to curb its own expenditures.

The budget deficit will not recede. It will grow by about an estimated $5 billion in 1976-77. The increase in spending is 16.2 per cent, approximately what was projected in the estimates; the increase in revenues, 15.3 per cent.

As for the fiscal year just ended, the government has revealed that total government spending was $725 million higher than had been earlier forecast. That amounts to an increase of 18 per cent in government spending rather than the 16 per cent announced by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) when he unveiled some of the plans to restrain government spending last December.

I will conclude my comments, Mr. Speaker, by reiterating what this budget really means. It means that the government is content to go through the rest of this year with unemployment at about 7 per cent of the labour force, hoping that the 7.4 per cent unemployment rate recorded in April was just a fluke and not a real upturn. It calls for real growth of the economy of 5 per cent this year, and not much better next year. This very modest recovery depends, of course, on the economic stimulus offered by other countries, such as the United States, and not by any initiative of our own.

● (2020)

This budget calls for an inflation rate, as figured on the Gross National Product rather than consumer prices, of a hefty 9.5 per cent this year and about 6 per cent next year.

All in all, this non-budget presents us with a real example of what could only be expected from a government whose record of economic mismanagement is so considerable. Other countries have done and are doing better, and without the built-in advantages which make even bad management in Canada appear to be not so bad. Indeed what the Minister of Finance has provided us with is no budget at all. There can be no doubt that the government will have to show us a real budget in the near future.

Canadians have come to expect very little, except ineptitude, from the government, and so it is that we can only ask that a future budget demonstrate an understanding of the nation's problems, hope for the unemployed, and initiatives which will promote Canadian industry; but to ask this government for even a mediocre effort is to ask more than this government is capable of providing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Arthur Portelance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) for his budget. As many of my colleagues know, I have worked for a long time in the clothing industry, and I can therefore say that the minister provided us with a "made to order" suit but with very few alterations, which shows that we already had a good pattern. I also want to emphasize the enlightened determination shown in the proposed changes in our unemployment insurance legislation by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) who is also responsible for the Unemployment Insurance Commission and whom I have the pleasure to second as a parliamentary secretary. Incidentally, as you may guess, this will be the subject matter of my remarks today.

Everybody admits that the unemployment insurance formula had to be amended, but as in the fable of the miller, his son and the donkey, it was impossible to satisfy everybody at the same time. This debate has already shown that proposals range from the funnel to the Danaides' barrel. For instance, some members have blamed the minister for not going far enough in the area of restraints, especially among those who feel there are too many people who live poorly but pleasantly at the expense of what some people call the "permanently chronic workers" whereas on the other hand, it was said that this government was engaging in tax surgery at the expense of those who find it difficult to make both ends meet.

As a matter of fact, the changes before us had to be made, logically and in fairness, both for the large majority of Canadians who are working and paying for maintaining the present unemployment insurance system and for those who occasionally are the recipients of this system and who will finally benefit from it, for one has to keep in mind that the changes made to the Unemployment Insurance Act will bring about a substantial expansion of job creating programs. Our first goal, as the Minister of Manpower and Immigration said in his speech of June 2, is to provide jobs for as many Canadians as possible.

Unemployment insurance is not a goal but a step towards a new job. Those decisions are not made unexpectedly but are rather the result of analyses, surveys on conditions prevailing in Canada as well as other countries. Indeed I want to stress that even with the new clause extending from eight to twelve weeks the number of weeks of work necessary to become eligible for unemployment insurance, the Canadian formula is even more generous than in all industrialized nations of the world, except the Netherlands. In Sweden, you need 12 months of contribution, including five in the preceding year; in the United Kingdom, you need 26 weeks in the previous year to get the minimum benefits and 50 weeks for the maximum. In Germany, you need 26 weeks in the three preceding years. And when the NDP leader points out that in those countries unemployment rates are lower, I say to him that that is an argument which goes against his theory, since in all logic a lower rate of unemployment means that people find more jobs and also more quickly.

It would be useless to imagine, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment insurance alone can be used to right all our economic or social problems, even if it constitutes one of the most important and effective instruments available to the government to create jobs, as it is going to do more and

more with formulas of the local initiative type, and training programs are extremely important in that respect.

The minister has been criticized for not unwrapping immediately before the House all the programs in their finest details. Yet, those statements already contain the assurance that the amounts which will not be used for unemployment insurance will be spent to create jobs, with due consideration for regional needs. In the same line, the reform launched by the minister will allow us to calculate benefits according to the regional rather than the national rate of unemployment but all those amendments requiring the passage of legislation will only affect the true status of unemployment insurance recipients at the beginning of next year.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) already indicated that all plans for those enlarged manpower programs will be completed in two or three months and made public no later than this fall.

Canada is already regarded as leading the way in the creation of employment when, for instance, our Local Initiatives Program has been adopted in Great Britain while experts from the United States, France, Australia, etc, are considering it in their turn. The advantage of these programs is that they stimulate workers and respect the dignity of man, which, in many cases, helps bring back workers on the labour market. In my constituency of Gamelin, in Montreal, seven local initiatives projects made wonderful things this year not only for the hundred persons who took part in them, but for thousands of others who profited by them indirectly.

It is also certain that a pilot program launched in Newfoundland and which has known considerable success, will take great extension. Through that plan, hundreds of people have been able for about a year to continue to receive unemployment insurance benefits while attending training courses which enabled them to acquire qualifications they will be able to use on the labour market in sectors where they will be needed.

To continue on training, the minister reminded us in this House last week that with the addition of $40 million for industrial and institutional training, the federal government will have put $522 million in that sector alone during the present financial year. In the same way, the workers' mobility program has been made more generous.

● (2030)

Reverting to the subject of unemployment insurance, I must say that the next law will no longer include severance pay in the salary of an employee for purposes of establishing his unemployment insurance allowances. Similarly, the famous "four-week" rule will be eliminated thus enabling people without a job to take temporary employment and still be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. This could become an extremely efficient incentive.

The amendments suggested by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration do not only meet the wishes of politicians, journalists or social agencies. In the interesting declaration he made on June 2, the official critic of the Progressive Conservative Party for manpower, the hon. member for Hamilton-West (Mr. Alexander) said, I quote:

The Economic Council is of the opinion that our existing legislation induces people to join the unemployment rolls and is a disincentive to work. It estimates that present legislation induced between 70,000 and 80,000 people to go on unemployment.

I am sure that what the government wants, and what the whole House wants, is a formula which will help those who are in need, a formula which induces those who are unemployed to look for a job and to keep it. By the way, merging the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Unemployment Insurance Commission will help to improve the situation in that particular area. Finally, Mr. Speaker, this formula is more practical, more efficient, more just and more realistically adapted to the needs of the Canadian economy.

Mr. Speaker, the journalists who are presently studying the situation are far from being unanimous. For example, last Thursday, the editorialist of the *Globe and Mail* estimated that the federal statistics on unemployment are no longer realistic because they consider as unemployed many people who do not really want to work or who do not want to get "bored" looking for a job. On the contrary, Charles Lynch, a journalist from the Southam News Agency, estimated that the progressive reduction, given the day before by the minister, in the number of those who claim unemployment insurance allowances among the so-called 8-to-11 week category and who would really have to face difficulties, was a calculation in which the statistics were sifted in a way very hard to control.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, no one of us can try the reins and the heart, as the saying goes. On the other hand, the demonstration of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration is based on the figures obtained from serious studies, and they prove, for instance, that the claimants of the "8 to 11 week" group cost 20 times, on the average, all the other recipients of unemployment insurance, that they use up their rights to the limit oftener, that they find work rather easily and quickly when they run out of unemployment benefits, that they often reenter the ranks of the recipients, that they are not usually the first breadwinner of the family but that their salary is added to the income of an average if not higher-income family, that they seldom if ever live on welfare, that their rate of claims is four times that of the average claim, in short that they are part of the category which is least exposed to having problems if an attempt is made to reduce the cost of unemployment insurance in a given sector.

Let us also remember that "disbursements" does not mean money taken from the worker, for it is understood that the amounts saved will be channelled towards programs for creating employment and training the workers, especially in those areas where the need is greatest. Finally, as the minister said again, the government does not seek the glory of reducing unemployment by one point or a fraction thereof, so much as, above all else, creating the largest possible number of jobs in the Canadian economy, as well as enabling the greatest possible number of Canadians to be advised of the existence of those jobs, to get them and keep them. That last point, namely that of keeping a job, illustrates well the importance of training programs which result in a more competent, better motivated and better remunerated labour force.

So we are not faced, as suggested by the New Democratic Party leader, with a sinister conspiracy to deprive those

unemployed who are most in need, and to let them treacherously on the street, but with the rational adjustment of the unemployment insurance system, so as to allow for instance more simple activities, the number of phases passing then from five to three, more generous operations because they will concurrently give way to some working forms or the registration for training courses, fairer activities because they will be more properly fashioned after regional requirements, finally more rational activities because they are based on the results of enquiries relating to the behaviour of certain categories of unemployment insurance recipients.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that to get the maximum of success with the new regulations on unemployment insurance and employment creation programs, we surely need the cooperation of workers, but also that of employers, as well as of provinces with which the Minister of Manpower and Immigration indicated Wednesday his intention to attempt every collective effort. One should also note that several provinces as well have interesting programs to reduce the number of people on welfare from various categories, including—and I say this for our friends from the Social Credit Party—those in British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Manpower and Immigration said, these few legal and institutional changes will be introduced to promote a more efficient employment policy in this country, and I urge my colleagues to support the government position.

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate the Minister of Finance for his courage in introducing this budget, because in the last number of years it has taken men of courage to prepare budgets.

In the way of summing up my thoughts on the subject, I endorse the following statement made by Claude Ryan in *Le Devoir* of May 27, and I quote:

> Caught in the narrowest margin left a Canadian Minister of Finance for a long time, Mr. Macdonald introduced his first budget, in the House of Commons Tuesday evening, under very difficult circumstances which prompted many critics to suggest this may be his last budget.
>
> Never in history did a federal budget come so close to being the "non-budget" it was immediately termed. Never in a long time did a Liberal Minister of Finance show so much reluctance and even shyness.

If I were to wish the minister something, it would be to hurry through that budget and avoid the path followed by his predecessors, who broke their necks at the head of that department we are tempted to call the death-trap ministry. As always, the budget tabled by the Minister of Finance for 1976-77 draws absolutely opposite reactions from businessmen and the millions of wage earners.

So it is not surprising that big corporations, banking monopolies and all the multinationals congratulate the Minister of Finance, while unionized and non-unionized workers alike and the 769,000 unemployed regret such an antisocial, not to say nationally shameful budget. But paradoxically, both sides may be right, since the government always favoured those who financed their elections, ignoring most of the time between elections those who were prevailed upon during the 60-day period to vote them back into power.

[Mr. Portelance.]

● (2040)

That is why I am wondering today which one is to blame—the governors or the governed who keep accepting to be easily taken in come every election time. It has been known by everybody, and this for 100 years, that successive governments have always protected the financial sector to the detriment of Canadians, and what is more astounding is that they have done so by making people believe that the elected government was acting in the best interests of Canadian workers.

The very proof of my allegations is found in the budget. After a somewhat in-depth review of the May 25, 1976 budget papers tabled by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), one has only to look at page 11 of this paper and examine the list of anticipated expenses for 1976 to realize easily that 35 sectors will be favoured with an increase, whereas only four will suffer cutbacks, or sizeable reductions.

Even more astonishing is the fact that the very sectors which should have been increased, at least at the rate accepted by the Anti-Inflation Board, are those the government has decided to take a crack at—agriculture, unemployment insurance, Secretary of State and transport.

In my opinion the minister should have limited the CBC and CIDA budgets, the charges on the national debt as well as outlays for national defence, bank interests, government corporations and all the items under "other expenditures", which we had seven times without any explanation. We see that the budget of agriculture is reduced by $17 million whereas it should have been increased at least by $40 million to meet the demands of the industrial milk producers of Quebec which are more than reasonable; these producers are facing the worst problem ever experienced in this sector, due only to the decisions taken unilaterally by the federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan).

Where is the logic of the government which after having eliminated 60 per cent of the small farms endangers 50 per cent of those which resisted the assault of the government? Having been invited and even encouraged to enlarge their farms, improve their buildings, modernize their techniques to obtain maximum efficiency, these producers are accused of overproduction only a few months later. Because the farm producers complied with the numerous requests of the Minister of Agriculture, because the industrial milk producers trusted the government's technocrats and technicians, the same producers are penalized for having listened to the government's specialists.

Has the Minister of Agriculture only thought about the financial effects on the milk producers? Is the government aware that instead of a 20 per cent decrease, those producers needed at least 15 per cent more than in 1975 to meet their financial obligations?

We must keep in mind that it is not of their own free will that the producers agreed to run into maximum debts to meet the department's requirements. The department should at least have the decency to recognize that it alone is responsible for the difficult financial situation of the industrial milk producers. Consequently, it is its responsibility, not anyone else's, not to request the producers to pay for its specialists' mistakes.

I can readily understand the march on Parliament Hill in Ottawa on Thursday, June 3 to ask the Minister of Agriculture to reconsider his decision. Why Quebec more so than the other provinces? Because it is Quebec, more specifically the industrial milk producers in Quebec who are the most seriously affected. Indeed in the western provinces the production of industrial milk is insignificant. In Ontario, which produced its highest out of quota surpluses last year, the measure only normalizes the situation whereas the Quebec industrial milk producers who are responsible for only 2 per cent of all milk surpluses are those who must bear the burden of the cuts in quotas.

If the Minister of Agriculture really had to take drastic action to avoid more surpluses, why did he not emphasize restrictions for those who had a surplus last year? Why reduce regular quotas and why must those who did not fill their regular quotas last year be penalized as well? That is where I see a lack of logic on the part of the department's experts, unless their deliberate purpose was to favour Ontario over Quebec. I believe the cause of all these problems is the total lack of long term dairy policy. Obviously it is much easier for the agriculture technicians to outline a 12 month policy than to make projections for five years ahead. Such a policy seems to be beyond the high officials of production and marketing of agricultural products. However, the possibilities are not lacking.

I am convinced it would cost less to the government to create a warehousing system for a five year period to restore balance between good and bad years. This would take us away from the vicious circle of surplus and shortage. Sometimes the federal government calls on producers, either in beef, pork, chicken, eggs or milk because a shortage is forecasted for a few months hence; the government makes promises to stimulate the production concerned. Producers go full steam ahead following the government incentives, only to learn 10 or 12 months later that they have caused a surplus. When shall we have enough competent people to stop playing this way with farm producers by making them support the burden of government mistakes or incompetence? Again, if producers were asked by the government to prepare farming policies we would have some reason to accuse and even punish these producers, but everyone knows full well that it is the officials who prepare and run all policies, whether they have to do with marketing or producing agricultural commodities. These officials are asked to think and to act for and on behalf of producers, but if officials make a mistake, the producers are quickly punished.

Further than that, today the Minister of Finance through his Anti-Inflation Board allows an increase of 12 or 15 per cent to all other groups of workers, indexed on the cost of living which is quite normal, but this same minister forces farmers and especially industrial milk producers to take a cut of 20 per cent in their income. Where is the consistency of the Ministers of Finance and Agriculture? I might add that it is discrimination against the Quebec dairy producers because, as I said earlier, once more Quebec bears the brunt. Indeed, when Canada had wheat surpluses, this same government compensated the western producers and even paid them not to sow wheat. Do I blame the western producers? On the contrary, I say to them: Good for you! I congratulate all hon. members from the west as I did then for imposing their will on the government and obtaining greater protection for farmers. Yet, the Liberals elected only a few members in the west, as is the case today; therefore it is not a partisan policy that prevailed but the pressure, the common sense policy.

● (2050)

If a handful of western members of the opposition have delivered that master stroke for their province, I wonder what the 59 elected Liberals in Quebec are doing. I fear that the Quebec Liberals are the victims of their strength in Parliament. Some surely have no backbone to uphold sincerely the interests of Quebec. Let us forget for a moment the condition of the party to think about Quebecers. The Quebec agriculture is ill and the cause is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). Can my dear Liberal colleagues do something? It is up to them to show it in the days to come.

My second criticism is related to the $45 million which the minister wants to take away from unemployment insurance. I think that after agriculture, which will remain our basic industry for a few years, provided members remain conscious of their responsibilities in the House, a very important sector for the Quebec economy more particularly is the maintenance of the manpower and unemployment insurance services. Among the 750,000 unemployed in Canada, my region has a very high percentage and they are not wealthy unemployed, but people who are looking for a job and cannot find any. The minister knows quite well that when no more benefits will be paid to the unemployed, they will be compelled to register on the rolls on social welfare in Quebec.

That is a way as good as any other to shift his responsibilities on to the back of the provinces. That is a good example of the famous balance-sheet federalism of the present government. We forgot to tell one thing to the population: that federalism was profitable only to the central government. In 1942, after having made the provinces yield all their taxation rights, the central government went as far as promising to the naive provinces that it would reinstate them in their rights once the war would be over. Thirty-four years have passed since then and the federal government still retains most taxation rights. I would even say that it takes advantage of its taxation power to intrude every day into areas reserved exclusively to the provinces.

Just to give you an idea of it, during the study in a special committee before the presentation of the budget, I drew the attention of officials to the enormous difference between the increase in personal income tax and corporate income tax. In the document entitled "Budget Speech" of June 25, 1976, page 40, we can see that Canadian workers will pay $20 billion in direct taxes against $16 billion in 1975 which is an increase of more than $4 billion while big corporations will pay an additional $700 million only. This is another levy which demonstrates the absurdity of our taxation system. While we live in a period of great banking and financial monopolies, multinational companies which own 80 per cent of our economy pay only 24 per cent of the national budget, whereas salaried people pay 76 per cent of it.

We have been asking the government for years to restore the economic balance by getting the money from those who pocket revenues and file astronomical profits. Far from

seeking to take the money where it really is so as to administer and guarantee each citizen an adequate minimum income to live on, the government turns back to the unemployed, to take more money from those who cannot even work to earn a decent living for themselves and their family.

As if he wanted to soften the blow, the minister first increased the premiums, and now he decides to reduce benefits. This is what I call administrative dishonesty. If the minister sincerely wants to save $75 or $100 million, he just has to turn to the Department of National Defence, and simply keep the $1 billion they intend to spend on the purchase of new toys for our soldiers overseas.

Let us talk a little bit, Mr. Speaker, of this famous Orion or Lockheed program, whichever one you wish to call it. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that after we were told that the government could not afford to spend $40 million to help industrial milk producers, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) is prepared to run us into debt to the tune of $1 billion to buy new military planes. While everyone is clamoring for improved rail services, the Department of Transport budget is being reduced to fill in the coffers of national defence—I was about to say "international" since most of our forces are overseas.

The government proposes to close down railway lines which are unprofitable. But is the Air Force profit-making? The country cannot afford it, so what, there is no problem, Lockheed will finance the Orion deal. Do you not think there is something mysterious about the transactions of this corporation which inspired so much comments with the terrific bribes it has resorted to in several countries to boost its sales? After the Sky Shops scandal, shall we get another involving Lockheed?

When you listen to the sometimes quite harsh interventions in this House, you wonder if some ministers or civil servants have not succumbed to the temptation of bribes. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been better for the government itself to negotiate a little loan for the benefit of farmers. Bribes would have been less significant and it would have been compensated by a political gain.

I could not conclude without speaking of our great Crown corporation, Air Canada, and its unilingualism. I have no idea what the Prime Minister thinks of the disastrous events concerning his bilingualism program and what is going on at Air Canada. In light of those events we are more and more convinced that for some English-speaking Canadians bilingualism is a good and nice thing as long as it is not implemented. We are just seeing the beginning of a fight where many senior civil servants and some ministers will have to show their true face to the Canadian people. Even if you are part of Canada, when you dare prevent a province from using its own language it becomes dangerous, Mr. Speaker. As always, the minister promptly created a commission to hide behind but the problem is still there. And what a commission, Mr. Speaker! For a commission on bilingualism, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) could not do any better than chosing a lawyer who was a former adviser to the pilot association, a group absolutely hostile to bilingualism in Quebec's sky.

The Association des gens de l'air du Québec denounced the appointment of Mr. Keenan and even declared that it would not cooperate in that inquiry because of the past action of Mr. Keenan. The association went even further: it demanded the appointment of a French-speaking co-commissioner or Mr. Keenan's dismissal. The Minister of Transport said no to everything. It was the slap in the face given by our Minister of Transport to the airline employees in Quebec. However, witnessing the increasing rebellion in Quebec, Mr. Keenan realized that his appointment as commissioner had become litigious and, far from contributing to solve the problem, it was only increasing it, so he made a decision. We have seen that Mr. Keenan, in spite of his formal opposition to bilingualism, has more sense than the Minister of Transport. Now we are waiting for the creation of the new commission.

To my mind, the minister is too compromised at this point to designate alone the members of that commission. The cabinet must be very careful to avoid more confrontations. In the meantime, we Quebecers are paying our share of the deficits of the big beautiful unilingual company, Air Canada. If the minister wants to stay with the status quo at Air Canada, let him at least give money to the unemployed and the farmers in Quebec, the money we must pay for the deficits of Air Canada. Then only will we start to consider him as an impartial anglophone who tries to work for the unity of the two Canadian ethnic groups.

[*English*]

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the debate on this budget of 1976, my mind went back over budget debates of the last 19 years. I think there is a well known expression, "The more things change, the more they remain the same".

● (2100)

We are suffering at this particular time from obvious evidence that the government did not know what to do and the civil servants did not know what to do, so they did nothing. I make that remark with some regret because I have seen one minister after the other in the last 25 years, going back to Walter Harris, suffer the same fate regardless of their politics because the elected representative was not contributing the knowledge that was available to the budget. We relied on the expertise of people who were sincere and able, but who had been consistently wrong for 30 years. I have made that remark on many a budget debate, and I regret to have to make it tonight. In a moment I shall refer to the source of this judgment. I always believe in being an optimist, however.

I was interested to read a statement by the former deputy minister of finance reported in the *Globe and Mail* of June 2. I shall not read the whole article but I would ask the members of the House who take seriously the part parliament should play in laying down the fiscal and monetary policy of this nation so as to maximize the good that will come from a proper policy, to pay particular attention to it. Here is a man who had been around for all of my time here and is now in private business. His concluding remark was: "Above all we economists should learn to be humble; so should our political leaders. Together we have much to be humble about." Now that Simon Reisman is free of government service he tells us to be humble because we have much to be humble about!

In my remarks tonight I am going to try to shift away from the details of this budget because there is general

agreement that it is a nothing budget. The minister himself made that very clear when he bragged that he would rather be cautious than foolhardy. I want to remind the House that along with a good many other people in Canada I have been seriously concerned this last year or so, as I saw the nation slowly begin to come out of the recession, that somebody would do something stupid to send us back into another recession.

In this history of mistakes over the last 30 years the situation we are in at this particular time in our economic cycle is exactly the same as on two other separate occasions in the years I have been in the House. On each of the previous occasions the circumstances were the same—a country slowly coming out of a recession and then the government did a stupid thing which sent the country into a worse recession.

Just before last Christmas I put the following question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) quietly at the end of the question period, as reported at page 10196 of *Hansard*:

> . . . would the Prime Minister give serious consideration over the next three or four weeks to re-examining the whole course that the government is taking because I believe it is heading us toward a recession and would he turn the whole program of the government around into one of expansion so as to give the government time to get at the basic cause of inflation, which this program is not doing?

I was referring to the anti-inflation program. The Prime Minister promised he would give it serious consideration but as the House will understand, when he gave that answer he thought the expansion I asked about was the same type of expansion program we have had for 30 years from the advisers of the government. He thought it meant pumping more money into circulation so that there would be more to spend. He mentioned that in his answer. He said in effect, "Look how big our budgetary deficit is—we are expansionary." He accepted the word of the Department of Finance experts who believe that if we have a big budget deficit, that is expansionary. I say it is time the politicians took over from these experts and began to do some real thinking on the deficits that are before us.

Tonight I am not going to deal with the details of the budget. I am going to suggest that there are alternatives and these alternatives have been made public. They are not new but they are not being utilized by the advisers of our governments. I will give an example, Mr. Speaker.

First, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) for being the one speaker in the opening stages of this debate who looked at the situation in a philosophical sense and saw what the government was doing. All the government was doing was trying to take a political posture to get the Prime Minister out of the hole vis-à-vis those silly speeches he made around Christmas time.

The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge put forward not a new philosophy but one that was laid clear as an alternative by the Economic Council of Canada six or seven years ago, namely, that when you have a large number of unemployed and 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the plant capacity unused, if you put that group of people to work and put that plant capacity to use, then there is no inflation. Inflation only occurs when you try to put the people to work when there is not enough plant capacity. The name for this alternative is very well known; it is called "potential budgeting". I hope it is the official policy of the New Democratic Party because when we form the government we can rely upon them as allies if they believe it. It is what we believe.

Everyone knows that if you use the labour force and use the plant capacity, the gross national revenue goes up, tax revenues go up, and the deficit comes down. This was used in the United States in 1964 when their budgeters reduced taxes by about $10 billion or $11 billion. Everyone said, "Disaster is upon us—here we have a big deficit and this crazy government comes along and reduces taxes by another $11 billion." But they put so many people to work and utilized so much plant capacity that when the year was over the government had $18 billion in new taxes and, instead of the familiar deficit, had a large surplus. This has only been used once in the United States to my knowledge, and it has never been used here. It is one alternative.

The second alternative is one I put forward some ten years ago in a series of three or four speeches. I suggested some refinements to the doctrine of Lord Keynes, and to keep it simple I called it "selective budgeting"—selective by region, selective by industry, and selective by social purpose. In those proposals I outlined how in a country as big as the United States or Canada the doctrines of Keynes would not work because they were designed for a small country like the United Kingdom. In Canada there are many regions and a great variety of sophistication in industries and great differences in social need. Any Canadian budget of the future should contain this selective feature.

I know these ideas were heeded because there is occasional evidence in a budget that they are known. In the last budget there was a reasonable concession to the maritimes on unemployment insurance. I would suggest that the principle of selective budgeting should be applied systematically in all phases of economic activity if we are to make this large country, with 16 or 18 different regions, work.

Those are two alternatives, Mr. Speaker. I shall now put forward a third alternative that to my knowledge has not been publicly formulated anywhere in Canada. The person who enunciated this doctrine is a Canadian, for which I give him full credit. His name is Mundell. For years he lectured at Waterloo. His quantitative analysis of those ideas followed over the years by our economic masters proved that those so-called truths are not truths at all; exactly the opposite is the case. Although this evidence has been accumulating for almost 15 years, it has not come to the attention of ministers of the Crown or ministerial advisers. Actually, there is a complete black-out of knowledge. There is no talk of the Mundell hypothesis.

● (2110)

Professor Laffer of the University of Chicago has also done quantitative analysis work confirming the correctness of the Mundell hypothesis. The hypothesis can now be described as the Mundell-Laffer hypothesis. In a nutshell, it says that assumptions which economists of all western nations have held to be truths are not truths at all. For instance, economists have assumed that when a country experiences a negative balance of trade in intangibles and tangibles, you should reduce the value of your currency.

Theoretically that move should automatically eliminate your international trade deficit. Actually it will not eliminate the deficit but increase inflation in direct proportion to the amount of devaluation.

Professor Laffer demonstrated with figures based on quantitative studies that our government advisers and the advisers to governments in most countries of western Europe have been following false doctrine. Conventional economists hold that if you have a deficit balance of trade you should automatically devaluate your currency. Yet West Germany, Taiwan, and Brazil have been doing very well by not following that doctrine.

I will not deal at length with the international ramifications of the Mundell-Laffer hypothesis. The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) will speak in this debate tomorrow. He is much more capable than I am of explaining the mysteries of economic workings. I want to relate that particular hypothesis to the domestic stance our government ought to take at this time, to show that nearly everything we have done in the fiscal field for 30 years has been wrong.

By the way, for those hon. members interested in serious reading I recommend a royal commission report which came out in 1964. It traces the economic history of Department of Finance policies for 30 years. One truth emerges from the report, and it is this. All our advisers to the government have been constant in one thing: they have been constantly wrong, both in advising as to the direction the government should take and in timing. Read chapter 20. Hon. members will see that not only the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain talks this way. The royal commission report has been available for 12 years, but there is no evidence to show that elected representatives of the people have even read it. It would give them ammunition with which to challenge their advisers whose advice has resulted in the type of crap we have had in the last several budgets.

What would Mundell do in present day circumstances? Since our economic charts are slowly levelling off instead of rising, and since there is unused plant capacity and slack in the labour force, Mundell would advise a policy of fiscal ease. Some would call that a policy of budgetary expansion. But the expansion should not be brought about by increasing the deficit, not brought about simply by cutting taxes across the board to encourage people to spend more and spend their way out of recession. That is not what he means. Neither is he thinking of handouts or transfer payments. He suggests that in times like these we should make full use of our labour force and plant capacity. We should achieve our purposes by instituting tax cuts which will affect regions and industries. In that way we could fulfil our social purposes. For example, our steel industry for the next 30 years will have tremendous opportunity. Let us back the industry and encourage it to take advantage of its opportunity.

Our steel production figures should be rising steadily; instead, in 1976 we have witnessed a decline in steel production. Canada among the western nations can boldly compete with anyone in steel. We pay higher wages per hour, produce better steel, and do it more cheaply than our competitors. Why should we not back our steel industry and encourage it to expand in the west and in the maritimes?

I would not oppose something several speakers have mentioned in this debate, imaginative tax incentives to encourage export efforts. You will notice that I did not use the word "goods." In the next 25 or 30 years a great proportion of Canadian exports will not consist of goods.

Mr. Rodriguez: No, they will be raw materials.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Our exports will consist of the know-how of our people, of our engineers, miners, and scientists. Their expertise is needed in the Middle East, Africa, the Far East, and even in countries more sophisticated in certain respects than we are, for we are expert in certain fields. Mr. Speaker, in certain fields of knowledge we have developed expertise which is beyond price. Price is not the criterion. I should like to see tax reductions to encourage such export efforts. That is one alternative under the fiscal ease policy of the Mundell hypothesis.

The second point concerns capital accumulation. Members on both sides of the House have spoken of this many times in the last three or four years. When I talk of capital accumulation I talk of many facets of saving. First, we must consider straight savings. The high interest rates of today are not only killing industry and governments; they are killing people trying to build a home, start a business, or buy a farm. If you take a $50,000 mortgage for 30 years at 12 per cent, you will pay $150,000 in interest charges on top of the principal sum of $50,000. Seventy-five per cent of the cost of buying a home, starting a mine or opening a business, consists of interest charges. High interest rates are the common enemy of the government, the business world, and the consumer. I say that capital accumulation in any form is good.

I notice that there was faint praise for the minister because he increased the exemption under registered retirement savings plans to $5,500. I will not give him faint praise. I say it was a good thing to do. I hope my NDP friends remember that we have a labour force of between eight million and nine million people; half the homes of that labour force are paid for. Their kids are educated. They want to take advantage of a registered retirement savings plan, to add to their pension on top of their company's pension. When you look at the figures it becomes apparent that more than a few people are using these plans. I suggest that around four million Canadians are taking advantage of them. Pretty soon I hope six million or eight million will take advantage of them. I say to the minister, good for him. It is good to invest the money that way. Unfortunately some pension plans put money to nonproductive uses.

Then we must consider the question of equity. Equity is the key whereby Canadians as individuals will own their own country. They will not own their own country if the state takes everything over; they can only own it as individuals. This means that we must put money into equity in such a way that Canadians not only own the majority of our resource and manufacturing industries, but control them. I have spoken on this before, and I must put it very bluntly, Mr. Speaker. Unless Canadians as individuals take over the ownership of these companies,

then what is happening so rapidly today will soon be over. Every time there is a problem, all the provincial government and federal government advisers can say is socialize them. If we continue taking over industry at the rate we are moving today in the so-called enterprise parties, by the year 1990 all the money earned by Canadians will come from government owned institutions.

● (2120)

There are some who would advocate that, but certainly not the NDP because they could not get any members elected if they did. It is coming from our civil servants who believe that the individual businessman, farmer, or labour union is not competent to make his or their own decisions. Therefore this question of accumulating capital through equity is the key.

The second type of savings is the more rapid circulation of money. I congratulate the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan), who was here a moment ago, for accepting the proposal I made to him some time ago, in that in so far as northern oil and gas is concerned we are taking off front end loading charges and not taxing them until they get their debt paid off. Then we will take a much larger percentage than we would have got before. I say congratulations are due to that minister for accepting that principle and listening to ideas from this side.

I ask the government and the people of Canada to realize that if you are going to get these huge interest payments down, you have to speed up the flow of capital. If you can pay off a debt in four years instead of 12 years, that is the same as having three times as much money. If there is three times as much money in Canada, interest rates have to come down. The Keynesians say that if we print more money, interest rates will have to come down. This has been proved wrong for 30 years.

We have to increase the amount of capital, with hopefully more and more going into equity. However, before you can ask someone to go into equity you have to get governments off his back in order to allow him to earn some dividends on his equity. Then he has something at the end of his life instead of it all being taken away by inflation and taxation.

More rapid circulation could be applied, not just to northern gas, but to all capital intensive enterprises. In that I include homes for our people. I gave the example of taking 30 years to pay off a $50,000 mortgage. Cut that time to ten years and you cut the interest rate from $150,000 to $27,000. There is a $123,000 saving by the fast payout. Give the money to somebody else and get the interest rates down.

I sit here and writhe as I see young people taking on horrendous mortages, knowing they will be in debt until they are old men and women, when there is a way to get away from it. The answer, as Mundell points out, is to get back to some old fashioned economics; when interest rates are high pay the debts off quickly. That is simple.

The third point I want to bring up under the Mundell-Laffer hypothesis is labour management. I am glad to see the former Minister of Labour, now Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey), in the House. He knows the truth of what I am going to say. One of the people to get all the blame for high costs is labour. In trying to protect themselves from high interest costs, land costs, and government costs, they grab for more and more in order to stay in the race. This becomes part of the cost-push and they get all the blame for it.

The minister knows there is a better way of doing these things. We have an example, not of the controls the government is using, but of a story that was leaked about a month ago, May 4. A union which had been constantly fighting management, and management constantly fighting the union, came to light in a report in the *Globe and Mail* of May 4. It actually appeared in the Vancouver *Sun* the day before. I quote:

> Canada's West Coast grain handling industry and the grain handlers union have taken a far-reaching and unprecedented step by agreeing to submit their differences over wages in a new agreement to arbitration.

One of the union men said:

> —the move to arbitration was taken because the union in no circumstances could be a party to halting the flow of grain through West Coast ports.
>
> It would have been disastrous for all concerned.

It would have been disastrous for management, union men, the consumer, and the farmer. Editorials came out stating how wonderful it was that some guys had agreed to something. The minister knows what I am getting at. I say that when the full story is told, it will be found that that story started here in the House of Commons and the minister is present who asked me the question. A group of members of parliament went out and took a little part in that. God bless them, they kept quiet this past year and a half and let the deal jell. Now we have the union and management agreeing.

Strikes are not necessary. We all lose with strikes. Mutual advantage says we should get rid of them. Indeed when the full story is told we can take this precedent and move it into many other sections of industry where we can measure quantitatively the amount of production, find out what the men want, and what management wants. We can get them both on the road and stop these absurd strikes without any law at all. All that is necessary is mutual observation and advantage. My time is running out, but I wish to ask this question. What was there in this budget to encourage labour and management to put an end to the obsolete confrontations that have developed over the past 30 years?

I will not say anything more about the cost of government or urban land costs. I have spoken on those subjects before. I want to conclude by simply saying that in this budget—tackling a few things, not causing any waves—there was no attempt whatever to use the time that the price and wage controls give to government to get at the six structural causes of inflation.

The government is betraying the people of Canada by forcing these controls. It is taking away the right of men and management to meet and deal as equals. It is not using the time on things which are well known. This is nothing more than a straight John Turner budget. It is nothing but civil service gobbledygook, trying to prove theories that were proven wrong 30 years ago. This budget cannot be supported by people who believe in growth, and the Conservative party went on record today, in the words of its

leader, as the party of growth in Canada, and there we stand.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, about 12 days ago, on the first day of this debate, the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) made a very accurate observation. He stated that the greatest contradiction of the Conservative position on this budget was the suggestion that the government could at one and the same time cut spending, cut taxes, and cut its deficit, while stimulating faster growth and employment. When asked to explain how to accomplish this feat, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) replied that it was because the private sector was going to be given a chance. Not even the Canadian Chamber of Commerce would subscribe to such nonsense.

In its pre-budget brief to the government the Canadian Chamber of Commerce stated that if it was considered necessary to inject some stimulus into the economy in order to alleviate high unemployment, there should be a tax reduction to provide an investment incentive. However, the chamber clearly recognized that such a cut would reduce government revenues and add to the prospective cash deficit for the current year. The chamber maintained that the proposal should not exceed that which they forecast for last year of $5.5 billion. The actual cash requirement was almost $1 billion below that of last year, and the government expects it will be about the same level this year, which is well below the maximum prescribed by the Chamber of Commerce.

● (2130)

In his speech the hon. member for York-Simcoe alleged that the accumulated deficits of the government would come to about $11.5 billion—presumably, from the context of his remarks, he came to that conclusion on a national accounts basis—by the end of this year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the net deficit from 1968-69 to that projected for the current fiscal year amounts to $7.7 billion, which means a difference, a discrepancy, an error, of nearly $4 billion on the part of the financial critic of the Conservative party.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a leader, and what kind of a position in the country can that party expect to have in the eyes of Canadians when their financial critic makes a mistake of $4 billion in a major speech in this debate? If I can express a hope, Mr. Speaker, give us back any time the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies); we would welcome him back. The greatest sin that he committed was that of contradicting himself once every six months, but he certainly never made mistakes of this magnitude.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe complained that since 1968 direct personal taxes, as a share of total federal revenue, had increased from 34 per cent to around 53 per cent, whereas the share of corporate tax revenue had remained constant at 15 per cent. It should be pointed out here that the hon. member's figures are once again in error. He has compared the revenues from personal tax in 1968 on a budgetary basis with those projected for the current year on a national accounts basis, which of course, Mr. Speaker, is like comparing apples and oranges, something that the hon. member for York-Simcoe frequently does.

[Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain).]

On a national accounts basis, personal direct taxes accounted for about 40 per cent of total federal revenues in 1968, not 34 per cent. They are forecast to represent around 53 per cent of total revenues in the current fiscal year.

While the hon. member for York-Simcoe condemns the increase in federal spending in recent years and the size of federal deficits, he conveniently ignores the fact that rarely a day goes by in this House of Commons when a member of the Conservative party does not press either for increased expenditure for this or that purpose—sometimes expenditures involving tens of millions of dollars—or opposes increased charges for public services or reduced subsidies aimed at reducing the deficit of the treasury.

This great financial critic of the Conservative party ignores an even more fundamental fact, that the admittedly large increase in government spending of the last few years has primarily been due to these two factors: first, the impact of inflation on the government's own cost of providing goods and services; secondly, increases in government expenditures undertaken to ease the adverse impact on the Canadian people of inflation and recession.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe accused the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) of "fiddling" and "diddling" and cooking the books—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: That is the best line you have had all evening.

Mr. Caccia: —misrepresenting charges, and so on. He complained that the main estimates tabled earlier this year projected expenditures by the Post Office of $981 million in 1975-76, whereas the budget papers tabled by the finance minister showed expenditures for last year of only $901 million. Since the increase in Post Office expenditures projected in the estimates for the current year would be significantly more when compared to actual expenditures last year, as opposed to the projection contained in the main estimates, the member proposed to lop $95 million off the total for the current year. However, the member failed to take account of a very simple fact, namely, the prolonged strike of postal workers last year which resulted in expenditures being significantly less than provided for in the estimates. Surely not even the hon. member for York-Simcoe would advocate a repeat of this kind of enforced cost control.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe contends that because of other similar differences between spending projections in the main estimates prepared last December and preliminary actual spending projections contained in the budget papers, there was room for a saving totalling $225 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, the most specious kind of argument.

The hon. member maintains that some $410 million can be saved from the non-budgetary side of the accounts, but does not tell us where he proposes to make cutbacks. He proposes to slash spending under the heading of "professional and special services" by $250 million. Coming from a Conservative, this is the greatest proposal for spending reductions! He apparently chooses to remain oblivious to the fact that expenditures under this category are for

services and facilities which are acquired from outside the federal government, because they can be obtained at considerably less cost than if we tried to provide them through government agencies.

Nearly 40 per cent of the total, for example, goes to purchase educational and manpower training services from the provinces. Large outlays are also incurred to purchase outside computer services, private security services, medical services, and to obtain legal and architectural services which in many instances can be provided far more efficiently by the private sector than by the government itself. Yet we have the hon. member for York-Simcoe, that great financial critic, expounding a theory which is diametrically opposed to that of his party.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the member proposes to save $140 million through administrative savings and amalgamating existing departments, or phasing out federal operations which overlap provincial operations. The hon. member proposed to make about $140 million disappear, but he was reluctant to tell us how he would do it. There is, however, a particular obligation upon this great financial critic—and as I say, give us back the hon. member for Don Valley any time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: There is an obligation on him in view of the fact that at their last policy convention the Tories approved several measures which would have the effect of significantly increasing the number of federal departments and agencies. When examined in detail in quickly becomes apparent that the "savings" of more than $1 billion conjured up by the hon. member for York-Simcoe are nothing more than the stuff that dreams are made of.

The amendment before us speaks of the failure on the part of the government to realize job creation. I should like to put on the record for the benefit of hon. members, in case their memories are short, the record of job creation on the part of the Liberal government. If we look at the job creation statistics that have been provided by OECD—and no one can claim that OECD statistics are partisan so far as Canadian politics are concerned—we find 472,000 jobs approximately were created between 1970 and 1972, 394,000 in 1972-73, 393,000 in 1973-74, and between 1974 and the last quarter of 1975, 552,000 new jobs, for a total of 1,811,000 new jobs created, and this is in a country with a population of only 22 million people. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, is that not a fantastic performance in job creation in this country?

● (2140)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Caccia: Let us consider for a moment this lack of confidence on the part of the Tories in this great nation of ours. Does this mean there is a lack of confidence in Canada when we have foreign investment pouring in every year?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: Surely the rest of the world is looking at Canada as the safest place to invest its money.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: How about the lack of confidence on the part of Canadians when they purchase Canada Savings Bonds in record time when they are put on sale in the market? How about that?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: How about the hundreds of thousands of people each year who apply for immigrant status to come to Canada because they think Canada is the place they would like to settle? How about that for lack of confidence?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: If anyone has a lack of confidence in Canada it is the Conservative party. That is what their amendment is all about. The amendment speaks about the lack of long-term growth and job potential and economic growth. It speaks of the lack of ability to create jobs.

This afternoon we heard from the new leader of the Conservative party. I could not help but think of the good old times when the leader of the Conservative party was the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), and I think of that party's lack of confidence in that leader. That was really shocking to the whole country when they dumped their leader.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Caccia: It was your decision, and it is up to you to draw your own conclusions. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the government for its ability in steering a fine course at a very difficult financial moment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. It being 9.45 o'clock p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to Section 7 of Standing Order 60, to interrupt these proceedings and put forthwith the question to dispose of the amendment now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens).

All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

● (2150)

[*English*]

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Stevens) which was negatived on the following division:

The Budget—Mr. Caccia

(Division No. 138)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Brisco
Cadieu
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Coates
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Fortin
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hargrave
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacKay
MacLean
Macquarrie
Marshall
Masniuk
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Ritchie
Rodriguez
Rynard
Saltsman
Schellenberger
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Symes
Wagner
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Woolliams
Yewchuk—90

NAYS

Messrs

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Fox
Francis
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert

Messrs.

Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Maine
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ouellet
Pearsall
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—121

● (2210)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the amendment lost.

It being after ten o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At 10.13 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 9, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE QUEEN

ALLEGED UNDERMINING BY GOVERNMENT OF POSITION AS QUEEN OF CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, which has to do with the latest issue by Canada Post of a philatelic description of postage stamps commemorating the 1976 Olympic games. In this one, as in other similar pamphlets issued earlier, Queen Elizabeth The Second of Canada is not mentioned. The reference to the opening of the Olympic games is, and I quote, "The Head of State normally declares the games open". This is another example of the way in which the Queen is being by-passed, and corresponds with some recent speeches made by the Prime Minister in which he refers to her as Queen of England, a gratuitous injustice to her, and contempt of the provisions of the Constitution and of Parliament, of which she is an integral part. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

That this House views with deep concern the manner in which the Trudeau government is endeavouring to undermine the position the Queen occupies as Queen of Canada by avoiding any mention of her.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FINANCE

PROPOSAL TO CALL JOHN TURNER BEFORE COMMITTEE TO EXPLAIN MISMANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC FUNDS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that projected government spending is $700 million more than last year with an estimated deficit of $5 billion at a time when the government is calling for restraint and in light of the fact that the former Minister of Finance, John Turner, was instrumental in developing during his term this fiscal mismanagement which has no precedent in the annals of handling public finance, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies):

● (1410)

That this House instruct Mr. John Turner to appear before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs to account for and explain his mismanagement of public funds.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can only be presented with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSAL TO BUILD TANK IN CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In light of the fact that we are negotiating a deal with West Germany for the Leopard tank which involves an expenditure of some $150 million, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan):

That the minister investigate the feasibility of building our own tank in Canada, which could reduce unemployment as well as instill a little self-confidence and pride in Canadians, and that we name this new Canadian built tank "The Beaver".

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ENERGY

SUGGESTED MASTER PLAN FOR PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY TO EASTERN CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Robert J. Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I rise on an urgent and pressing matter pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. Whereas the sharing of the electric power product of generating facilities using renewable resources and lowest cost fuels is an urgent need for all Canadian consumers, and whereas the Atlantic provinces and Quebec have tremendous unused potential

development sites for power and industry, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion be directed to contact representatives of each of the government of Quebec and the Atlantic provinces and work with them in a spirit of co-operation to produce a master plan for the production, transmission and distribution of electric power and energy at the lowest possible cost in an eastern Canadian power pool.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM ICELAND

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before proceeding to the oral question period I wonder if I might ask hon. members to permit me to call attention to the presence in our gallery of a distinguished delegation from Iceland led by their most distinguished Speaker of the Upper House, Mr. Speaker Kristjansson.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF POLICY ON OWNERSHIPS OF OFFSHORE RESOURCES

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The minister has announced that a 200 mile limit would come into effect by January 1, 1977. In light of this statement of intent, why has not more been done to reach agreement with the provinces over the ownership of the resources on the seabed and in the subsoil, so that oil and gas companies might be encouraged to increase their exploration activity in these areas? Will the minister make a statement of government policy concerning this matter in the House in the near future?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the question of negotiations between the federal government and the provinces with respect to the off-shore resources is not directly under my department, but I will draw the attention of the Prime Minister to it.

[Mr. Howie.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED INABILITY TO PATROL FISHERIES ZONE IF EXTENDED 200 MILES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): According to Ambassador Beesley who is Canada's major negotiator at the perennial Law of the Sea Conference, we do not have the ships, the planes or the manpower to do the necessary patrol work in a 200 mile area. In light of this criticism I should like to ask the minister what steps the government is planning to take to remedy this inexcusable shortfall in equipment?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I think I will have to speak to Ambassador Beesley.

POSSIBILITY OF INCREASED RESEARCH IF FISHERIES ZONE EXTENDED 200 MILES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the same minister. The Minister of Fisheries in his address to ICNAF yesterday recognized that a massive surveillance effort is required and also that our budget for research should be doubled or trebled. This is something which has been pointed out to both ministers in the past. I wonder if the minister would indicate what the position of the government is with regard to a co-ordination of effort on the massive area Canada will have to protect, provide surveillance for and patrol. In addition, what are the intentions of the government coincidentally with the establishment of the 200 mile fishing limit with regard to doubling and trebling our research effort?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when I made my statement giving the government's decision to extend our jurisdiction, the main element in the protection of our fisheries zone would be the consent and the acquiescence of other states which normally fish in what will be Canadian waters. In the absence of that consent, acceptance or acquiescence there would be very little effect derived from surveillance activities, as has been demonstrated in other cases. Because we have worked out, through bilateral negotiations with other countries, arrangements which will respect our jurisdiction, we believe that the surveillance role, while important, does not assume the same importance as the acquiescence of the other countries.

As I understand the arrangements under the system of extended jurisdiction, foreign vessels fishing in the Canadian economic zone would be there under licence from the government of Canada. It seems to me that the possibility of losing that licence should act as a very strong deterrent from infringing any of the Canadian regulations, and I believe it will be possible under that kind of regime to enforce Canadian jurisdiction. I should repeat what I have already said, that there has been at work within the government a task force preparing for the time when Canada will exercise its jurisdiction, and plans are being made to ensure that surveillance and enforcement can be carried out.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PLANS TO PATROL EXTENDED FISHERIES ZONE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): I agree with the minister that acquiescence would be the solution to the problem. However, in view of the fact that in the past, even with the ICNAF quotas agreed to by foreign nations—and I hesitate to mention particularly Russia, which ignored all the quotas it agreed to—I wonder if the minister would now be prepared, as I asked in my motion yesterday, to make a statement on motions with regard to this interdepartmental committee and with regard to what the actions of the committee are, and would he have referred to a combined committee of those departments responsibility to discuss the matter in order to get an agreement on Canada's position for the future?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I think it would be a good idea, at the appropriate time, to make a statement giving the House all the relevant information on the plans which have been put in place to enforce and patrol waters under Canadian jurisdiction, and I would consider doing that, probably not this session, but I or my colleague the Minister of State (Fisheries) may do it early in the new session.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

DUMPING OF WASTE MATERIAL INTO ATHABASCA RIVER BY GREAT CANADIAN OIL SANDS—REASON FOR DELAY IN GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment regarding reports that Great Canadian Oil Sands of Fort McMurray, Alberta is pumping 400,000 gallons per day of waste from its tailings into the Athabasca River despite the fact that its permit to operate requires it to keep its tailings in self-contained pits. I want to ask the minister how long his department has been aware of this situation, what steps have been taken to stop this deplorable state of affairs, and if he can tell us, following his visit to that area, what action he proposes to take now to stop this inexcusable and illegal dumping of toxic materials into the Athabasca River.

● (1420)

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think it is true that some polluted water is discharged into the Athabasca River. As the hon. member mentioned, I was there last week—no, this week—or last week—anyhow I visited—

Mr. Epp: Where are you now?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): When I listen to you I do not know; it may be heaven or hell. As you know, we had a report on this particular problem last year and the province contacted the company and they are now in the process of correcting this situation. There is about 400,000 gallons of water which is discharged into the river which is a large amount. Relatively, of course, we cannot say it is a disaster but it has to be corrected. The company is committed to correcting it and they are taking steps to do so before 1977.

An hon. Member: The minister is a disaster.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this situation has existed for some two years, and in view of the fact under the Canada Waters Act passed by parliament in 1970 the minister has the authority under section 9 by agreement to set up water quality management areas and under section 16 to do so unilaterally if the province does not agree, may I ask why this situation has been allowed to go on so long? Why could not water quality management areas have been set up. Is it the minister's intention now to establish one in the Fort McMurray area?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is under the Canada Waters Act we can act but under the Fisheries Act where we have the real power. We could do it, but we have chosen to try to collaborate with the province of Alberta in order to have the standards respected and that is in the process of being done. Why it has not been done for two or three years—it is anybody's answer.

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT ON TOXICITY TEST OF WASTE WATER DISCHARGED INTO ATHABASCA RIVER BY GREAT CANADIAN OIL SANDS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister still has not told the House what steps he intends to take. In view of the fact that the report prepared by his department in conjunction with the provincial authorities in 1975, based on tests taken in August, 1974 showed that the waste water had excessive toxic content and also the fact that the public interest groups have not been able to get copies of the results of those tests, may I ask the minister if he is prepared to table in the House the toxicity test of the waste being discharged into the Athabasca River by Great Canadian Oil Sands?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, as far as the last part of the question is concerned, I have the report here and am ready to table it at any time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

INQUIRY IF GOVERNMENT REJECTED REQUEST FOR $40 MILLION IN AID FOR MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

As a result of the meeting held yesterday between some ministers and the APU representative, *La Presse* reported this morning that there is every reason to believe that the Canadian government will not change its present policy with regard to the $40 million requested by milk producers to face present problems. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us today whether it is true that the difference will not be made up in any way by the federal government? I

should like the minister to indicate clearly whether or not the request for special assistance in the form of $40 million has definitely been rejected by the government?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we never intimated to them that we were going to give them the $40 million. We told them of the processes that were taking place with the subcommittee that is presently meeting and had been meeting for three or four weeks to review the situation. I repeated what I had said in the Agriculture Committee about farm credit when it was discussed there, and said that we would be very lenient with those people who possibly got into trouble with repayment through no fault of their own. We compounded that action yesterday. We have already said the same thing to other dairy producing provinces that are making the same kind of representation. Yesterday I told the people who were here from Quebec the same thing that I told their executive members last Thursday—that I have to act as Minister of Agriculture for all industrial dairy producers in Canada, not just one province.

[*Translation*]

POSSIBILITY OF OTHER MEASURES TO AID MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

In view of the minister's reply, can he tell us whether, to make up their losses, the producers can recuperate those $40 million, and whether the government might not be willing to pay, in part or in whole, those $40 million; and also whether he will take more efficient means than merely making farm credit conditions more flexible to solve the problem?

[*English*]

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, what we are mainly concerned about and what the committee is presently reviewing is the present supply position, how much quotas can be cut back and whether the penalty of $8.60 per hundredweight is too severe. If that can be relaxed in any way it would mean tremendous savings to dairy farmers.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED USE OF SMALLER CRAFT RATHER THAN DESTROYERS FOR FISHERIES PATROL WORK

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my first question is directed to the Prime Minister. Since he has stated that one of the roles of the Canadian navy is to patrol the extra 200-mile fisheries zone and since, according to reports, he learned from seamen during a recent trip to the west coast that they do not relish this role, can he say why the government has never considered building smaller craft especially designed for this purpose, since it costs $4,000 a day to operate a destroyer on patrol?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, I cannot see the positive side of that suggestion. If the hon. member is suggesting that smaller ships can do the job more cheaply, perhaps he is right. I take it he is not also suggesting that we should have no destroyers in the Canadian navy. The point is, we have destroyers in the Canadian navy. They are good ships and well manned. There is no war on at present and we are having them do some of this work which is helpful for the preservation of Canadian sovereignty.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EXTENSION OF FISHERIES ZONE 200 MILES—POSSIBLE DISCUSSION WITH UNITED STATES ON BOUNDARIES

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my first supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Since he announced the other day that Canada would extend its fisheries zone on January 1, whereas I understand that the United States will not extend its zone until March, I wonder if the Canadian action has been taken in order to extend the boundaries between the two zones in a manner most favourable to Canada or whether there have been conversations as to where the zones will come together.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, unquestionably, the action taken by the Congress, Senate and President of the United States in passing the law to bring into effect the jurisdiction of that country on March 1 had a bearing on the over-all action taken by Canada, but not necessarily on the timing. As my statement indicated, we will ensure that the 200-mile fishing zone is in place by January 1, 1977. It could happen earlier; probably it will not.

With respect to the boundary question, there have already been discussions with the United States on this subject. Recently, when I advised Secretary Kissinger of proposed Canadian action, I suggested that early attention ought to be paid by both governments to the question of boundary disputes, or boundary arrangements between the two countries. I hope these discussions will begin at an early date. We have not set a date at the moment but I hope the discussions will begin soon so that this aspect of our bilateral relations will not flare up into a matter of difficulty.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

CANADIAN MONETARY COMMITMENT TO ENSURE SUPPLY OF POTABLE WATER THROUGHOUT WORLD

Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, may I address my question to the Prime Minister? In view of the objectives set by the Minister of Justice and other officials at Habitat, namely, that the world should establish 1990 as the target date for ensuring the supply of fresh, clean water throughout the world, is the government of Canada prepared, before the end of Habitat, to make a definite commitment, a dollar commitment, that it will help to clean up the world's water supplies?

● (1430)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member that Canada's commitment in this area is already very high. I believe a statement will be made there. I do not have all the figures, but I believe something like $200 million has been spent through our external aid program to help supply clean water to those countries which want that to be done. However, it is important for the hon. member to realize that our external aid programs are carried out under the aegis of co-operation. In other words, we do not go to a country and impose our particular priorities on it. We discuss the expenditure of Canadian funds in co-operation with the national governments. Many of them have not yet come to the conclusion that clean water is their first priority and they are asking us to spend money on other things. In that sense, I would not feel it proper for Canada to set an absolute figure now and say that we are going to spend it whether the recipient country likes it or not. We are acting in a way whereby we hope they will realize that Canada is prepared to give this priority, but they have to come to that conclusion themselves.

Mr. Wenman: I expect that both the demand and the priority will be made well known and, in fact, has been made well known at Habitat. Is the government prepared to supplement the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of the Environment to ensure that all Canadians can be certain of a supply of safe, clean, fresh water by 1980?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, that is indeed a strange question. If any Canadians are deprived of a supply of clean water, I do not believe it is because of a lack of action on the part of the federal government. There is a lot of clean water in Canada. There is more that we are cleaning up. Of course, the provinces, municipalities and the federal government have to decide that is where the money should be spent. If the hon. member is just suggesting that we increase our expenditures for that particular purpose, I say to him that we are in a period of restraint. It would be more important to identify areas where we could cut back in order to supply clean water to those communities which presumably do not yet have it.

ALLEGED STATEMENT BY MINISTER CONCERNING AMOUNT OF AID FROM CANADA TO ENSURE POTABLE WATER SUPPLY FOR THE WORLD

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of the Environment. It deals with Habitat and the clean water project. The minister is quoted in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, dealing with Canada's foreign aid and particularly the clean water project, as saying and I quote:

> How much can we deprive Canadians of their so-called standard of living without being defeated in the next election.

As a matter of fact, many Canadians do not regard that as a crisis or a fate beyond living with.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jarvis: I find this rather strange. If the minister has been misquoted, I would like to give him the opportunity of correcting it. Did the minister mean by that statement Canada should reduce its foreign aid commitment in order to increase its commitments domestically, particularly in terms of clean water? Is it the intention of the minister to increase expenditures with respect to the Great Lakes cleanup which has been the subject matter of very exhaustive and disturbing reports lately? What did the minister mean by that statement in this morning's *Globe and Mail*?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member would be better advised to ask the *Globe and Mail* reporter what he meant before excerpting a sentence from an interview of half an hour expressing an idea which was not said in that sense. What I said is very simple. I said: I was asked whether we should increase Canada's foreign aid commitment because other countries have problems. As far as I am concerned, I think we should. We have to decide to what extent we can do so before the Canadian population reacts. This is the meaning of my intervention, and there is no other. Almost all the *Globe and Mail* can do is to report completely mistaken views of what one says.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Now that the Prime Minister has expressed his views on pure water, conspiracy, of love and problems of poverty, is he going to invite some poor kids to swim in his pool this summer?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: No, answer, Mr. Speaker? That was a serious question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ATTITUDE OF CONSERVATIVE PARTY TOWARDS BILL C-242

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Toronto-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the government House leader. Will he undertake to consult with his counterpart in the Progressive Conservative party to try to ascertain whether that party is going to continue to block passage of Bill C-242—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Oral Questions

COMMUNICATIONS

PROPOSED USE OF BALANCED ARMATURE RECEIVER BY BELL TELEPHONE—REQUEST FOR DELAY

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Communications, I will direct this question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Bell Telephone Company will begin this July to place a device called a "balanced armature receiver" in their telephones, and in view of the fact that this device is not compatible with the use of hearing aids or with the use of Teletype machines in the homes of the completely deaf because of the low magnetic field it produces, can the Prime Minister assure the House that he will intervene with Bell Telephone with regard to withholding implementation of the new receiver until the company finds a solution to the problem in the same manner as it has done in the United States?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the organization involved has had extensive talks with Bell Telephone Company. There have been some difficulties, but I believe the CRTC is trying to play a role as an intervener in order to bring them to some point of co-operation.

Mr. Rodriguez: In view of the fact that the CRTC has not been able to resolve the problem between the company and the organization of Canadians with disabled hearing, will the minister now intervene and ask the Bell Telephone Company to install the same kind of coil they install in their telephones in the United States in order that those with hearing disabilities will have the right to communicate?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly bring that to the attention of the CRTC so that as the discussions continue, they will be aware of the hon. member's views.

* * *

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF CANADIAN NATIONAL AND AIR CANADA TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Jack Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Due to the great concern across this country with regard to rail and air passenger traffic and the fact that both CN and Air Canada have tabled their annual reports, is the minister prepared to refer those reports to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to look at that and discuss the matter with the committee.

[Mr. Speaker.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DATE OF DECISION ON REORGANIZATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Defence, I will direct my question to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister tell us what progress has been made by cabinet which has the question under discussion as to the restructuring or reorganization of the armed forces infrastructure in Canada? I ask this because there is great concern in many areas as to possible changes and the continued procrastination that is taking place is only causing further unrest.

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): They are better at asking questions than they are at hearing the truth.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): My minister and his department have indeed prepared a forces structure review to present to cabinet. I understand it is before a cabinet committee but has not as yet been brought before the whole cabinet. As a consequence, nothing can be said about it until cabinet makes a decision.

● (1440)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Since the Prime Minister presides over cabinet would he assure the House that the question will be brought before cabinet at the earliest date in order to relieve the uncertainty and unrest felt not only amongst service personnel but among the civilian population in the areas concerned?

Mr. Trudeau: As the hon. member knows, the Minister of National Defence is in Europe attending the NATO meetings at the present time. It would be possible to bring this matter before cabinet now because we have such an excellent parliamentary secretary—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: In spite of that, I think it would be better to await the return of the minister because he will have further information from his NATO colleagues and perhaps he will have further information for the hon. member who would then learn that the morale of our armed forces is very high.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN—NUMBER OF CANDIDATES INTERVIEWED

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. It relates to the recent appointment of the Vice-Chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation. In view of the fact that considerable dissatisfaction has been expressed about this appointment by those in the agriculture sector as well as by those in the Corporation itself, may I ask whether it is now government policy to ignore qualified personnel within the Corporation in favour of defeated Liberal candidates?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): I do not think any man should be condemned because he takes part in the democratic process by offering himself to be elected.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: Yes, but he should know something about agriculture.

Mr. Whelan: He was elected and he served in a distinguished fashion in this House as far as I am concerned. He has a farm background; he graduated from the Ontario College of Agriculture; he has a knowledge of agriculture which I believe is basic. We needed someone from Eastern Canada to serve as vice-Chairman. I interviewed many people though I do not believe I received any recommendations from the hon. member. If I did, they were not quite as good.

Mr. Wise: I was in no way condemning the appointment of the new vice-Chairman.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Horner: I will condemn it!

Mr. Wise: Can the minister give us some indication of the number of candidates who were accorded interviews for the position?

An hon. Member: And whether their memberships were paid up.

Mr. Whelan: It is hard to say. I can tell the House that members on all sides did make recommendations to me about certain people who had served with distinction in elected positions and who could possibly fill the vacancy. It was public knowledge for many weeks that this position was open; I held it open purposely, hoping that distinguished Canadians would come forward and offer their services, but not many did.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MINISTER'S POSITION ON RIGHT OF QUEBEC TO DECIDE ON USE OF FRENCH

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

During a very special caucus last weekend, the Minister of National Health and Welfare reportedly stated that the federal government did not need the "crutch" of the Bourassa government to defend the rights of Francophones in Quebec. Did the minister mean that the government of the province of Quebec does not have at any time the responsibility to see that French is being used on its territory?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, we have repeated that, as a government, the defence and promotion of the French language in Canada are important priorities for the federal government and on that matter, we count on the full cooperation of all provincial governments including the government of the province of Quebec. But we also pointed out quite clearly that it is important for each government to promote and defend the French language within its own jurisdiction. If such were the case, I think the promotion of the French language and greater cooperation between both linguistic groups of Canada would be achieved much more rapidly and efficiently.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary.

Considering that Mr. Payeur from Quebec did not take kindly to the minister's statement last Sunday and that yesterday he reportedly sent the minister a telegram indicating the centralizing trends of the government, does the minister intend to reply to the telegram and to disclose its content for the benefits of all of us?

Mr. Lalonde: I have not yet gone through the whole text of the telegram. I will surely reply. As to disclosing the reply, I will see about it in due course. But once again my statement at the convention and the federal government's position on the matter of linguistic rights has nothing to do with the centralization or decentralization of powers at these various government levels. On the contrary, hopefully this matter should be a major priority for all levels of administration, whether provincial or federal.

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING NATIONAL FOREST POLICY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment—I have given him notice. It has to do with the lack of a national forest policy. Is it now the government's intention to accede to the many requests and recommendations from senior officials to announce a national forest policy? Can the hon. gentleman tell the House whether his officials are presently discussing with the provinces the implementation and structuring of such a policy?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): The hon. member will understand that I cannot elaborate a national forest policy without the co-operation of all the provinces; the federal government controls not more than 10 per cent of all the territory within which such a policy might apply. However, we are to have a meeting soon with

the provincial ministers—some time next week, I believe—after which I may have some information for the hon. member.

Mr. Oberle: Could the minister elaborate on the areas in which the federal government is prepared to share a degree of responsibility with the provinces? Will the arrangements be similar to those agreed upon with the provinces in the past? Is the government prepared to assist in measures of fire control, pest control and measures to deal with the serious problems which are facing the provinces right now?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): These are some of the matters which are on the agenda so I cannot give the hon. member an answer today. Maybe later I shall be in a position to do so.

* * *

HEALTH

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE CANADA ACQUIRING PROPER TYPE OF SWINE FLU VACCINE

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare? In view of the false starts made by one firm or perhaps more than one, in manufacturing vaccine of the old swine flu type instead of modernizing and incorporating the transmutations which have occurred in the interval may I ask the minister this: since Canada is buying vaccine in Australia, Europe and the U.S.A., can he assure the House he is getting the right type of vaccine, the modernized swine flu vaccine which affords much higher protection?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I am advised by my officials that all the commitments we have obtained concerning the supply of vaccine completely meet Canadian standards in that respect.

Mr. Rynard: Has the minister been in touch with the manufacturing firms for reassurance on this point?

Mr. Lalonde: My officials are in continuing contact on this and other matters.

● (1450)

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY IF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC REQUESTED ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO PROVIDE SERVICES

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

In view of the difficulties experienced by some governments, among which are Quebec and Ontario, to allocate funds to hospitals, so much so that some hospitals in various counties or rural areas will have to close their doors, could the minister tell us whether he had consultations with his provincial counterparts and if requests for additional subsidies have been made by those provinces to help them provide better medical care in Quebec and Ontario?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there was a federal-provincial conference of health ministers a few months ago. I must advise the hon. member that no province asked for additional federal funds under the hospitalization insurance scheme. As the hon. member knows, under that program the federal government provides 50 per cent of all operating costs of hospitals and this still remains entirely available to the provinces.

Any decision about the restriction in the provision of hospital services at this time would be exclusively made by the provincial authorities concerned.

* * *

[*English*]

ENERGY

SITE OF DUMP FOR RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL REMOVED FROM PORT HOPE—APPOINTMENT OF PROJECT MANAGER

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and relates to cleanup at Port Hope which was to have started on June 1. In view of the fact the minister has had recommendations from several of his advisers regarding alternative dumping sites, other than the Port Granby site, since at least April 7, is he in a position today to tell us where the material in respect of the Port Hope cleanup is to be dumped permanently?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, work is still going on in respect of this very important and difficult question. Several permanent dump sites were examined within the boundaries of Port Hope, but were found to be unacceptable on the part of the citizens and the council of Port Hope. We have been looking at surrounding municipalities and they have rather the same attitude as does Port Hope. I must say that the various agencies involved, the task force in particular, are seeking an acceptable site some distance from Port Hope. This is going to require additional studies and, indeed, probably some tests in respect of the ground. I can assure the hon. member that we are going forward with this as quickly as we can. We have made arrangements for a temporary transitional site so that work can start and, indeed, I am told it did start on June 1. The program will be able to move forward with that transitional or temporary site, and the material stored there will eventually be moved to a permanent site.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the minister just once more to refer to the letter dated April 7 from the chairman of the federal-provincial task force on this matter which contained recommendations far removed from the Port Hope dump site. My supplementary question is, has a project manager for the cleanup operation been appointed by the government even yet?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, there has been a project team in operation in Port Hope for some months. I believe if a

formal appointment has not been made it will be made within a matter of days. In any event, I can assure the hon. member that is not a reason for any holdup.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

SUGGESTION MINISTER CONSIDER RETRACTING STATEMENTS ABOUT MR. STOPFORTH

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the Minister of Supply and Services in this House denounced a senior public servant, Mr. Stopforth, accusing him of misleading the minister or of gross negligence. I read with great care what the minister said in the House and it seems to amount to the fact that the minister at one time was informed there was no information of Lockheed undertaking to put interim financing, and later he apparently discovered that Mr. Stopforth had heard of a telephone conversation between representatives of the Department of National Defence and Lockheed. I should like to ask the minister whether, in view of the great possibility of a misunderstanding in this matter which is both complex and vague at the same time, the minister will review the whole matter and reconsider whether he should make a retraction in respect of the attack he made upon Mr. Stopforth?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should read my whole statement instead of quoting part of it. In addition, this matter will be dealt with in a proper manner at a proper time.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

POSSIBILITY MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE REMOVED FOR ALLEGEDLY WITHHOLDING INFORMATION ABOUT LOCKHEED CONTRACT

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Supply and Services has removed a senior civil servant from his position because he withheld information from the minister concerning a verbal agreement between the Department of National Defence and Lockheed. The Minister of National Defence apparently withheld the same information from the Treasury Board and the Cabinet in much the same fashion, on the same subject. I should like to ask whether the Prime Minister is going to take similar action to that taken by the Minister of Supply and Services, and relieve the Minister of National Defence of his position, or is there to be a different rule for Cabinet ministers than for senior civil servants?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the facts are not at all like the hon. member seems to have understood them. First of all, it was not the minister who removed the civil servant. He has asked his deputy minister to proceed in the usual way to discipline this particular civil servant. The reason for that has been stated in the House by the hon. minister who had been giving the House wrong information on the basis of wrong

information he had received. I expect the House finds it proper for the minister to correct the wrong information that he conveyed, and that is what the minister did.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

ALLEGED TEN PER CENT PREFERENCE TO NORTHERN CONTRACTORS FOR WORK IN THE NORTH—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. In a recent statement the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is reported to have said that contractors situated in northern Canada will be given a 10 per cent preference on all federal contracts tendered for the north. Is the minister satisfied that this additional leeway is necessary in order for northern contractors to compete effectively, because this could constitute a considerable increase in funds for northern projects?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with this particular statement, but I will be glad to look into it.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

DATE OF TABLING ORDER FROM REPRESENTATION COMMISSIONER

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, under Section 22(1) of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act the Secretary of State apparently has received a representation order from the representation commissioner. If that is so, when will he be tabling it in the House? If he has not received it, has he been informed when he can expect to receive it?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will have to check into that and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Dick: That's what you said the last time I asked.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

REQUEST MINISTER MAKE ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING MR. STOPFORTH OUTSIDE HOUSE

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary arises from the question asked by the hon. member for Greenwood. In light of the fact that statements made by parliamentarians in the House are privileged, would the Minister of Supply and Services be prepared, if he has not done so already, to make the same remarks with regard to Mr. Stopforth being guilty of misinformation or gross negligence, outside the House as he did in the Commons and, if not, why not?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered this question. This matter is going to be dealt with in a proper manner at an appropriate time.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, the question has not been answered. Will the minister say the same thing out of the House as he said in the Commons and, if not, why not?

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR FAILURE TO SECURE INFORMATION ON FINANCING FROM REPRESENTATIVE ON MANAGEMENT BOARD

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, since Mr. Stopforth was deputy project manager only, reporting through General Allan to the management board, and the assistant deputy minister of supply and services was on the management board, at a higher level than Mr. Stopforth, will the Minister of Supply and Services indicate whether the management board was informed of the Lockheed finance discussions including the verbal agreement and, if so, will he say why that Lockheed information was not communicated to him through his senior representative on that management board?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I encourage the hon. member to read the minutes of proceedings of the parliamentary committee.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST MR. STOPFORTH BE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE COMMITTEE TO CLEAR HIS NAME

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Prime Minister. On April 30, in answer to a request by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar to have a written explanation regarding the actions of a senior public servant, the Prime Minister responded by saying that "by innuendo, he cast aspersions" on a civil servant who was by this simple request being "tarred" and smeared. In view of the expressed concern of the Prime Minister for civil servants and for justice, will he take the initiative to see that Mr. L. H. Stopforth is brought before a parliamentary committee so that this House and the Canadian people will know all the facts and, perhaps equally important, a man who has been a loyal public servant for many years will at least be given a chance to clear his name?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, assuming the hon. member is sincere in his desire to have Mr. Stopforth clear his name, I suggest that the best way of doing it is not by bringing him before a parliamentary committee where the Proceedings might be tainted with political input from both sides, but to follow the normal grievance procedure, of which he has several.

● (1500)

Mr. Bawden: What are they in detail?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I just want to re-emphasize what I answered a moment ago. The minister, properly in my view, felt embarrassed at having misinformed the House on several occasions by giving it wrong information. He felt, I believe again properly, that he should explain to the House that he had been given wrong information which he did. I expect the House would have then said: Why have you given wrong information? The answer is that he had received wrong information. This is the essence of the matter before us. If the conveyor of the wrong information is not guilty he will follow the procedures and be completely rehabilitated. If he is guilty, Mr. Speaker, I think that the discipline imposed on him will follow its course.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary by the hon. member for Calgary South.

AVENUES OPEN TO MR. STOPFORTH TO CLEAR HIS NAME

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the public servant in question has neither been fired nor demoted. Therefore he has no rights under the options explained by the minister, the House Leader and the Prime Minister, so perhaps the Prime Minister would explain just how this man's rights are to be upheld and how he will be given a chance to clear himself.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is some paradox in the hon. member showing concern for a civil servant and indicating that perhaps in order to get justice he should either be fired or have a loss in salary.

Mr. Paproski: He did not say that.

An hon. Member: We want to get at the truth.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I think the facts as alleged by the hon. member opposite indicate that the deputy minister, on behalf of the minister, showed a certain amount of moderation in the discipline. There was no demotion, no firing and no loss of salary. I do not know the details of what discipline was imposed. I understand he has moved sideways to another post at the same salary. If the man feels he has been unjustly treated there are recourses under the law. I understand he has either an appeal to the Federal Court or else he has a grievance procedure within the rules.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member says "no". If that is the case presumably the man has suffered no grievance.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Why don't you go home and take a swim?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that full questioning and answering has taken place on this question. We are now beyond the limit of the question period. The right hon. member for Prince Albert on a question of privilege.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DIEFENBAKER—ANSWER GIVEN BY PRIME MINISTER

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege arising from a statement made yesterday afternoon by the Prime Minister that was totally untrue. I did not hear what he said at the time. I was not aware of it until this morning when I read the summary in the *Globe and Mail.*

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, these noisy interruptions indicate there are several varieties of animals over there. It is now confirmed by *Hansard.* He used these words concerning me:

> Well, Mr. Speaker, the question, as I answered in the first place, is hypothetical in its form. I have no cause to know what the answer to that hypothetical question would be. I do not have the advantage perhaps the hon. gentleman has of having phoned a judge.

The allegation is very clear. I know the sensibilities of the hon. gentleman when since the Sky Shops revelations it became unpopular to dial judges.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to have such contributions from people who have no common sense whatsoever. The Prime Minister made it very clear that I had phoned a judge. I throw that back at him. It is false. It is not unusual for him to make false statements. That statement is completely false. It is a product of the Prime Minister's imagination in order to smear by innuendo. I have not spoken to, nor have I phoned any member of the Supreme Court of Canada regarding this matter, and that is final and complete.

Such allegations that are made by the Prime Minister, too often with that Machiavellian turn of mind, constitute a breach of the privileges of members of this House. If any one member said that, he would be subject to discipline. When the Prime Minister makes a false statement like that, with the vast prestige of his office, I would expect him to withdraw it unreservedly.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed at the reserves of synthetic indignation the right hon. gentleman has.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I cannot believe he is serious about this point of order, Mr. Speaker. But just in case he might be, and that the indignation is founded on something within him, I would remind the House of the circumstances of the exchange. The right hon. gentleman was asking, I believe twice in succession, the same question about would the government do such and so if the Supreme Court threw out the federal legislation, and in his repetition of his question it seemed apparent to me that he was assuming that this would be the result of the case.

I said it was not only hypothetical but was very pessimistic. This does not happen to be my view. As he seemed to be so sure that the federal government would lose the case, I said he must have more information than I have; I

have not phoned a judge, perhaps he has. The hon. gentleman tells us he has not phoned a judge. I accept that. Perhaps he got it from God that we were going to lose the case.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1510)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Questions of privilege always create great difficulty. They are subject to several interpretations, depending on the circumstances. Often they relate to unparliamentary language, to interference in the performance of hon. members' duties, to contempt of parliament and a number of other factors. Often they relate to disagreements or grievances. In any case, there is no machinery under which the Chair is entitled to permit repeated interventions by hon. members.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert has expressed, by way of a question of privilege, indignation at the remarks made yesterday by the right hon. Prime Minister. The right hon. Prime Minister has made a reply to that. Hon. members know that there is no process or procedure under which the Chair can permit a second intervention by the right hon. member for Prince Albert, and presumably a second intervention by the right hon. Prime Minister.

The matter is closed. It is for the Chair to decide. No motion has been put forward. The right hon. member for Prince Albert has called for either a clarification or a withdrawal of the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister. It is not altogether certain whether or not this comes within the authority of the Chair under the provisions of questions of privilege, but in any case, the right hon. Prime Minister has indicated that he did not expect the matter would be taken seriously. In any case, it is entirely clear that the right hon. member for Prince Albert has not, in fact, contacted any member of the judiciary on this matter. This would seem to the Chair to close the question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I was not given the opportunity to reply—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have not on this occasion, nor have I had on any previous occasions, a procedure which is known to me which would give me the right, with any sense of respect for the procedures that we have followed here traditionally, to allow one hon. member to participate more than once in a discussion on any point, whether it be procedural or substantive, and I think the matter should be closed at this point.

Business of the House

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Fourteenth report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, in both official languages.—Mr. Corbin.

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

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF BILL S-35

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that there have been discussions among the parties with relation to one of the rather minor bills which remains on the order paper for completion before June 30. I understand that agreement has been reached, and I now ask for unanimous consent that at 5.50 p.m. this afternoon the House shall consider third reading of Bill S-35.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There have such discussions, Mr. Speaker, and we are prepared to give unanimous consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: There has been a suggestion that the House give its consent that at 5.50 p.m. this afternoon the ordinary order of business be interrupted to permit consideration of the bill referred to by the President of the Privy Council. There seems to be agreement to that effect.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed, and so ordered.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the question period today the Minister of the Environment referred to a report prepared by his department with regard to the waste material being put into the Athabasca river by the Great Canadian Oil Sands at Fort McMurray, Alberta. Since the minister has left the House and will not be able to table that report, I ask the House leader if he would undertake to see that this is tabled according to the commitment which the minister made.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the question period the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore made reference to his Bill C-242. You called him to order in the course of that, Mr. Speaker, but there was sufficient on the record before you called him to order to leave the impression that the official opposition, as a party, was opposed to this private member's bill. I think it is important to indicate to the House of Commons that that is not so. As I have said, the hon. member's bill is a private members' bill, and in that sense enjoys support on all sides of the House.

The House will recall that at the outset of the debate an attempt was made to draw out the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council and me, the House leader of the opposition, as if there had been some form or arrangement between us representing our parties in the private members' hour. I want to say that both of us studiously avoided that kind of involvement. It is interesting to note, as well—if it is any comfort to my good friend, the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore—that I spoke on second reading in support of the bill, and that those of our party who were on the committee which dealt with the bill spoke in favour of its principle. So I think there was general acceptance from all sides of the House to the priciple of the bill.

But I think it is important that we make it clear that private members' hour is just that, private members' hour, during which members of parliament can express their own personal views on the matters discussed. I want to make it extremely clear, especially to the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore, who I know has laboured for a long period of time on this matter, that our party is not opposed to the principle set forth in this bill, and in fact a careful reading of the committee's hearings will indicate that that is so.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I suppose Your Honour might call it a point of grievance. During the question period, when the Minister of Agriculture was answering questions from the hon. member for Elgin about the appointment of a new vice-chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation, he indulged in one of those sweeping generalizations that we associate with him and that we enjoy, when he said he had had recommendations for this position from all sides of the House. I suggest that that was in error. I have checked, and I find no one in this party and no one in the Social Credit party made any such recommendations. I leave the Tories to speak for themselves. But I wish the minister would contain himself a bit, instead of making these wild generalizations.

Mr. Whelan: If I recollect correctly, I thought I said "from both sides of the House" . If I did say "from all sides", maybe that was erroneous. But I will have to check my memory again, because I think one member from the hon. member's party did make a suggestion to me.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, that is not so.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a brief addition to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It gives the Chair some difficulty to restrict the right of hon. members to intervene. I stopped the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore from putting what I thought was clearly an improper question. At best it was a representation, and in any case it was argumentive. I had several reasons for ruling it out of order. I allowed the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton to raise it after the question period was over because we do not consider points of order during the question period, and even the putting of the question left an innuendo

which there was no opportunity to answer. However, I think the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton had a good answer on the matter and I really do not think it should be discussed any further.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF EXTRADITION TREATY WITH SWEDEN

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I would like to table, in both official languages, the text of the new extradition treaty with Sweden.

* * *

● (1520)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 5,038, 5,075 to 5,086 inclusive, 5,281, 5,342, 5,477 and 5,504.

[*Text*]

OLYMPICS ARTS AND CULTURE PROGRAMME

Question No. 5,038—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. What is the purpose of the Olympics Arts and Culture Programme?

2. How much has been budgeted for the Cultural Olympics and what amount will the (a) government (b) Government of Quebec (c) COJO (d) remaining provinces and territories contribute?

3. What is the administrative cost of the programme, excluding the budget to pay entertainers, hotel costs and transportation?

4. Who are the members of the Cultural Olympics Committee and (a) what are their individual salaries (b) for what period of time are they hired (c) what degree of expertise has each?

5. What cities other than Montreal will play host to the Cultural Olympics?

6. How many advance tickets sales does the Arts and Culture Directorate of COJO anticipate and what is the expected revenue of such sales?

7. What is the expected revenue from total ticket sales?

8. What will the Arts and Culture Committee of COJO be responsible for during the Olympic Games other than staging the Cultural Olympics?

9. What is the total amount budgeted for the Arts and Culture Committee excluding the Cultural Olympics budget?

10. What federal departments or councils are involved in the Cultural Olympics?

11. If the Cultural Olympics budget falls short of defraying the costs of staging the events and programmes, is the government prepared to increase its share of financial contributions to support the events and, if so, in what amount?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Secretary of State, Canada Council and Treasury Board as follows: 1. This program does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Order Paper Questions

2. (a) The Government, through the Secretary of State Department, has agreed to provide some assistance, mainly to defray the transportation and hotel costs of entertainers and groups performing in the Montreal Cultural Festival. A sum of $1 million has been allocated for this purpose, with the Canada Council being responsible for administering the program. Concerning questions (b), (c) and (d) COJO informs us that: (b) $3 million; (c) $1¾ million; (d) $2 million*; an additional $½ million is contributed by private sources.

---

*estimated

3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Not applicable.

10. The Touring Office of the Canada Council administers a fund of one million dollars specially allocated by the Secretary of State to cover the travel and accommodation costs of groups and artists participating in the Olympics Arts and Culture Programme.

11. Not applicable.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN MANITOBA

Question No. 5,075—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Manitoba for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	82	285	4	17
1966/67	23	672	2	10
1967/68	427	1786	13	65
1968/69	—	(166)	1	5
1969/70	515	422	4	110
1970/71	—	428	5	82
1971/72	20	293	5	18
1972/73	—	(293)	201	264
1973/74	340	1732	55	166
1974/75	(160)	(182)	114	230

NOTES: 1. The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

2. Bracketed figures for English expenditures in 1968/69, 1972/73 and 1974/75 represent the net disposition of assets within the province, i.e. the net value of assets scrapped or otherwise written off because of obsolescence and charged to the reserves for depreciation. These figures represent the amount in excess of the value of assets purchased as replacements in that year.

Order Paper Questions

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN YUKON TERRITORY

Question No. 5,076—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Yukon Territory for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	Radio (000's)	Radio/TV (000's)
1965/66	—	3
1966/67	—	21
1967/68	—	12
1968/69	—	—
1969/70	18	395
1970/71	—	34
1971/72	—	117
1972/73	—	14
1973/74	—	72
1974/75	14	58

NOTES: 1. The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

2. The figures given are for English investment only. There was no French investment during this period.

3. The "Radio/TV" designation represents costs for rebroadcast units and transmitters used for both radio and television service.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 5,077—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Saskatchewan for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio (000's)	TV	Radio (000's)	TV
1965/66	6	34	—	—
1966/67	—	2	—	—
1967/68	8	1	—	—
1968/69	7	—	—	—
1969/70	193	1447	—	—
1970/71	48	226	—	—
1971/72	17	1275	—	—
1972/73	15	59	—	—
1973/74	17	109	—	—
1974/75	57	917	150	—

NOTE: The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 5,078—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of British Columbia for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio (000's)	TV	Radio (000's)	TV
1965/66	113	259	—	—
1966/67	172	282	—	—
1967/68	606	1546	—	—
1968/69	—	175	133	—
1969/70	887	2761	62	—
1970/71	272	825	135	—
1971/72	(37)	(99)	—	—
1972/73	—	241	—	—
1973/74	50	569	140	—
1974/75	2803	8507	510	1320

NOTES: 1. The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

2. Bracketed figures for English expenditures in 1971/72 represent the net disposition of assets within the province, i.e. the net value of assets scrapped or otherwise written off because of obsolescence and charged to the reserves for depreciation. These figures represent the amount in excess of the value of assets purchased as replacements in that year.

3. The figures for expenditures in 1974/75 include expenditures on the CBC Vancouver consolidation project.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Question No. 5,079—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Northwest Territories for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

[Miss Campbell (South Western Nova).]

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	Radio (000's)	Radio/TV (000's)
1965/66	—	29
1966/67	—	—
1967/68	—	87
1968/69	—	73
1969/70	13	689
1970/71	—	111
1971/72	10	241
1972/73	—	(8)
1973/74	51	307
1974/75	24	150

NOTES: 1. The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

2. The figures given are for English investment only. There was no French investment during this period.

3. The "Radio/TV" designation represents costs for rebroadcast units and transmitters used for both radio and television service.

4. Bracketed figures for expenditures in 1972/73 represent the net disposition of assets within the province, i.e. the net value of assets scrapped or otherwise written off because of obsolescence and charged to the reserves for depreciation. These figures represent the amount in excess of the value of assets purchased as replacements in that year.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN ALBERTA

Question No. 5,080—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Alberta for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	14	233	—	—
1966/67	36	1249	—	—
1967/68	7	473	—	—
1968/69	725	—	—	—
1969/70	918	338	—	868
1970/71	132	157	—	8
1971/72	(176)	(611)	—	4
1972/73	62	172	—	—
1973/74	504	224	540	309
1974/75	186	710	57	124

NOTES: 1. The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

2. Bracketed figures for English expenditures in 1971/72 represent the net disposition of assets within the province, i.e. the net value of assets scrapped or otherwise written off because of obsolescence and charged to the reserves for depreciation. These figures represent the amount in excess of the value of assets purchased as replacements in that year.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN P.E.I.

Question No. 5,081—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Prince Edward Island for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	—	—	—	—
1966/67	—	—	—	—
1967/68	—	—	—	—
1968/69	—	92	—	—
1969/70	—	7	—	—
1970/71	—	105	—	—
1971/72	—	963	—	—
1972/73	—	459	—	—
1973/74	—	294	—	—
1974/75	—	127	—	—

NOTE: The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 5,082—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Newfoundland for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Order Paper Questions

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	302	1055	—	—
1966/67	385	1012	—	—
1967/68	268	1184	—	—
1968/69	410	775	—	—
1969/70	356	882	—	—
1970/71	382	1	—	—
1971/72	319	1486	—	—
1972/73	(40)	(135)	30	45
1973/74	715	714	40	60
1974/75	239	694	30	131

NOTES: 1. The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

2. Bracketed figures for English expenditures in 1972/73 represent the net disposition of assets within the province, i.e. the net value of assets scrapped or otherwise written off because of obsolescence and charged to the reserves for depreciation. These figures represent the amount in excess of the value of assets purchased as replacements in that year.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 5,083—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of New Brunswick for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	11	—	11	17
1966/67	25	—	27	28
1967/68	157	—	309	391
1968/69	31	—	76	104
1969/70	105	—	378	480
1970/71	542	—	174	720
1971/72	154	—	24	555
1972/73	61	—	22	201
1973/74	75	—	95	190
1974/75	210	—	58	734

NOTE: The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 5,084—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Nova Scotia for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	88	205	40	40
1966/67	146	342	6	5
1967/68	—	—	4	—
1968/69	483	1485	—	28
1969/70	50	1253	42	—
1970/71	345	1027	10	178
1971/72	125	380	—	10
1972/73	493	1480	69	596
1973/74	390	1180	—	33
1974/75	139	406	—	5

NOTE: The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN ONTARIO

Question No. 5,085—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Ontario for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	234	1,087	—	36
1966/67	785	3,645	67	137
1967/68	835	3,875	48	148
1968/69	1,245	3,310	427	153
1969/70	420	1,790	50	72
1970/71	30	115	—	2
1971/72	200	895	25	35
1972/73	850	440	45	938
1973/74	1,100	4,290	115	290
1974/75	1,010	3,951	105	265

NOTE: The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RADIO/TELEVISION IN QUEBEC

Question No. 5,086—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

From 1965 to date, by year, what amount did the government spend in the Province of Quebec for the development of (a) French (b) English radio and television?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) and (b)	English		French	
	Radio	TV	Radio	TV
	(000's)		(000's)	
1965/66	24	78	97	512
1966/67	442	1,630	2,080	10,675
1967/68	53	195	245	1,290
1968/69	235	1,730	1,540	4,380
1969/70	85	370	425	1,970
1970/71	85	350	400	1,840
1971/72	724	1,203	1,530	15,195
1972/73	315	677	8,619	26,130
1973/74	369	1,485	3,137	13,500
1974/75	146	580	1,233	5,296

NOTES: 1. The above figures represent capital expenditures reported in the year in which the project was put into service. Work in process in any given year has been excluded as such information is not readily available until the year of completion of the project and, for that reason forms part of the figures for the year of completion.

2. The figures for French expenditures in 1966/67 include expenditures on projects connected with facilities required for Expo '67, while those for 1971/72, 1972/73, 1973/74 and 1974/75 include the costs of the Maison de Radio-Canada consolidation project in Montreal.

WHITTAKER TEXTILE MILL, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 5,281—**Mr. Howie:**

1. Was any money committed by DREE to the Whittaker Textile Mill at Marysville, New Brunswick and, if so, in what amount?

2. Was the full amount actually advanced and, if not (a) what amount was advanced (b) for what reason was the balance not advanced?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Whittaker Textiles (Marysville) Ltd. accepted a DREE incentive offer of $2,745,850 to manufacture and process textile fabrics at Marysville, New Brunswick.

2. (a) The amount of the offer actually disbursed was $928,402; (b) The balance of the authorized incentive was not advanced because the company did not fulfill its obligation under the Regional Development Incentives legislation, in that the first phase of the project on which the initial payment had been based was discontinued before the expiry of the control period. Before the amount due to the company in respect to completion of phase two could be determined, a decision was made to discontinue all production at the mill.

USE OF AIRCRAFT BY PRIME MINISTER

Question No. 5,342—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 5,121 that the cost of the aircraft for travel to and from Anticosti Island was $778 per hour (a) what was the total amount of flying time involved and the total cost (b) what was the total amount of waiting time involved, if any, and the total cost (c) did the aircraft and crew remain with the Prime Minister during his stay and, if so, what was the total cost of their stay (d) did the aircraft fly back to Ottawa, returning to pick-up the Prime Minister later and, if so, what was the total cost of all flying time involved?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): (a) 6:20; $4,927; (b) Not applicable; (c) No; (d) Yes. For total cost see (a) above.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—ICEBREAKING AND DREDGING SERVICES

Question No. 5,477—**Mr. Forrestall:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 5,105 which stated in part that icebreaking and dredging services "may be beneficial to the entire St. Lawrence basin from the point of view of shipping, flood control and economic development", what is the government's best estimate of the dollar value derived by (a) shipping (b) flood control (c) economic development from all the monies spent by the government on icebreaking and dredging since 1965 and, if such figures are not available, will the government consider studying the situation to determine them?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Transport Canada is now in the process of developing and applying the two major concepts of cost recovery and operational performance measurement which together will enable the benefits of specific transportation services to be more clearly identified. Because these two concepts are not fully developed an adequate estimate cannot be provided at this time of the benefits derived by (a) shipping (b) flood control and (c) economic development from monies spent by the government on icebreaking and dredging since 1965.

USE OF CONTAINER CRANE IN AREA OF BERTHS 73 AND 74 AT PORT OF MONTREAL

Question No. 5,504—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. At what percent of its estimated potential thruput assuming (a) one container crane (b) three container cranes and necessary backup equipment, is the area associated with Berths 73 and 74 at the Port of Montreal now leased by Logistic Corporation being operated?

2. How many 20 foot equivalent containers were handled at this facility in 1975 and what was its estimated potential in this respect?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. The terminal at Berths 73-74 is not a container terminal per se but a combination general cargo-ro-ro-container terminal with a total storage area of only 9 acres. It is equipped with one container crane on Berth 73 only. Two or more such cranes would not increase the thruput which is limited by storage area. The total area is 100 percent utilized by Logistec Corporation.

2. 5,969 T.E.U containers were handled at Berth 73 in 1975. The estimated potential is 6,600 T.E.U. containers per annum for Berth 73 (4½ acres). In addition 93,000 tons of general and ro-ro cargo were handled at Berths 73-74.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 100 and 101?

[*Text*]

COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE ON PROPOSED SWINE INFLUENZA VACCINATION PROGRAM

Motion No. 100—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence and minutes of meetings between the Minister and officials of the Department of National Health and Welfare and the ministers and officials of the various departments of health of the provinces on the implementation of a national swine influenza vaccination programme.

[*English*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgency of action required resulting from the March 23 meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Immunizing Agents—and I refer the hon. member to the statement and recommendations of that particular committee as tabled on March 30—no formal correspondence or minutes exist between the minister and officials of the Department of National Health and Welfare and the ministers and officials of the various provinces on the implementation of a national swine influenza vaccination program. Consultation at that time was carried out through telephone conversations. I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this matter and the need for the public of Canada to know the facts surrounding the whole program, I think this motion should be transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

[*Text*]

COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO SWINE INFLUENZA VACCINE

Motion No. 101—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all papers relating to calculations by means of which the Minister of National Health and Welfare arrived at his estimate for the cost of swine influenza vaccine at $0.60-$1.00 per dose.

[*English*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, estimates for the cost of swine influenza vaccine were derived from discussions with manufacturers. More precise figures were not available because of the uncertainty over the ease with which the recombinant strains of A/N.J./76 would grow and the yields that could be obtained during the manufacturing process. Other influenza vaccines have sold generally in the price range of 60 cents to $1 per dose. In view of the hon. member having another opportunity to debate that issue on the other notice of motion, I now ask him to withdraw his notice of motion.

Mr. Yewchuk: Transferred for debate, as well.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of documents be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand that the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) had the floor at the conclusion of the debate yesterday. Although technically yesterday's debate was on the amendment and we are now continuing on the main motion, it seems to be a generally accepted practice that an hon. member, in that circumstance, ought to be able to continue for the balance of his time on the main motion.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, in the budget there are a number of measures which deserve discussion. I will devote a few minutes to talking about two aspects of the budget. One has to do with a proposed measure with regard to unemployment insurance, and the other has to do with the budget measures relating to energy conservation, and in particular to those which provide incentives for the development of alternative forms of energy.

With regard to unemployment insurance, the question which comes to mind and which is probably in the minds of those who are interested in this issue is really this: How many weeks of contribution are considered to be fair, in a social security program like unemployment insurance, before qualifying for benefits? It seems to me that the issue boils down to that basic question. If we consider other programs of a similar nature—for example, workmen's compensation, medicare and hospital insurance—we will find that in most of those programs one can become eligible for protection from the moment one starts contributing to those systems.

In other words, to the best of my knowledge there is no qualifying period for coverage; a person is covered from the moment he starts contributing. This is true in the public sector for programs of the kind I have mentioned, and it is also true in the private sector. If a person starts paying premiums for home insurance, life insurance, or any other form of insurance, for that matter, he is covered from the moment he starts paying into the scheme. Therefore, it is natural to conclude—at least, it is to me—that under the unemployment insurance scheme it is desirable to strive for a system whereby a person can qualify for coverage from the moment he joins, because that is the pattern and the criterion which has been applied to other insurance schemes both in the private and public sectors.

If we ask the proponents of 12 weeks, 16 weeks or more to give a reasoning for that period of time before qualifying, we will notice that it is very difficult, even with the best of intentions, for them to come forward with rationale for that. I cannot provide the rationale for 8 weeks either, but if I were asked what we as a government should strive for over a period of time, my answer would be that it should be something which will take us in a direction opposite to the proposal in this budget, namely, toward lowering, rather than increasing, the number of weeks required to qualify for unemployment insurance.

I know it is very popular at the present time in this country to be tough with regard to unemployment insurance. I know there is much support for the idea of increasing the number of weeks. However, I do not share that view, because I think we have in unemployment insurance a good social program which protects people, particularly in those areas of the country where employment is seasonal and the availability of jobs is very limited. Those areas are away from large industrial centres and include areas such as New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, P.E.I., parts of Quebec, northern Ontario and virtually all the areas of the country which benefit at present from our regional economic expansion programs.

I may be wrong, but I have noticed—despite the speech made by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) who, on behalf of the Conservative party, supported the increase in the number of weeks—a certain nervousness in Conservative ranks as expressed in questions asked by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) on May 27 and by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie) on June 7. If that impression is correct, I can well understand that nervousness because some areas of this country will be seriously affected by the change in the number of weeks from 8 to 12 as proposed in this budget.

It seems to me that when a person becomes unemployed, that person becomes unemployed for reasons beyond his or her control. A good social security measure, therefore, should be available at the earliest possible time—in the shortest number of weeks that the social security system can offer. I am not so impressed by arguments that are based on the question of abuse. It is very easy to make a charge of abuse, but to the question of where the abuse occurs the answer rarely comes forth.

● (1530)

It must be kept in mind—and this seems to be forgotten by those who are criticizing the unemployment insurance policy—that if a person quits his or her job without reason, that person goes without benefits for six full weeks. That is a pretty long time to be without benefits, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be an impression that you qualify for unemployment insurance the moment you quit, or a week or two after. That is not so. If you quit without reason, you go six weeks without benefits. No one in his right mind would want to abandon a job with the knowledge that the social security system, in this case unemployment insurance, will not be forthcoming in less than a month and a half.

I would, therefore, urge the government to reconsider this measure in the budget and to stick with the eight weeks. It is a good measure. As the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) said, our unemployment insurance system is one of the best in the world. We should not be ashamed of it or retreat from it; we should be very proud of it. If the government does not find it possible to reconsider this measure for the whole country, I would suggest, as an alternative, that we retain the eight-week period of contributions before benefits are payable in those regions of Canada presently benefiting from regional economic expansion. I would urge that compromise at least.

I should like to devote the little time I have left to another aspect of the budget, Mr. Speaker, for which I would like to congratulate the government and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). I refer to the measure that was announced on May 26 concerning energy conservation. In particular, I refer to the two-year tax write-off that is extended to cover equipment enabling industrial wastes to be used as a fuel source and industrial equipment that produces energy from municipal waste. In addition to that, the federal sales tax is removed from items which contribute to energy conservation or contribute to the development of alternative forms of energy, including solar furnaces and heating panels, wind-powered generating equipment and heat pumps.

Before I go on, Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to the work done in this area over the years, when it was rather like crying in the desert, by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton). For years he

has appealed for better use of wind energy in the part of the country from which he comes. Now we have come to the crunch. We have reached a point in history when it is quite clear to us that we will run out of non-renewable resources. The government's measure reflects concern and foresight in anticipation of things to come.

The *Globe and Mail* of June 8 published a report which read in part:

> A background study prepared for the federal government estimates that renewable energy sources could provide anywhere from 2 per cent to 4 per cent of the country's total energy requirements by 1990.

It went on to say that the study reports that by the year 2020 the percentage could rise to 20 per cent of energy needs. Mr. Speaker, I am more optimistic than that, although I cannot base my optimism on any scientific knowledge. I think that at present we are badly underestimating the potential of the sun as an energy source. What concerns me is the fact that when we make $122 million available for research and development for this fiscal year, according to my calculations only 2.2 per cent of that is available for research in the renewable energy field, namely, sun, wind and tidal. I think this is an alarmingly low percentage. If we cannot increase the total amount, I would at least urge the government to review the percentage or the slice that is allocated from the research and development total fund and give much greater emphasis to research in the field of renewable energy.

As things stand at the moment, of the $122 million allocated for research and development, 8½ per cent is for research on conservation, 10 per cent for oil and gas, 4.5 per cent for coal, almost 70 per cent for nuclear, 5½ per cent for transportation and transmission, and only 2.2 per cent for renewable resources. In light of the very important decision embodied in the budget respecting energy conservation and incentives for the discovery and implementation of new sources of energy, I think it is imperative that we give much greater impetus to research in the field of renewable energy resources.

It seems to me that the next step will lead to the creation of a Canadian industry based on Canadian technology in the field of solar energy and, following that, the creation of industries and jobs. Then would come the development of a market at home and with countries which have similar climatic conditions to ours or, indeed, even different climatic conditions. There is an opportunity at hand, and I am certain we have the knowledge if we have the political will to move in that direction with greater speed and determination than the figures would seem to indicate.

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to commence my remarks this afternoon by congratulating the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) for the brilliant speech he delivered last night on the budget. It was a speech full of original ideas and observations which, if they were followed by the government, would put this country in better shape than it is today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillies: I do not intend to spend much time this afternoon talking about the specific deficiencies of this budget. Both inside and outside this House, the lack of any direction in the budget, the inability of the government to decide what it is trying to do, the loss of faith which is shown in this nation as perceived by an almost pathetic suggestions that Canada's economic destiny is controlled by foreign forces, has been commented upon by newspaper editorials and reporters very, very widely. To me, other than the technical deficiencies in the analysis and in the proposals, both in terms of economic policy-making and the government's attitude toward energy, the most disturbing aspects of this stand-pat budget, as it has been called, is that the government has so little confidence in this great nation that it can suggest at this time that what we need is a stand-pat budget when we have inflation at an annual rate of 9 per cent and unemployment at a seasonally adjusted rate of 7.4 per cent, which means that 760,000 Canadians are out of work.

● (1540)

The government is apparently accepting this incredibly poor economic performance and literally believes, in spite of the great resources of this country, in spite of the quality of the labour force, in spite of the fact that we have been isolated from the oil crisis created by the OPEC countries, in spite of an abundant agricultural sector, that Canada should have a slower rate of economic recovery than many other countries of the world, much slower than that of our major trading partner, the United States, and that average economic performance vis-à-vis other countries is satisfactory.

Why is there so little vision in this budget? Why, when there are such opportunities and potentials for creating a veritable Utopia in Canada, has the government turned its back on the people in the country by offering nothing? Do we not have one of the greatest opportunities of any people anywhere for creative development of techniques to bring oil from tar sands? Do we not have an overwhelming opportunity to find out new ways for operating in northern areas, new ways which could be useful for all other countries with Arctic resources? Are we not, perhaps, on the brink of one of the most exciting and far-reaching national ventures—one unparallelled since the building of the great cross-country railroads at the end of the nineteenth century—with the possible construction of pipelines from the northern resource areas?

Do we not have the great challenge of making the cities more livable and housing more available? Where is the thrust toward public transport, the ultimate aid in conservation, if not only of energy but of the urban environment? Where is the policy to encourage dispersion of industry so that we can have imaginative and controlled development of urban regions? Where is the program to really deal with structural unemployment and regional disparities? Where is the imagination that links what we could be with what we are? Where is the potentiality for taking us from underutilization of our resources to full use, for the benefit of all?

How can we accept, in the face of what we could be doing in this nation, an attitude that 7.4 per cent of the labour force unemployed, and a growth rate of less than 5 per cent, is acceptable? Again I ask, what has happened? Where is the vision? Where is the effort to rise to the opportunity? This tone of defeatism in the budget, in this

land of potentiality, surely must be disturbing—indeed distressing—to every Canadian.

The budget reflects, of course, the tone and attitude of the government, a tone and attitude that there are only problems, not opportunities; that Canadians are tired and weary; that our horizons have narrowed; that we cannot be better than we are, cannot strive to influence and shape our own destiny; that we are caught in the throes of worldwide events; that we must surrender our dreams and aspirations; that we must look for less, not more; that we cannot show the way. How wrong this is. What a misreading it is of what Canadians want from a government. What a reflection it is of a government that has been in power too long, that is tired, worn-out, unimaginative and uninspiring.

A budget is, of course, a technical document as well as a statement of economic aspirations of the government and, therefore, the country. The economic aspirations of this government are to hope for a gradual decline in inflation from its current level of 9 per cent to 4 per cent in 1978, an aspiration for performance 100 per cent less than the aspirations of the United States government which is looking for a 2 per cent inflation rate at the end of 1977.

The government is also looking for a gradual decline of unemployment with the oft-repeated suggestion that the actual unemployment rate in Canada will decline when the rest of the world recovers. This analysis, or premise, concerning what happens in the rest of the world apparently has become the cornerstone of economic policy-making of this government. It was the explanation used by the former minister of finance for his inability to turn the Canadian economy around. He will undoubtedly be remembered as the most incompetent and, finally, least courageous minister of finance this country has ever had. And it is the explanation now used by the present minister. I can only conclude that it is the basic and unswerving position of the officials of the Department of Finance.

It is this type of thinking which is destructive for the nation, because it is the ultimate cop-out for doing nothing on the domestic scene and, significantly, it also permits the abdication of careful analysis of alternatives and assessment of past performances to see if, in fact, we could have done better. When everything is determined by something beyond your control, the need for accountability of performance is removed.

No one would argue that Canada is not a part of the global economy, and a significant part. No one would argue that Canadian economic performance is unaffected by what happens in other countries. But where great issue can be taken with the minister and his advisers is that they believe Canada can take no action on its own to mitigate the impact of changes in the world economy on the Canadian economy; or, indeed, that Canada can take no actions which can in fact influence the world economy. We are not spectators in the world; we are participants. But we can influence events in the world economy, just as we can influence the impact of world events on the Canadian economy. By knowing and analysing what is happening in the world, we can adopt policies to channel the consequences of such events in Canada's interest. To suggest that we can do nothing is a surrender of responsibility and ought to, and will, lead to surrender of the right to govern much longer by the party now in power.

The general apathetic, helpless approach to budget-market has been reinforced in recent years by an increasing emphasis on the part of the government on the use of broad or macroeconomic tools in preparation of the budget. While it is true that since the work of Lord Keynes in the 1930s there has been recognition of the fact that the levels of expenditures and revenues by government can greatly influence the direction of economic activity in the nation, during the past few years in Canadian budget-making there has been so much emphasis on the broad forces that influence the economy that it has been forgotten, or indeed underemphasized, that the way in which these broad forces are created is as important as their size. This retreat from traditional classical analysis has led to gross errors in the management of the Canadian economy.

Moreover, it is apparent that much less is known about the impact of gross changes in the economy than was believed only a decade ago. One does not hear much today about "fine-tuning" the economy, one of the catch phrases of the early seventies. The fact is that economists, certainly not the economists advising this government, simply do not know what impact spending, taxing and other proposals will have on the economy. The effects anticipated from specific action in periods of less competition, inflationary expectations and huge government intervention in the economy are simply, at this stage in the development of economic knowledge, unknown and unpredictable. Yet in spite of all the evidence that they do not know what they are doing, evidence supported by the record of past performance, the minister insists on bringing in a budget based on the same type of analysis at that of his predecessors. Unfortunately, it will have the same consequences for the Canadian people.

Look at some of the paradoxes. The governor of the Bank of Canada argues that it is necessary to have rapid increases in the money supply to keep interest rates down. So Canada has had a money supply increase at an unprecedented level and has, not what we were told we would get, low interest rates, but the highest interest rates in its history. In the United States, the federal reserve system has kept its rate of increase in the money supply low and interest rates are substantially lower in that country than in Canada. Clearly, it is not the rate of increase in the money supply but other factors which are establishing interest rates: But our Canadian officials do not seem to understand this simple proposition.

Consider the fact, implicit in the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) about his budget, that his officials are still talking about a trade-off in unemployment and inflation. Yet the facts are clear. We have not had in this country a substantial change in the rate of inflation as unemployment has risen. The trade-off in any meaningful sense, within any acceptable limits, simply does not exist. The facts appear, rather, to support the proposition that unemployment is created by increasing inflation and that both rise together. The policy-making is based on the false premise of the trade-off. So it is no wonder that the economic performance in Canada, in spite of the enormous advantages inherent within this nation, is so poor. Economic policy-making here is based upon a

theory of economy which is simply not appropriate for the time. As long as this error persists, we will have poor economic performance.

The greatest example, and the one with possibly the most extreme consequences of the error of concentrating on broad aspects of the economy instead of looking with great care at specific sectors, can be seen in the way in which the energy sector of this nation has been mishandled by the present government for the past few years. The incompetence, which can almost be labelled as scandalous, of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the National Energy Board in forecasting Canada's energy resources has been commented on many times. Today it is simply unbelievable that within this decade responsible members of the government were stating that we had endless supplies of oil and natural gas for our own needs, that we could export unlimited amounts to our neighbour, and yet next year we will probably be a net importer of oil.

● (1550)

It is truly unthinkable that as recently as three years ago the government had a taxing policy that literally discouraged exploration and development. It is again almost unbelievable that through the past years the government has not worked out a meaningful process for discussing and resolving energy questions which involve different jurisprudences. The fact is that even today we do not have a carefully thought-through program for conservation and development of alternative energy supplies, and yet we know that without energy great problems are ahead of us.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) spoke in the budget debate. I read his remarks with care. Most of what he said had been put forth before, and with some of it I agree. The time is long past, however, since Canada has needed an appropriate tax regime that would encourage exploration and development. The feeble steps that the government are taking in this direction are welcome, but not nearly enough. The bold imagination necessary to move effectively in the tar sands, in the north, across this entire continent, are lacking. Nothing is done for the mining industry which through the years has been one of the most important elements in the development of the Canadian economy.

What is most startling, however, and indicative of what is wrong in the way the government is approaching the problems of the nation is that the minister in his speech said very little about energy in relation to the Canadian balance of payments. I make this point because Canada's balance of payments difficulties are going to have a profound effect on every Canadian in the course of the next few years, and many of the problems are created because of our inability to deal with energy. If a solution had been found for our energy needs, a solution which would shift reliance from imports and such a high volume of domestic consumption of oil and natural gas to other sources, then our balance of payments problems would be less threatening. In 1985, the Economic Council of Canada predicts, 38 per cent of the deficit in the balance of payments will be from petroleum products—something which indeed is scandalous, given our resource base.

It is not helpful, however, to discuss the balance of payment problems in a vacuum. It is a product of neglect of various segments of the Canadian economy, each one of which should have been dealt with specifically in the budget and by policy through the years. Again, this is one of the prices that has been paid for so much emphasis on broad policy-making. The neglect of the elements which in the last analysis are influenced by that policy, and indeed how they react in the long-run, determines whether or not such broad policies will, in fact, work.

What are the Canadian balance of payments problems, and why are they so serious for the Canadian economy? In the most simplistic sense, the base of the problem is simply that Canada is buying far more from other countries—buying, that is, services, payments for capital, and everything else—than she is selling to all other countries in the world. Indeed, Canada had a deficit, in this sense, of $5.1 billion in 1975. Since things that are purchased have to be paid for, Canada borrowed $4.7 billion in 1975 to help make up the difference. So in this period when the government is saying it is the policy to lessen foreign ownership in Canada, we are in fact faced with an economic situation which simply requires that foreign investment increases, unless we do something about it.

If we do not want to borrow, the only other thing that can happen is that the Canadian dollar can be devalued and devalued, it will be if the present situation continues. But what does this mean? Fundamentally, it means that Canadian imports will be more expensive, and that has to mean strong inflationary pressures on the Canadian economy. Although, because it is the conventional wisdom of the Minister of Finance and his officials to believe that this will increase exports because the dollar will be cheaper, the recent work of Professor Mundell of Columbia University suggests this is not true, and the evidence of the past few years supports him.

The fact is that the rise in the price of imports, and the inflation which this rise in price creates, has meant that devaluation has led, in every country he has studied, to a rise in costs to such an extent that it more than offsets the advantages of the cheaper currency. What country in the world has had the most continuous devaluation of their currency? Great Britain. And it has had the longest period of balance of payments problems. What country has had no balance of payments problems and has maintained high levels of exports? Germany. And it has not had a continuous pattern of devaluation.

It is a myth to think that devaluation will solve the balance of payments problems. It will not. It will simply add to inflation and exacerbate the difficulties. If the government does not recognize this, and if it is not prepared to see the entire Canadian economy owned by non-Canadians, it must totally revamp its economic policies or we will never get out of the inflation-unemployment dilemma which we are now experiencing.

What has to be done? We need to cut back on exports where it is possible to do so; not through tariffs or restrictive trade practices, but where we can substitute domestic production for imports on an economic basis. Certainly, this means a crash program in energy development, a program to move the tar sands ahead on a priority basis, a program to generate energy from alternative sources, the tides, the wind, the sun and nuclear power properly safeguarded. The minuscule approach to this effort indicated

by this budget clearly shows the government has no realization of the scope and implications of the change in Canada from an exporter of energy to an importer, implications for the balance of payments and the rest of the economy.

Second, we must increase our exports, not through devaluation, because devaluation will not work, but by making the areas in which Canada has a world advantage more competitive and more productive. Tax policy must be directed at stimulating productivity, at developing our mineral resources, at improving our forest industries and keeping our agricultural sector one of the most competitive and efficient in the world. The Economic Council of Canada is absolutely correct in stating that we have to move away, in our policy, from programs that put us in direct competition with Hong Kong, Taiwan and other Far-Eastern countries which are labour-intensive. We have to strengthen our industries through tax treatment, incentive programs and general support where we have some advantage. Our future is based on resources and advanced technology and we must build our policies to strengthen these areas.

The current account in trade has been in deficit in seven of the past ten years. Despite the wishful thinking of the government that this problem will go away as the world economy recovers, it will not. Canadian export trade developed in the late fifties and over the sixties because of the Kennedy Round, Viet Nam, the auto pact and other special circumstances. It is all changing. The world is developing into trading blocs and Canada is not in one of them. The Kennedy Round approach is being replaced by bilateral negotiations and commodities, and it is certain that the trading patterns of the 1950s and 1960s will not be repeated. The automobile may be on the decline in this energy-short society, so if Canada is to prosper through trade it must have new policies and be more competitive.

Therefore, this budget deserves all the condemnation that it has had from Canadians from coast to coast. It lacks vision of what this country can be, and therefore has no policies for the long-run approach to the fulfilment of the nation's potentialities. It continues to emphasize broad-gauged fiscal and monetary policies which, important as they are, are less reliable for guiding the economy because no one knows what the results of such policies will be in an inflationary, government-dominated nation. It neglects the traditional task of a budget of producing policies and programs for specific sectors of the economy which must be supported if inflation and unemployment are to be reduced. It is based upon an out-moded and patently incorrect analysis of the manner in which an economy operates. It neglects to come to grips with the most significant approaching economic problem Canada is facing—the enormous deficits in our buying and selling relationships with the rest of the world.

● (1600)

In studying this budget and the philosophy, economic analysis and confidence in Canada which lies behind its formulation, Canadians can only conclude that the present government is worn-out, tired, incompetent and incapable of providing the leadership which a nation with the great opportunity and potentiality of Canada clearly deserves to have.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, before I go further I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) on his presentation. Of course, I do not agree with many of the points he has made, and unfortunately I am not replying to him; I have other topics to talk about. But I listened carefully to his speech, and even though I disagreed with it I thought it was a most useful presentation. He talked in a very commendable way about the budget, expressing his views upon it and upon what should be done.

I was surprised to hear him speak as he did about the devaluation of the Canadian dollar. As he knows, there are many articles being written at this time suggesting that we should weaken the value of the Canadian dollar in relation to the American dollar—it is now two or three points above the U.S. valuation. I am glad to note that the hon. member recognizes that there are a lot of people in Canada who say that if we want to improve our export position, we ought to have a kind of devaluation. I will pass the hon. member's views on to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). At least the hon. member for Don Valley is very happy with the healthy situation of the Canadian dollar at the present time and he does not want to change it. It is a fact of life. I was surprised to hear his condemnation of the government at the end of his speech, to the effect that it was a tired, old government, and so on. I do not feel tired at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: As I say, I am happy to know there is one member who is in accord with this particular aspect of Canadian fiscal and monetary policy to the extent that the Canadian dollar should be, not at par or below the value of the American dollar but that it should be a healthier dollar.

I have notes today. Usually I provoke a lot of controversy when I speak, so on this occasion I have written down the observations I intend to make. In rising today to participate in the budget debate, I would like to discuss two aspects of my responsibility as President of the Treasury Board. First, I will speak about government spending and then I will turn to the subject of the official languages policy.

Government spending is a matter which has been receiving much attention for a long time. It is right that it should receive a lot of attention because it is very important. The trouble is that it is also very complicated, and many of those who may have much to say on the subject have not taken the trouble to learn enough to understand it. As a result, a great deal of criticism people hear is misinformed. It is not forgivable for a large segment of the opposition to be so wrong-headed in talking about government expenditures when they should be giving leadership through informed criticism. But how can they give leadership when they stand paralysed in an attempted acrobatic effort to move in three directions at the same time? They advocate cutting government expenditures in total, but are critical of cutting expenditures in any particular area. In a third dimension, they favour a whole lot of new ideas which involve expenditure. Let me touch on a few points to entertain these hon. members as they stand in their fixed position.

First, let us consider the question of the growth of expenditures. This is usually looked at in terms of current

dollars discounting the effects of the use in prices. In those terms, total outlays, both budgetary and non-budgetary, rose 25 per cent in 1973-74, 28 per cent in 1974-75, and according to necessarily preliminary figures presented in the budget, by 18 per cent in 1975-76. But in terms of constant dollars, with the effect of price increases removed through a deflator, the actual rise in the years I have mentioned was 15 per cent in 1972-73, 15 per cent in 1973-74, 13 per cent in 1974-75, and 8 per cent in 1975-76—a different story, one of persistent decline. If we achieve our aim of staying under a ceiling of 14 per cent growth in 1976-77, price effects included, the growth in real terms will be no more than 5 per cent, maintaining the decline.

As hon. members know, our commitment to the future is that the trend of growth in expenditures by all levels of government will not exceed to trend of growth in the gross national product. This is a collective responsibility which the provinces and municipalities must share if it is to be discharged. I have shown in the record of decline just set out that we can be expected to do our part.

The word "trend" is significant. No government worth electing would bind itself to an automatic formula. Should the economy require assistance through added expenditures from time to time, the assistance must be given. Recent history offers a pertinent case in point. There is little doubt that the performance of the Canadian economy during the recent period of slow growth was assisted by the fact that federal expenditures remained at a high level. We avoided the decline in GNP which our neighbour suffered.

I maintain that our advanced social welfare structure, put in place by a series of Liberal governments, had much to do with this favourable outcome. The collection of programs which make up this structure has, as its primary purpose, the relieving of hardship among those who are the beneficiaries. But the indirect, cumulative effect is to maintain the purchasing power of the domestic economy in the face of downward pressures. So what we intend to do, by and large, is to hold expenditure growth over the medium and long term to the trend of the GNP. But we will depart from that trend when it is the right thing to do.

There is another general aspect of government expenditures which is analogous to the welfare aspect and which appears to go unnoticed. A large part of what is spent is in the nature of investment. Every year hundreds of millions of dollars are disbursed in budgetary outlays for capital acquisitions. The convention of the government accounts is to write off these outlays in the year they occur. The balance-sheet of Canada contains an almost quaint entry of one dollar to represent the value of all these budgetary investments from all the years this country has been in existence. That is a very big dollar. Business and commercial practice would show, in similar circumstances, an entry for billions of dollars, as well it might. The airports, the wharves, the roads, the postal terminals are in their own way as productive facilities as the factories and stores which weigh heavily in valuations of the commercial sector.

● (1610)

I have mentioned on other occasions that after you subtract transfer payments to other governments and to individuals, and after you subtract subsidies to transportation, research and the like, and after you subtract public debt charges, you are left with a few percentage points of the total. These few percentage points include all the budgetary capital investments I have been talking about.

On the non-budgetary side, productive investment is much more marked. Here, our accounting practice is a little close to the commercial. The public accounts for 1974-75 show $1,831 million as a return to the government on its investments. These investments include, very prominently, the mortgage funds provided to CMHC to assist housing, the funds given to the Export Development Corporation to promote export, those given to the Farm Credit Corporation to assist agriculture, the Northern Canada Power Commission to support northern development, and much more.

What I have been trying to counteract here is the false impression created by so many who wave around the big figures of total expenditures in a way that hides the beneficial effect. The subject of the beneficial effect, through transfers to all segments of our society, I hope I have covered often enough before. These investment aspects are not mentioned frequently enough.

I really must deal, now, with the remarks made the other day by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). To say the nice things first, his remarks do serve some purpose in that they illustrate what I meant about uninformed criticism. I have not the time to reply to everything he said, so I will content myself with some of the juicier morsels. He started with the Post Office, about a difference between the 1975-76 expenditures figures for that department as forecast in the main estimates and as reported in the budget papers. Surely the hon. member must know by now that the main estimates are compiled in the December preceding the start of the fiscal year on the basis of departmental submissions received around the end of October. One figure is a forecast made some months before the year ends, and the other is a figure reported after the year ends. He must also be aware, if he was around, that there was a postal strike last year, a little incident that lasted for many, many weeks.

Miss MacDonald: Don't we remember!

Mr. Chrétien: Yes, and during which the Post Office was, naturally, not paying the workers who were not working and, as a hardly surprising result, actual expenditures are less than forecast expenditures. The estimates for 1976-77 were made on the assumption that similar circumstances will not arise. So this is why you have the difference. Then the hon. member went into the question of the $725 million difference between the expenditure projection I made in February and the preliminary totals reported in the budget. The explanation is very straightforward. We had expected at that time to disburse $33,625 million in budgetary expenditures and $2,875 million in non-budgetary expenditures.

The budgetary expenditures were in fact $262 million greater, for two reasons: statutory expenditures, particularly those for the Canada Assistance Plan—and we pay the bills the provinces send to us in that regard—were higher than the forecast, and reflecting the pressures placed on departmental resources by the current restraint

program, the actual amount not spent, the lapse between estimates and actual expenditures, was less than forecast. I cannot resist a little bit of praise for myself because I have done my job too well. The lapse at the end of the year was 1 per cent. If you look at the past history of budgetary handling by the government, you will find it is 2 per cent on average. Last year, because we have been involved in two exercises, one in the amount of $1 billion and another one in the amount of $1.5 billion, of course the departments were left with less money at the end of the year because we had put the squeeze on.

Rather than have a 2 per cent lapse, I forecast a 1¾ per cent lapse, and in fact it was around 1 per cent. This is because I was too tough with the department. I recognize that I made an error there. I have to tell everyone that it was the first time, last year, that a president of the treasury board had ever tried to come to the House and instead of just tabling the blue book, made a forecast as well for supplementary estimates for the year. This was the first time it was tried. I know I was taking a heck of a gamble, but I wanted to try to give the total picture.

This is why we are having problems of that nature. We used to have different accounts here and there, and the return on expenditure was always lower than now. Now we put everything into it. Now it includes everything, even the special fund which used to be put aside from the budget. We put into that figure all the non-budgetary items so the country would have a total picture. This is why we must recognize that in February, 1976, I did not arrive at exactly the total of budgetary items. The difference was, as I mentioned earlier, $262 million. I do not think that is too much. For the rest of the non-budgetary items the difference was $463 million, and this was because a decision was taken at the end of the fiscal year to increase the flow of investment funds to Crown corporations in the energy and export fields. These are two well recognized priorities for this country.

We made that decision in the last few weeks because we felt that the revenues were better than predicted, and the Minister of Finance decided to make some advances in the field of energy and exports. I think the opposition would be very ill-advised to complain about this. When I was listening to the speech of the hon. member for Don Valley, I noticed he devoted the greater part of it to energy and export policy. Of course, there was a change there in the forecast of $463 million. That money was used in respect of these two fields because revenue was higher than expected. This permitted the government to make that decision in the last weeks of March. That is the explanation. It is nothing we want to hide. It was not a miscalculation to the extent of $463 million. This was a conscious decision of the government to advance funds in respect of energy and exports.

Mr. Mazankowski: Just juggling.

Mr. Chrétien: No, we made that decision because we had the money to do it, and I think that was a pretty good policy to follow. You can see I have spent much more, and I can tell you where.

Mr. Mazankowski: Why didn't you bail the Lockheed company out?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: That is a different question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) has the floor and I suggest we listen to him.

Mr. Chrétien: Perhaps I should go back to my text. A third subject the hon. member went into was the familiar delusion of the opposition about the amount spent on consulting contracts. We went to some trouble to clear up their confusion in the 1976-77 version of "How Your Tax Dollar is Spent". The opposition has again and again confused the object "professional and special services" for which $1,162 million is provided in the main estimates, with one of its minor components, just a little component—as a matter of fact, less than 8 per cent of the total—for that purpose. To make it very clear, the total is only 8 per cent for that. The opposition should not be confused. I have said this a dozen times, and I repeat it.

The so-called experts who were there—and they may be good at managing banks—could not understand that. It is just a percentage of the total. The total covers the cost of all outside services obtained by departments, including some they obtained from one another for which they are required to pay. The hon. member does not understand, so I will try to make myself very clear. Eight per cent is for consultants from outside. When one department pays another department for services, it is included there. Thirty-nine per cent of that amount of money, for example, covers educational and manpower services purchased from the provinces. It is not consultants in the sense they want the people to believe. If they were honest about it, they would recognize that the money that is spent in the provincial sector for training by the federal government is a consultant's fee we pay to the ministry of education of every province. So it is not a friendly little consultant of the government, which is the impression they try to leave.

● (1620)

Other consultants' fees are fees paid to private medical practitioners, lawyers, computer services, private security services, and the like. Does the hon. member, as an alternative to buying these services from the outside, suggest, instead, that we expand the public service itself? Why should we hire more dozens and dozens of lawyers, doctors, and so on, when we can have those services from the outside?

Mr. Oberle: You have consultants now to tell you what you want to do.

Mr. Chrétien: I am trying to clarify your mind. I know you want to understand, but your guys on the front bench confuse you all the time. I think that from the wobbly base he established with his Post Office example, his misconception of professional and special services, the elimination of some unspecified departments and what would amount to retrenchment in export and energy investment, the hon. member came up with a magic figure of $1,025 million in savings. May we all give fervent thanks that the finances of this country are not in such hands. Perhaps

now, Mr. Speaker, I can turn to my other preoccupation for today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal now with the government program on official languages. As you know, the cost of such programs gives rise to many comments, particularly because of the present restriction period. However, from the outset the consideration of all those linguistic matters must be placed in its real context.

As for any other government program, the funds allocated to the official language program are now subject to the strictest assessment. In the light of available data, the government estimates will have to spend about $310 million on those linguistic programs during the current fiscal year. This represents .8 of 1 per cent of the government overall spending which, according to the estimates, will be around $42 billion.

If we compare the cost of the official language programs with those of other sectors, we see that the linguistic programs require less money than the military equipment needed for national defence: $322 million. The same goes for the manpower rehabilitation and training program: $530 million.

[*English*]

This is one of the arguments they use. They think these are consulting firms.

[*Translation*]

As for the program concerning the native people of Canada, their budget of $605 million is almost double the total budget for official languages.

Out of the total projections of $310 million, 43 per cent or approximately $135 million are included in transfers for financing provincial programs of second language education. The amount of $135 million is spent and transferred to provincial governments, to Quebec for teaching English as well as outside Quebec for teaching French. In other words, the government has already agreed to the wishes expressed by the Commissioner of Official Languages and others that it would be more profitable to invest in young people attending school.

Moreover, $39 million were assigned to the bilingual program for military personnel in order that a national service of the scope of the Canadian Armed Forces can, within the country and abroad, reflect the bilingualism of Canada.

Regarding expenditures on programs for Canadian civil servants, these will reach $137 million, approximately half the subsidies to be paid to milk producers. That figure includes the cost of language training for civil servants, that of translation services for all documents, of course translation services for the House of Commons, and the budget of the Commissioner of Official Languages and also the operation costs incurred by my department under vote 15, that is the salaries of civil servants absent from work to follow language courses. The total is $137 million. All translation services at the House of Commons—

An hon. Member: Too loud!

Mr. Chrétien: . . . do I speak too loud? It will not be very long.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

There have been reservations concerning the linguistic designation of jobs within the Public Service of Canada and the language training program for civil servants. It has been implied for example that the identification of too many bilingual jobs would of necessity entail a lack of unilingual ones. However, any evaluation of that particular aspect of the program must adhere strictly to the original aims and criteria followed in the identification of language requirements for each job.

Under the Official Languages Act, government policies and programs are intended firstly to ensure that members of the Canadian community can communicate with and be served by federal bodies and departments in their own official language. The second objective is to make available to public servants every opportunity to work in the official language of their choice.

Procedures which were used to identify the linguistic requirements for various positions, while taking into consideration previous objectives, were described in the text of the resolution adopted in June 1973 by all parties represented in the House of Commons. The system used to identify the requirements for positions were not designed as if the situation would never change. On the contrary, it was meant to adapt to any situation which could arise and to promote the development of the official languages whenever it was desirable. I should point out in that respect that the resolution on official languages also included provisions for the increasing use of French within the confines of the merit principle, thus involving both francophone and anglophone communities in the federal administration process. The positions have therefore been identified to meet not only immediate needs, but also future requirements of the linguistic development of the public service.

As I already announced publicly, the Treasury Board, in cooperation with federal agencies and departments, will undertake the systematic review of linguistic requirements of all federal positions. If, in the light of the data collected during this review, we have to recognize that too many bilingual positions have been identified within the federal administrations, we shall not hesitate to take the required action.

In November 1974, I announced in the House that the government had decided to commission some experts to study linguistic training programs in the public service. The government has just received the thick report prepared by this study group, and it is now being translated and printed. We hope to make it public as soon as possible.

I would like to take this opportunity to express on behalf of the government my gratefulness to Mr. Gilles Bibeau of the University of Montreal who was asked to direct this important study. I would like to tell him once again that the government will study closely his evaluation and recommendations.

There is no doubt that the transformation of the Public Service of Canada into a functionally bilingual institution at an acceptable but fair cost is an enormous task. The concept of linguistic planning is in itself revolutionary and until now, no other country in the world has undertaken such a wide linguistic training program for adults.

Those who never had the opportunity to take part in the activity of a bilingual organization sometimes find it hard to understand how bilingualism can be introduced in a working context. Occasionally, the vocabulary used by those who are interested in bilingualism can lead to confusion. It is obvious that someone in the academic field who has the opportunity to have a sabbatical year in a second language will have a tendency to consider bilingualism differently than a federal employee who is faced—

● (1630)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. minister, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Chrétien: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I should like to point out that I answered some questions at the request of some hon. members.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Go ahead.

Mr. Chrétien: I am going ahead. I have to switch to French, and I need a couple of seconds to adjust. I will give you a couple of hours to adjust also, if need be.

[*Translation*]

A whole vocabulary was established to distinguish between the various forms of bilingualism, from operational bilingualism to institutional bilingualism. I for one believe that in more than one situation, operational bilingualism will have to be used where one expresses himself in his language while all understand one another. In the Treasury Board, for example, that is the formula being used because we believe everyone must have the opportunity to participate in the creative process, and for most of us that is only possible in our mother tongue. But we all want to use our knowledge of the second language at work.

Some Treasury Board meetings sometimes take place entirely in English, and others entirely in French, but I sometimes express myself in French while others speak in English. Such a flexible and relaxed approach seems to us particularly successful when it comes to working without being bound by a prepared text. Mr. Speaker, I only touched on a few of the particular aspects of the government official languages policy and programs.

In concluding, I could not overemphasize the importance of another dimension of official languages, because it would be wrong to reduce them to a simple linguistic matter. If through that linguistic reform we want to achieve a civil service that provides services suited to the needs of the Canadian public on the one hand and, on the other hand, a hospitable working climate for the civil servant, the Public Service of Canada will have to become aware of and sensitive to the culture dimension. In other words, when it comes to a decision likely to affect the whole of this country, it is important for those who participate in the decision-making process to seek to understand and respect provincial variables. In short, we must pursue and try by all means to implement in the federal public service the very climate that Prime Minister Pearson was proposing when he stated in 1966, and I quote:

> Civil servants of both linguistic groups will be able to work together toward common goals using their own language and drawing from their respective cultural values while at the same time appreciating to their full value and respecting those of others.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important at this moment to thank everyone in the various departments in Ottawa for their great understanding of the government's policy in this respect. I think we have made a lot of progress. There is much good will, and this should be emphasized more often because I know that in my department this has been a great experience. As I have said in my speech, everyone uses his own language at meetings when we have to make decisions. This is of great satisfaction even to people who sometimes appear to object the most to this policy.

It is sometimes said that we do not provide sufficient opportunity for those who have learned the French language, to use it. Some people say that not enough French is spoken in Ottawa. I must tell hon. members that I have been a member of the House since 1963, and in my view the situation now is completely different. Sometimes when we have technical discussions in my department I prefer to use my native language. I speak in French, which my officials understand, and they reply in English. This is the kind of attitude that is being developed and one which is gratifying to both sides.

In my view, too many people tend to raise the problems and not talk about the results. The other day I heard someone complain that some people claim they use French only 9 per cent or 10 per cent of the time. I refer here to English people who have learned French. Some English-speaking officials in Ottawa have learned French and use it only 10 per cent of the time, and yet this is a revolution, a revolution in the right direction. I think we have gained from those exchanges.

Of course there are many problems, but I think that not enough people speak about the real progress that has been achieved, the understanding between people and their willingness to understand each other. We should not try to put into perspective only the problems, because there will always be problems. I see, after talking with members on both sides of the House and from all parties, that they want this policy to be a success. This will not take place overnight, but I think every one of us should look at the problem realistically and not forget the good progress we have made in the last ten years in Canada in this respect. The other day I was in British Columbia and some people came up to me to talk about this policy, people who want to be part of the fabric of this nation, who want to have access to the two greatest western cultures, the French and the English. There are other components—

Mr. Oberle: Too much, too fast. Start in the schools.

Mr. Chrétien: We have made much progress in Canada and we should try to put the progress into perspective and not speak only about the difficulties. After two years in this position I can say that I was somewhat worried when I assumed the position because of my own personal background. I was worried that some people would assume that

I had ulterior motives in doing what I was trying to do. I think the reception of the whole public service and the willingness of public servants to participate in this policy is gratifying. I think we have made a lot of progress and everyone is helping to develop a better understanding within our nation.

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) must have put a lot of time and effort into the drafting of this budget. It is obvious that this has not been a hasty effort or one lacking in ingenuity, either. It took an awful lot of planning, enterprise and expertise to prepare a budget that does not contain a single, solitary item that should have been in the budget. In fact, it is such a sterile and useless document that the Minister of Finance might have used his time to better advantage, possibly rounding up some money with which to buy long-range patrol aircraft for the Canadian armed forces. There are so many things missing from this budget that it might become famous as the case of the missing budget. It might have to share billing with Keith Spicer's famous annual reports on the failure of bilingualism in the public service, or that infamous volume of instructions on how to tender for contracts at the nation's federal airports.

● (1640)

Because of its shortcomings, this budget is guaranteed a place in history, the history of "nothing" budgets, "nothing" reports and "nothing" programs, because there is not a program in it. It was inspired and inaugurated by the Liberal aggregation across the floor. It is not surprising that the advisers of the Minister of Finance disagreed with him as to what kind of budget this is. The finance minister said that it is slightly stimulative and mildly expansionary. His economic advisers are reported to have described the budget as mildly restrictive. Surely, a minister responsible for approving and tabling national budgets should know the difference between expansionary and restrictive policies; at least that is what I hope.

Things do not change much from day to day around here in the life of this Trudeau government. It staggers along in disarray and chaos. The situation has become so bad that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet are now unable to confront the confusion, corruption, hypocrisy and ineptitude of his administration. The multi-million dollar loss incurred by either one of his two ministers, or both, in the ill-fated Lockheed deal is the latest albatross around the neck of the Trudeau government, and the best thing the Prime Minister could do would be to sack both the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) and the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer). The government's policies are damaging our economy, or what is left of it.

We had the dubious distinction last Thursday afternoon of being the spectators of stormy scenes here on the Hill, brought about by the demonstration of the Quebec milk producers. That demonstration proved to be quite impressive. I can appreciate their milk marketing problem because I come from a farm background. I have milked cows and helped produce milk at ridiculously low prices in the past, and I have witnessed milk surpluses in my area as well as nationally. Nevertheless, I cannot condone the damage done to public property by a small minority of the Quebec milk producers. If this deliberate vandalism does not stop, the government should ban all demonstrations on the upper concourse in front of the Peace Tower and permit demonstrations on the lower level of the front lawn only. Persons and property must be protected. That is the first duty of the government. But the Prime Minister can blame himself and his own policies to a great degree for the terrible state of general insolvency in the dairy industry in Canada today.

The Prime Minister has been the chief abettor of the main grievance of the Quebec dairy farmers, namely, the accumulated surplus milk products and the lack of market for this surplus. I want the House to pay special attention to the following: The Prime Minister's importing this year of 50 million pounds of cheese, much of it from the European Common Market, which is part of his much vaunted contractual link with that group of nations, only contributes to our own surplus. This represents about 500 million pounds of milk and costs our producers an additional $3.6 million over and above our current surpluses. This import item of cheese was one of the chief points of protest raised by the Quebec milk producers.

One of the statements made by the finance minister on budget night sticks in my mind and worries me, but I think it was the closest the minister has ever come to levelling with us. He said: "The outlook for 1977 is, of course, much more uncertain at this time." Every finance minister since the present government took office could say, and in many cases did, that the coming fiscal year looked uncertain. We have lived for a long time in that atmosphere of uncertainty—too long—and it shows up in everything we see when we summon the nerve to look around us.

I just have time to look in one more direction at present. We should consider our manufacturing industry and certain parts of it. The budget does nothing for our manufacturers, our secondary industry and especially for the textile industry. The Canadian textile industry, in all its facets, is in deep trouble and severely depressed because of our damaging imports of vast quantities of low-cost offshore products. I received a protest from Celanese Canada Limited, the owner and operator of a large plant at Millhaven in my constituency of Frontenac-Lennox and Addington. I want to put that protest on the record. I have a letter here from Celanese Canada dated May 17 which reads in part as follows:

Dear Mr. Alkenbrack,

Further to my letter of April 15th, the polyester yarn business continues to be severely depressed. You may have noticed since that our competitor, DuPont, has deferred the opening of a new plant at Coteau-du-Lac, Quebec.

We have now found it necessary to cut back production further at our Millhaven, Ontario plant. This entails the lay-off of an additional 94 employees, bringing to 465 the total number of jobs lost this year in the Company's polyester filament yarn operations in Ontario.

I also received a resolution from the county of Lennox and Addington. The county government is so concerned about this that it sent this resolution to me, to many other elected representatives in this House and in the provincial government in Toronto. The county government goes back quite a way in the record of this government. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas on May 14th, 1970, the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister, Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, tabled a document known as the Canadian Textile Policy;

And whereas its intention was to give the textile trade in Canada—

That is referring to Mr. Pepin's document which he tabled.

—the necessary protection against low-cost and damaging offshore imports;

And whereas on the local scene there is much evidence of the Canadian textile industry being in serious trouble as evidenced by large lay-offs in two main fibre producing plants in this area and cut-backs in expansion of facilities and a slow down in production of output;

Now therefore the council of the county of Lennox and Addington requests the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce—

That is, the present minister.

—to hasten the implementation of the immediate and long-term remedial action necessary to bring the textile trade in Canada to an acceptable economic level.

I also want to bring to the attention of the House and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) that a major recommendation has been made to him by the Clothing and Textile Board with regard to polyester yarn and filament. It has been in his hands now for five weeks. The minister promised to table it in the House and to table his answer within 15 days. I ask the government, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and the Prime Minister as well: In light of the serious situation now present in the general textile industry of Canada, why has this report not been tabled? Why has the minister failed to do this?

The Canadian economy at the present time is all tied up in knots, and the example I just gave is just one of the complaints. The Canadian economy is tied up in knots with the gold-dust twins, Jean-Luc Pepin and Beryl Plumptre, grinning and fawning as they try to justify their enormous salaries and preemptive power over every aspect of our economy. This is what the present government told Canadian voters in the 1974 federal election campaign could not possibly work. The Prime Minister was right, even as he was deceiving the voters into returning this government to office. Soon after the election, this government implemented a program of wage and price controls that had been drafted and approved long before the election campaign. The finance minister of that time has since resigned from the cabinet and from the House. There can be no doubt that the former minister knew a lot that we did not know, and do not know to this day, and that it was too much for him to accept and to live with and remain in the government.

● (1650)

We could have been less honest with the voters at that time, but that is not Conservative policy. We could have warned the people what to expect in the way of controls and restrictions if the then government were returned. Instead, we proposed a program—a sensible program—of selective income and price restraints, tied in with restraints in federal government spending—I repeat, tied in with restraints in federal government spending. The result of that honesty is history. The Prime Minister conned the Canadian voters and they turned down our sensible and reasonable restraints program. Now they are caught up in a gigantic and expensive bureaucratic web, and it is both possible and probable that our economy may never fully recover from the effects of these controls and restrictions.

I am surprised that the Minister of Finance did not use this opportunity to respond to the report of the Commissioner of Official Languages and slash the budget for bilingualism in the public service, since Mr. Spicer says it is a failure. We could find the money to buy the equipment and airplanes we need for our armed forces simply by establishing realistic priorities for government spending. The billion dollars we need for aircraft to replace the aging Argus patrol aircraft has been available to us, but most of it has been spent on bilingualism—"squandered" would be a better word.

What do we have for that money? We have a level of inefficiency in our public service that is lower than at any time in our history. There is no merit system left. We have a morale problem both in the public service and in our armed forces that is a disgrace. Our country is divided as never before in our history, yet we are told continually that bilingualism is bringing our people closer together. The plain fact is that this government's bilingualism program is destroying confederation by creating the two nations that the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has been warning against for the past decade.

This would be a good time for the Minister of Finance to come clean on the ill-starred Lockheed deal, a boondoggle that threatens our good relations with our NATO partners and could cost us up to $20 million for nothing. The Minister of Supply and Services has found a likely goat to hang the Lockheed fiasco on, a public service official who cannot defend himself. The minister claims that he was not kept informed of what was going on in the Lockheed negotiations, so the offending official must go. What a travesty, Mr. Speaker!

I simply cannot believe that a minister of the Crown, a minister responsible for federal government purchasing, could suggest that he was not kept informed of negotiations on the largest proposed armed forces purchase in the history of our country. Even though we have seen the ultimate in inefficiency and bungling among cabinet ministers in this government, I still cannot accept the minister's statement that he did not make an attempt to follow each and every step in the Lockheed negotiations. If he allowed other people to carry out negotiations on their own, without assuming responsibility for what was said and done, then he cannot do anything except resign his cabinet post. Passing the buck to someone in the ranks is simply not good enough. It would not be acceptable on the part of a public servant, and it is not good enough for a minister of the Crown. What we need more than anything else, though, at this point in time is the full story of the Lockheed deal.

If it is true that a senior official in the public service is responsible for the colossal blunder that promises to cost the Canadian taxpayer $16 million or more, then we should know exactly how it happened so that we can plug that loophole. If a senior public servant has been guilty of negligence, or has been guilty of assuming authority to disburse sums from the treasury that were not lawfully his

to assume authority for, then his indictment must be supported by facts, not innuendo, and this evidence must be presented to this House. The members on this side of the House who moved for a public inquiry are to be commended.

If, on the other hand, this is simply more ministerial bungling, then that minister must be forced to accept responsibility for the expenditure and in fact the misapplication of millions of dollars of public funds. For the minister to simply announce that he has fired an offending public service employee is not sufficient, Mr. Speaker, and the minister is not naive enough to believe that we will accept that as a full and complete explanation and expiation of this appalling example of negligence. This House, and through us the Canadian people, must be made aware of the full and complete story of the Lockheed affair.

Mr. Speaker, this might be the time and place to ask why the Prime Minister does not see fit to give us the full story on another case of ministerial shenanigans—the case of the Sky Shops contract tendering. My colleague, the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) has done a great service to all Canadians by exposing the sordid details of the Sky Shops affair and I do not intend to add to or detract from that member's excellent efforts. I only wish to say that there must be some compelling reason why the Prime Minister insists on protecting those involved in the Sky Shops affair, in a conspiracy of prime ministerial silence. I cannot help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, if one or more of the principals in that sordid affair might have been among the anonymous donors of the Prime Minister's now famous swimming pool. Could that be the reason for his reluctance to have the full story known?

There is one item in the budget that I concur with, and that is the provision to extend the eligibility period of insured employment from eight to twelve weeks in order to receive Unemployment Insurance Commission benefits. I do not agree with all its ramifications, but I agree with the time limit. This is not a sufficient reason to bring in a budget, though, Mr. Speaker. This could, and should, have been done long ago by the simple expedient of tabling a bill in the House. There is one thing wrong with this item, though, and that is the effect that it could have on people in areas of high unemployment, such as in the maritimes. Some of the traditional jobs in the maritimes, largely in fisheries, have a seasonal duration of eight weeks and these people will not now be eligible for benefits.

I urge the government to re-examine this provision in the UIC regulations to see if there is some way that these people can be considered as exceptions to this rule—not fishermen only, but others as well. I know that exceptions lead to more exceptions, but these are worthy exceptions. I know there is a danger that the desirable effects of this change in the regulations could be watered down, but surely we should be able to work out some way whereby these people will not be further penalized by a situation that is unique to the region or area in which they live. They might well become victims of the very uniqueness of their types of principal employment.

I have also suggested that if a way cannot be found to include them in the benefit program, then these people should not be required to pay unemployment insurance premiums in the first eight weeks. It would be grossly unfair to expect anyone excluded from the benefit program to pay premiums. This principle is a sound one and it is in fact enshrined in the founding principles of the American revolution. The colonies, rightfully, refused to pay taxes to support a parliament in which they were not represented and could not therefore derive any benefit. This is a parallel to the question I have raised. I say that where there is no possibility of receiving benefits, there should not be the requirement to pay premiums.

● (1700)

Mr. Denis Ethier (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, having listened to the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack) and heard him often refer to the budget as a "nothing" budget, I might conclude he made a "nothing" speech. I promise to read it tomorrow and appraise it fairly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the participation in this debate on the budget in the last few days is perhaps a repetition of some remarks already made. For some hon. members, it was congratulations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), for other hon. members, it was an opportunity to speak on a topic, and for my hon. colleagues opposite, it was simply criticism, even negative criticism, because I heard nobody offer alternative solutions or even one alternative to the budgetary measures. In any case, I congratulate them for their participation in this democratic process.

I should like to join my colleagues who spoke before me to congratulate the Minister of Finance for his first budget. As the Canadian public on the whole seems to welcome it, and even if our most ardent critics from the media agree to say that this budget is trying to meet the needs of the state and of the economy at this time, it seems to me that perhaps the most important sector of our economy has been neglected namely agriculture.

It seems to me that there would have been room in the budget for these 5 or 6 per cent of the Canadian people who provide us with all our food. I will come back to this later. Even though I make this remark, Mr. Speaker, I must, in all sincerity, comend the Minister of Finance for several items of his budget.

First, concerning the conservation of energy, I fully endorse the proposed measures, namely the increases in the prices of oil and natural gas, so that the exploration and development of these resources may continue. Those who venture into that field assume enormous financial risks. It is very easy to criticize oil and multinational companies, but even if for economic reasons these companies decided to discontinue their research and exploration activities, we would be the first to feel the secondary effects of that decision. We would immediately be subject to the world price for oil, which would mean increases of almost 50 per cent, and I am convinced that this is not the wish of the Canadian people.

In my opinion, a price increase such as that proposed in the budget is a positive factor of conservation. We must realize that our per capita spending of non-renewable energy is higher than that of any other industrial country. It is a moral issue. We have no right to use more than our share of these non-renewable resources. We must leave

their fair share to the coming generations. A price increase would therefore bring the desired effect, that is less waste.

In his comments my hon. friend from York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) accuses this government of taking an overly large share of the tax on a gallon of gas—almost 13 cents. But he does not dare mention much higher taxes collected by provincial governments and particularly the producing provinces. At least that 10-cent federal tax is only aimed at protecting the consumers in the east of the country and if the hon. member for York-Simcoe wishes a return to the Borden line system he should have the honesty to admit it.

I wish also to mention the proposed changes to the unemployment insurance system. Merging unemployment insurance and manpower services is certainly a step in the right direction as those two services have so many things in common. The qualifying period will be increased from 8 to 12 weeks, a change which also received strong support because, in fact, the 8 weeks were mainly for the underprivileged areas which only have seasonal employment. But like in any good program there are abuses and changes must be made. We had reached the point where full employment areas had so many profiteers who worked only 8 weeks to qualify and received their benefits when in the same areas employers were looking for manpower. Then, I endorse those changes in principle but I shall encourage the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) to bring about all those changes to help areas with seasonal employment and to adopt even stricter measures for full employment areas.

For the less privileged areas maybe we should have LIP projects on a continuous basis but strictly with the cooperation of municipalities. We could even return to our Opportunities for Youth Program but still strictly with the cooperation of municipalities. It would eliminate criticism that some of those projects were not productive. There would be an authority or I should say a control.

Without any doubt, several of those projects gave very good results in our communities but as in the case of the 8-week qualifying period for unemployment insurance there were abuses. I was listening to my friend, the hon. member for York-Simcoe when he criticized the changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act. He asked that the unemployment insurance system operate on the principle that we should collect as much as we contribute. But two lines further he says that he supports the principle that the government should give a revenue to those who need it.

[*English*]

The hon. gentleman cannot have it both ways. He either supports a social measure, or he does not. This is something like his criticizing the government's policy on the Olympic gold coin which is being minted to help cover the Olympic deficit. He managed to slip the subject into his speech to show his refusal to co-operate on any measure concerning the Olympic deficit. Yet while he says this in the House, his leader, the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark), is touring Quebec and telling the people of the province that if a Progressive Conservative government were to assume power in Ottawa, it would help the province directly to eliminate the Olympic deficit. Here, again, they cannot have it both ways. Inside Quebec they support the Olympics; outside Quebec they do not support them.

Mr. Paproski: When did he say that?

Mr. Ethier: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian people are entitled to know where the official opposition stands concerning the Olympics.

Mr. Paproski: You don't know what you are talking about.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ethier: In that budget closely following the anti-inflation program, it is fair and reasonable to expect stricter measures concerning government expenditures. This means a sacrifice for a number of our citizens, because the reduction of government expenditures directly affects the social welfare programs directly or indirectly under our jurisdiction.

The changes to the unemployment insurance scheme will require sacrifices from the residents of areas where employment is seasonal. Urban dwellers are also asked to co-operate since the anti-inflation program is in effect. Many young unionists have seen their collective bargainings rejected by the Anti-Inflation Board. However, they had expected a raise comparable with what they had received in the last five years, which does not seem exaggerated. Professionals will have to restrict their increase in income to a limit of $2,400. Businesses will surely be asked to accept a smaller margin of profit.

● (1710)

The people in rural areas were also prepared to do their share. They were ready to make a sacrifice just as the rest of our society, but a shared sacrifice and not one supported only by the dairy community.

This is the main reason for my intervening today. Following the demonstration of June 3, it is obvious that there is a problem, an uneasy feeling, but we cannot and should not accept this responsibility alone. I have been quite surprised that so few producers understand the responsibility of their own marketing committee since this committee is composed of their own fellow producers who, as a matter of fact, appoint their delegates to sit on the management and supply committee with the Canadian Dairy Board.

I have been amazed and humiliated, Mr. Speaker, to see how the delegation treated the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) on June 3. I am sure several of the participants will regret this gesture, because they will soon find out how quickly they have forgotten their hero of the day before. Yes, I do say hero, for never in the history of Canada has a Minister of Agriculture done so much and in such a short time for those he is defending in cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather believe what many people have suggested, namely that this demonstration which was supposed to be peaceful turned out differently as a result of the infiltration of a few professional trouble makers. The large majority of producers are blaming the federal government for all the problems that the dairy industry is facing as a result. But the marketing boards have a responsibility and I would say it is their duty to better control the dairy production for 1975-76. They have done just the opposite. They have encouraged overproduction up to the very last minute. These marketing boards are operating under a provincial legislation so as to control production.

That is why I say we will never agree to assume full responsibility.

As regards the problem which dairy producers are facing, at the beginning of the 1975-76 dairy year, the Minister of Agriculture informed the marketing boards through the Canadian Dairy Commission that the money available for subsidies amounted to only $266 million, that is $2.66 per hundred weight of milk. Obviously they meant that all production in excess of 100 million hundredweights of milk would not be subsidized.

In August and September 1975, the Canadian Dairy Commission and the Minister of Agriculture warned the producers and the marketing boards in particular that there was overproduction and that if this was not under control as soon as possible, it might have an adverse effect on the dairy industry especially in the industrial sector.

I read an article in the *Ottawa Journal* of May 8, 1976 where Ontario Agriculture Minister William Newman is quoted as still arguing that there is no overproduction in Ontario. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful for a minister to play on words in such a way. He knows very well the difference between production eligible for subsidies and quota production. True, the production has not gone over the quota but the minister should show a minimum of integrity and confess that our production was more important than what was necessary to be eligible for the subsidies and this is precisely where the problem is, namely the lack of money. The necessary production to be eligible for subsidies was 100 million hundredweights of milk and we have produced 112.6 million hundredweights. If we wanted to play with words, it would be very easy to say that we are not asking for a 5 per cent reduction but simply for a 15 per cent reduction, because last year we were asking for a production of 100 million hundredweights of milk and, this year, we ask for 95 million hundredweights to be eligible. But we do not want to play with words and we will not. There is a problem which must be dealt with, but before all we must be frank.

The problem is all the more important in Quebec because in that province there are two marketing bodies. The Federation of Industrial Milk Producers controls industrial milk producers and the Federation of Milk Producers controls producers of fluid milk and also the integrated producers, those who produce both fluid and industrial milk. I think that, here again, there is some misunderstanding. They too refused to assume their responsibilities and keep production below the necessary level to be eligible for subsidies. Here again, these two bodies are run according to a provincial law.

I think we are far from having a national policy with a single market for milk if, in one single province, they insist on keeping two federations, one for fluid milk and the other for industrial milk. I think that it would be more profitable to take some time to solve this problem of the two markets than to come and pour milk on Parliament hill.

Mr. Speaker, here are some propositions which might help this group which belongs to the industrial sector.

The cabinet could perhaps consider the possibility of creating a system to promote our dairy products on the export markets, at competitive prices. There might result a lower price for our dairy products but not necessarily a reduction of net incomes. For example, with regard to the producer who is getting nothing for the milk produced in excess of his quota, I am sure he would choose to get a lower price, but for his whole production.

It will now cost the producer something for having overproduced, for not only will he not be paid anything for the excess milk but under the existing policy the Canadian Dairy Commission could charge the producer for a product he has not been paid for.

So a good advertising at world level is imperative if we are to find outlets for our dairy products, even at the risk of products commanding lower prices. If, as I was saying earlier, producers were free to produce as much as they want, this would have a double impact: higher income for producers and lower prices for consumers.

I would like to make another suggestion, Mr. Speaker. We could perhaps urge provincial governments to get back to the old custom of distributing free milk in primary schools and providing milk at special or reduced price in secondary schools. Schools should even be forced to have automatic vending machines for milk; there are always some for soft drinks, but seldom for milk.

I would like to make another suggestion if I may. There is still this agreement between producers and the Canadian Dairy Commission about the levy, that famous levy which affects industrial milk producers only. It is intended to cover the deficit incurred by the lower export prices compared with the home-market price or the subsidized price. This five year old agreement ought to be renegotiated and the burden could be shared in one of the two following ways: Either by the industrial milk producer, the natural milk producer, the processing plants and the two levels of government which are also responsible to the producers, or by the provincial and federal governments.

This would help us dispose of our present surpluses and empty out our storage rooms, then we could use the same system which is being practised in the European Economic Community, namely do away with the levy and, as I have said before, do away also with the export support price as the common market countries do.

Right now, our producers find themselves in competition with the government of those countries and not with the producers and I think this is not fair.

Another suggestion would be to have a single market for the milk but there again, as I said previously, as long as we insist on having two federations in one province, that does not seem possible.

[*English*]

I was pleased to read in today's Montreal *Gazette* that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) informed the producers that a two-year moratorium had been offered on the repayment of loans to the Farm Credit Corporation. I hope this will also include the interest. If not, it means very little to the producers who have just contracted large loans, since during the first years very little is in the form of repayment of capital; it is mostly interest.

Another welcomed announcement by the Minister was that the present limit of 95 million hundredweight will be raised if farmers demonstrate their willingness to stay within their assigned quota level. As I have said, there is a

serious problem for the industrial milk producers, and all those responsible should work together toward a policy or formula whereby situations such as the one we are not witnessing do not happen again. All those responsible should include the federal government, the provincial governments, the transformation plants, the fluid milk producers and the industrial milk producers.

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, this budget has been called a status quo or standpat budget by some. By others it is referred to in over-all terms as being fiscally neutral, a "wait and see" budget. That means we must wait and see if the American economy, slowly making its way out of its deep recession, will accelerate enough during the presidential election year to also lift our national economy by its bootstraps.

The budget, in essence, expects that the growth of the American economy will greatly improve the performance of our export sector. It seems to expect, at the same time, an increase of imports at reduced prices and thus improve our internal price structure as measured by the gross national product price deflater to 9.5 per cent. It projects a growth rate of 5 per cent which in real gross national product will just create enough new jobs to cover the increase in the labour force and thus leave us with average national unemployment that will remain at a seasonally adjusted rate of 7 per cent.

● (1720)

One of the disconcerting things about the budget, as I read it, is the finance minister's remark about the relationship between the present economic systems of control as characterized by the Anti-Inflation Board and what the economists call aggregate demand in the economy during peacetime conditions. He says on this point:

> A clear lesson of history is that controls cannot be made to work in peacetime in the face of excess pressures of demand.

There is scarcely anyone who would argue the point, but surely even a neophyte Minister of Finance can see that when you have a seasonally adjusted 7.3 per cent level of national unemployment, you do not have an "excess demand" situation but a lack of demand. It surely called for some tax cuts or tax credits for the low income groups in this country. This lack of demand tends to create a level of unemployment which is about the highest in the western world. Indeed, if we exclude the United States we can truthfully say that Canada has by far the highest rate of unemployment in the western world.

Some would like to deny the reality of what that means in billions of dollars in goods and services which are not produced and which quantitatively and/or qualitatively could improve the lives of many Canadians. These people also think that young adults and women workers, with their material needs and desire for work, can be dismissed by trite slogans or phrases such as "marginal attachment to the labour force" or "secondary workers". The very people who measure their own standard of living by the level of their family income would deny that the same criterion be applied to hundreds of thousands of unemployed Canadians.

The old bromide is still around, that there are lots of job vacancies if "they" would only look. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we now have estimates from Statistics Canada on job vacancies which include both full and part-time categories. As the leader of our party noted earlier in this debate, these figures show there are now 12 unemployed Canadians for every available job in this country. He stated:

> If every available job was filled tomorrow, there would be more than 700,000 Canadians who would be unable to find work.

The finance minister's remarks in the budget on Canada's central bank money supply growth targets provide clear evidence that a relatively tight money supply and an accompanying high structure of interest rates will be with us well into the future. The effect of this on our already overvalued exchange rate and the current account of our balance of payments—to say nothing of our own housing sector and investment in the business sector—and the likely consequent increase of unemployment is not seriously considered in this budget.

One may rightfully doubt that even a sluggish growth rate at this time, of 5 per cent, one which will produce 250,000 jobs and leave us with a 7 per cent level of national unemployment, will result from this so-called fiscally neutral budget. What if the game plan turns out to give us only 4 per cent or 4½ per cent real growth in GNP? It will take at least six months fiscally to stimulate the economy back to a more stable and acceptable condition. Recent Economic history in Canada seems to suggest that it takes about $800 to $900 million to reduce the unemployment rate by about one percentage point.

Mr. Speaker, this budget does nothing of substance to fight unemployment. In fact, in my opinion it may increase it. It talks about productivity, but does little or nothing about it. It does nothing to reduce Canada's increasingly high interest rates. It is altogether too dependent on the economic stimulus of the American economy. It might be considered a fiscally neutral budget in over-all terms, but in reality it is more of a do-nothing budget. It certainly will not be neutral in its effect on certain sub-regions and categories of people who can least protect themselves.

Granted, single parent families and families in which both parents work will be able to make larger income tax deductions with respect to child-care expenses. The most significant change is in the proposed amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act. Unemployment rates were recently at a 15-year high. What does the government do? Does it implement measures to stimulate employment? No. It makes it harder for those same unemployed people to receive benefits. This, despite the protestations of the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Andras), smacks of a cynical move on the part of the government to shift the blame of its failure to create jobs on to the very people who have suffered from that failure. On budget night the minister announced his intention to increase the number of weeks of insured employment from 8 to 12 with respect to eligibility for benefit. Regional extended benefits, he stated, would be related in a more sensitive manner to levels of regional unemployment. This second statement was taken as a concession to ease the burden of changes in areas of high unemployment. The Canadian Press story in the Halifax *Herald* of May 26 fell for this line when it stated:

> This will result in a longer benefit period in areas of high unemployment such as the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest this is not the case at all. Take, for example, a person who has worked for 12 weeks before losing his job, in a region with 10.5 per cent unemployment. At present, due to a system of national and regional extended benefits he could draw unemployment insurance for 44 weeks. Under the revised, and supposedly more sensitive system, he could collect for only 32 weeks. So much for helping the regions where unemployment is traditionally high!

I want to pursue this question of regional extended benefits. The minister claims they will be related in a more sensitive manner in future to levels of regional unemployment. The present legislation includes the notion of extension of benefits based on regional figures. The problem here is that the region chosen is, for example, the whole of the province of Nova Scotia. Let me show how this discriminates against the unemployed in Cape Breton, including my own constituency, that of Cape Breton-East Richmond, as well as that of Cape Breton-The Sydneys, Cape Breton Highland-Canso and other Nova Scotian ridings. Indeed, it applies to many ridings in the Atlantic provinces and probably through Quebec as well.

Under the normal labour force surveys carried out by Statistics Canada, Nova Scotia is divided into three economic zones for the purpose of measuring unemployment. Group four consists of the four counties on Cape Breton Island. Group five includes the eight counties from the Strait of Canso to the Bay of Fundy. Group six comprises Halifax County including the well-off Halifax-Dartmouth metropolitan area and the South Shore counties. The average unemployment rate in these three groups varied widely for 1975. Group four—Cape Breton Island—had 13 per cent unemployment. Group five had 7.5 unemployment. Group six experienced 6.2 per cent unemployment. But the unemployment rate for Nova Scotia as a whole was 7.8 per cent for 1975.

● (1730)

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration last Tuesday, I think it was, when he made his speech claimed that almost half of those who were in the category of the eight weeks are under the age of 25 and many are working wives and young persons living at home. What he left unsaid was that over half are over 25; 75,000 are between 25 and 34; 41,000 are between 35 and 44; 35,000 are between 45 and 54; and 19,000 are between 55 and 64. As for the charge that some of these people represent only a second income to the family, according to the 1971 census 6,200 heads of households in my riding draw less than $5,800. These families, surely, should not be denied a second source of income by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Further, the minister said that only 30 per cent of the 8 to 11-weekers have established a seasonal repeat pattern. That is only 110,000 Canadians in the course of a year. That is 110,000 people who quite probably will not even be able to remain where they are to work those 8 to 11 weeks per year if this measure passes. Has the minister given any thought to what will happen to these seasonal enterprises if the people can no longer stay in the area to work for the two months because it does not provide the necessary stamps to carry the person over the winter? Job creation is the proposed solution to the gap left by these measures. I suggest this is a sham. In reality it will be just replenishing the slashed coffers of LIP. LIP programs were cut in the last Turner budget, and now in reinstating some of the cut money the government tries to present this as a solution to high unemployment regions.

We will probably wind up making jobs for a couple of months so that people will be eligible to collect unemployment insurance benefits under the new qualification period. What does the Conservative manpower critic, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), have to say about this mutilation of a fine piece of social legislation? Five years too late, he says, and he brags about amendments proposed by himself in 1971 to increase the insured period from 8 to 12 weeks. It is easy to see that the hon. member for Hamilton West does not have to live with serious structural and seasonal unemployment in his constituency. He may feel that people in his riding work for eight weeks, quit and draw pogey and then get another job. In many areas of this country the possibility of another job is just not there. I suggest the hon. member should listen to some of his maritime colleagues on this subject.

I want to return again to the question of unemployment regional figures and to show that under the present legislation the definition of "region", when it includes the whole of the province and does not include the sub-regions which are used in a labour survey conducted by Statistics Canada, completely discriminates against those areas of very high unemployment. In other words, in the example I gave previously, the fact that you have such low levels of unemployment, from 3 per cent to 4 per cent in the Halifax-Dartmouth region—which is part of region six—lowers the average level of unemployment, and therefore the extension of regional benefits to areas like Cape Breton Island is away down and we are getting gored in two ways. First, we are not getting the jobs, and we are not getting the compensation we should get because of the lack of jobs. As I mentioned in the example of Cape Breton Island, it has the worst of both worlds. It has the highest unemployment in the province, yet it is included with the Halifax-Dartmouth region which has had full employment, or much less than 6.2 per cent.

Under the proposed changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration has not given any indication that they plan to change the definition of "region" and, therefore, the basis for regional benefits. All the minister has to do to make the benefits more sensitive to the region is to follow the sub-regional patterns of unemployment that Statistics Canada already uses for its labour force survey. Regional benefits were designed to help areas with high unemployment, and Cape Breton, among others, is not being given its fair share of benefits. To repeat, our ox is being gored twice, as it were: first, in being forced to put up with intolerable rates of unemployment, and then in not getting fair compensation for the people suffering from these hardships.

By such devious statistical sleight-of-hand, this government gets out from under the moral and legal obligations accepted when the act was changed in 1971 to protect the unemployed who sincerely could not get work. God knows, we have battled long and hard for government policies to be designed to give them permanent employment, and we know from living with these people that 80 per cent to 85

per cent of them would be glad to have a job. This is particularly disturbing when we see that a recent study published by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, "Climate for Regional Development", which was published a few months ago, purported to show that during the 1970s economic progress, as measured by per capita national income, has increased in the Atlantic region in general.

It is even more optimistic about DREE's work in the Atlantic provinces, for it shows a pretty graph that reveals that even earned income per capita has increased for the Atlantic provinces. Alas for the DREE study. Mr. André Raynauld, the head of the Economic Council of Canada, said before the Standing Committee on Regional Economic Expansion that any increase in income levels in the Atlantic provinces vis-à-vis the rest of Canadian provinces is the result of transfer payments. It can also be documented from Statistics Canada that unemployment in the Atlantic area has increased since the inception of the anti-inflation, restraint program.

However, this study done by DREE showed that in Nova Scotia, for example, the disparity between the central core, that is, Halifax-Dartmouth and the peripheral area, including the whole of Cape Breton—with some 160,000 people—and southwestern Nova Scotia, advanced from 31 per cent to 37 per cent during the 1970s. When you consider that the 1971 census showed that Sydney, the only city in Cape Breton, had a per capita income that was only 68 per cent of the Canadian average, this is a disturbing trend. Glace Bay, the largest town in my constituency, was then only 54 per cent of the national average, and New Waterford, the next largest town, was only 48 per cent.

Little wonder that the former national Progressive Conservative party leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), recently was quoted as telling a dinner meeting of the Dartmouth Chamber of Commerce, as quoted in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald*, the following:

● (1740)

> The disparities within our region have become just as great as those between our region and central Canada.

What is equally true for New Brunswick is more true for Newfoundland, and just as true to a large extent for Prince Edward Island. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) said that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration would have more to say on the matter. Did the Minister of Manpower use the occasion of his speech during the budget debate to enlighten us? The said fact is, so far as I am concerned after reading his speech, that we have to say "No." Is this government actively pursuing a policy that is linked to the concept of full employment? No. The minister says:

> Our goal is the fullest employment rate possible, in light of inflationary pressures and the international economic situation.

These two qualifications are being used as an excuse for inaction. The Minister of Manpower quotes the Economic Council of Canada, but he does not heed their comments in regard to the Unemployment Insurance Act. The ECC's study, "People and Jobs", on page 39 says—and I hope all Liberals will listen to this:

> We believe that most Canadians affected by unemployment are well served by the unemployment insurance system and use it honestly . . . It would of course be possible to try to eliminate abuses by cutting certain categories of claimants or the duration of benefits, or by extending the period of work, before claimants could become eligible for benefits. But such recommendations could prove harmful to persons most exposed to periodic and genuinely involuntary unemployment.

The report by the Economic Council of Canada recognized not only the fact that most Canadians use the program honestly, but also that it provided transfer payments to persons most exposed to uncertain or seasonal jobs. Unemployment insurance serves as a major income-stabilizing element in the economy, safeguarding purchasing power at crucial times for groups and areas that would otherwise suffer. This safeguard, I fear, is about to be knocked down for these groups and areas when they most need it.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about what these proposed changes could mean for my area. According to our local Manpower centre, which I might add is most helpful in providing needed information, there are 11,000, out of a work force of 44,000, unemployed in industrial Cape Breton. This represents 25 per cent unemployment. That does not include student summer unemployment. The record of this government, as we see the unemployment situation across the nation at this time of year, especially among students, is absolutely abysmal. The government is waiting until next fall to come up with a program.

Our local economy is on the ropes and the government is about to provide a series of damaging body blows. The fishermen and fish plant workers, all seasonally employed, now have the added worry of not having enough stamps to collect unemployment insurance if it is a bad season. Even if they get 12, 15 or 20 weeks' work, the period for which they will be able to draw will be substantially reduced.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration has not been truthful with parliament with regard to this matter. What will happen to the steelworkers laid off with no hope of being recalled until well into 1977? The Minister of Manpower—cynically, it seems to me—tries to argue that the figure of 330,000 individuals who would be affected by the increased eligibility requirement is wrong. He suggest that 100,000 at any one time would be affected. This is akin to the general who denies he had 12,000 troops die in a year, but says it was more like 1,000 a month. He states that almost half are under the age of 25 and many are working wives and young persons living at home. What is left unsaid is that over half are over 25. Furthermore, the minister says that only 80 per cent of the 8 to 11-weekers have established a seasonal repeat pattern. That is only 110,000 Canadians in the course of a year. There are 110,000 people who quite probably will not even be able to remain where they are to work those 8 to 11 weeks per year, if this measure passes.

I noted in passing what the manpower critic for the official opposition had to say in respect of minimizing the action of the government. In fact, if I may say so, the financial critic for the official opposition and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration seemed to be vying with one another as to who should receive the credit and who suggested this thing. The financial critic for the official opposition, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), congratulated the minister for adopting such a sound measure. During a question period after the budget I made up a little doggerel as I listened to the Minister of

Manpower and Immigration, the hon. member for Hamilton West and the hon. member for York-Simcoe vying concerning who should get the honour on this occasion. It goes like this:

Where could Mr. Andras have gotten
An idea so stinky,
Likely from Cafik and Liberal Ontario
Colleagues who are blinky,
But also of course from those vaunted
Ontario Tories called sinkie and linkie.

The Tory manpower critic quotes editorials from the *Globe and Mail* to support his stand. He should also read the columnist on the same page. Geoff Stevens, in dealing with the budget, pointed out that tampering with the UIC legislation might gain the Liberals a few votes, but it would be a mean and crass political manoeuvre to hurt those in society who can defend themselves least. The member for Hamilton West is concerned about abuses and disincentives to work. Perhaps when he wants to quote editorials he should read the regional press. An editorial in the Cape Breton *Post* stated:

Finance minister Donald Macdonald estimates that about half of these workers will simply find work for the additional four weeks now required and thus will retain their eligibility. This estimate seems overly optimistic but, even assuming Mr. Macdonald is correct, the implication is that those workers only stay on a job long enough to qualify for the pogey.

In effect, they are shirkers who would rather collect UIC benefits than go to work. Yet they are the ones who will retain their eligibility. At worst, they will be inconvenienced by having to work an extra month.

It is the other half of these 330,000 citizens (or more than half, if our guess is correct), those who are genuinely incapable of finding steady employment, who will suffer in Cape Breton, during the present economic travail.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being 5.50 p.m., pursuant to order made this day the House will proceed to the consideration of Bill S-35, to amend an act to repeal the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act and to amend the Trade Marks Act.

* * *

PROPRIETARY OR PATENT MEDICINE ACT, AND TRADE MARKS ACT

MEASURE TO EXTEND LICENCE DATE

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill S-35, to amend an act to repeal the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act and to amend the Trade Marks Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Goyer (for Mr. Lalonde) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

● (1750)

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss in my position as health critic for the official opposition if I did not make a few comments at this stage on the bill. I am sorry that the parliamentary secretary and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) both think it is of little importance and neither of them is here, having known well in advance that it would be coming up at this time.

We gave this bill a fairly careful look in committee and we learned a couple of things. I think the position which we took earlier in refusing to let it whistle through the House at all stages in one sitting, without any questions asked or any debate, was justified. We have seen examples that there has been a good deal of shortsightedness on the part of the government, and even a little bullheadedness when they dealt with this matter when it was presented to the House in the form of Bill S-9.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the bill deals with the repeal of the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act and replaces it with certain regulations under the Food and Drugs Act, provision 10, part C of the food and drug regulations. When this matter was first before the Senate, the Proprietary Association of Canada stated that they would require a December 31, 1976, proclamation date in order to have sufficient time to make changes in labelling and packaging to conform with this legislation. For some reason, the government at that time adopted a stubborn position and insisted on moving the date up to July 1, 1976. Very shortly thereafter it became obvious to the Proprietary Association of Canada, as well as to the government, that the representations made by that association in the first place were valid and that the date would have to be moved forward. So here we are, once again dealing with a bill which, if it had been carefully studied in the first place, and if the government had paid the slightest attention to the results of its consultations with the industry involved, we would not have before us now.

One of the reasons given, which struck me as rather strange, was that the principal hold-up which made it impossible for the industry to be ready for July 1 was the government itself because of its failure to provide certain numbers to its proprietary patent medicines, which are required in order that the labels be appropriately printed. When we were before the committee there was another show of gross sloppiness on the part of the government in that they had the parliamentary secretary speak on behalf of the government, but no officials of any sort. Indeed, there was nobody there to answer any questions on behalf of the government. The parliamentary secretary took a few guesses, but in the final analysis we had Mr. Don Harper, the president of the Proprietary Association of Canada, giving answers on behalf of the government.

Here was a man representing private industry answering questions in committee and trying to explain things on behalf of the government whose representatives were unable to provide us with the information required. I think that is a rather shameful approach by this government to parliament and to the committee system. It indicates a certain disregard, perhaps even a certain disrespect, for the validity of the work that committees do, because if the government had had regard for our committee's work it would have at least provided us with some experts or civil servants who could give us answers to questions.

We will not hold up this bill. As a matter of fact, we agree with its intent and we think it is necessary. We agree with the bill on the basis of assurances given us in written

form that the provinces will be ready to comply with this legislation by April 1, 1977. We agree with it, also, on the basis of assurances given us by the Proprietary Association of Canada that they will be ready on April 1 with their new labels and packaging.

With those few comments, I will conclude my remarks. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if anybody from the government side is listening—which I doubt—I hope they will have learned a lesson from this experience which suggests that if the job is not done right the first time, it has to be done again and in the long run this wastes everybody's time. We on this side of the House are not interested in wasting anybody's time. We think the government has a responsibility to try to run its business in an efficient manner, but in my view the manner in which this bill has been dealt with is far from efficient.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, whatever or however it happened, it seems quite clear that the mistake with respect to the date that was made in Bill S-9 needs to be corrected, as proposed in this bill, and therefore we are prepared to let it pass at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 10, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. G. H. Whittaker (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-84 proposes the abolition of capital punishment. I shall vote against the bill. By so doing, of course I shall vote to retain the death penalty for those who commit premeditated, first degree, coldblooded capital murder, call it what you will. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues in this House that no single issue, certainly since my election over two and one-half years ago, has caused me more personal concern and torment than the issue of capital punishment.

Some complex issues have been discussed during this period. I think of the efforts to deal with the economy, inflation and of course the frustrating issues of unemployment as well as the energy crisis. There have been more heated issues. We have only to recall to the judges' affair to establish this fact. However, in over-all terms the death penalty or its abolition contains such a tremendous mixture of values and considerations that the subject defies, at least for me, a logical or rational approach, and frankly, in my judgment, presents a problem that is incapable of a solution that will continue to be acceptable to all segments of our Canadian society and all regions of our country.

Likely by now most of us have had for some time a definite opinion on this issue. But the considerations that prompted us to formulate this opinion are not nearly so definite. A great deal of opinion has been based on religious considerations, and I think quite validly so. Much of my mail and the personal representations I have received have this basis. What is difficult for me, and I am sure some of my colleagues share this difficulty, is that we find different church groups taking diametrically opposite views on the retention or abolition of the death penalty. Similarly, I have many constituents, and I am sure I am not unique, who are members of a certain church who will disagree firmly and openly with the official view that the Church has taken. I suppose, therefore, I should not be too confused or even too surprised when I see two individuals in support of completely opposite positions quoting me the same Holy Scripture. That is the nature of capital punishment.

Another consideration involves the general concern regarding law and order, and in many cases it goes certainly far beyond concern. I detect a very real fear. People see an increase of some 25 per cent in the number of murders committed in roughly a five-year period, and they want a solution. Generally, people who are in fear look for a quick, simplistic and understandable solution. So the government has seen fit to bring in the peace and security package to this House for debate. It has tried to convince the people of Canada that this is one entire package, but really it is two different bills, Bill C-83 which deals at great length with gun control, wiretapping and other housekeeping amendments, and this bill. Bill C-83, the main thrust of which is gun control, has been debated in the House and it is now under discussion in the committee. Bill C-84 of course is the one we are debating now, and that deals with capital punishment. It also contains other provisions.

I wish to make another point regarding the conduct of the government in bringing in legislation such as Bill C-84. This bill has been highly touted as providing for a minimum 25 year prison term in place of execution. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) said this 25-year provision is harsh, that it may be counterproductive with respect to rehabilitation, that it may increase the problems in our prisons and for our prison guards. He does not know whether the 25-year rule in capital murder cases will act as a deterrent. In view of all this I, and others, must ask why we have the 25-year minimum rule? The only answer I can find is that the government, by instituting the 25-year sentence provision, may garner enough votes in this House to abolish capital punishment. It is the price it will pay to eliminate the death penalty which is unacceptable to it.

What happens then if this bill is passed? There are two classes of murder. A person convicted of either class may receive a sentence of life imprisonment. In spite of the sentence, is the murderer eligible for parole? Sure. In the case of first degree murder, the minimum 25-year rule applies. Does this mean that a murderer convicted of a cold-blooded murder has to wait 25 years to become eligible for parole? No, that is not what the bill provides. It provides that after 15 years a man convicted of first degree murder may have his case reviewed.

● (1110)

What does all this mean? It means that life imprisonment is not life imprisonment but 25 years, and it means that 25 years is not really 25 years, it is 15 years. Yet, the government wonders why the public is confused and angry. The government saw fit, in bringing in this legislation, to support it with a great deal of publicity and a high cost advertising program to try to convince the people of Canada that the peace and security legislation could

replace capital punishment in this country. We saw the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) on television and we heard them on radio. We received a great deal of literature, which must have cost the government a fair amount, and which was distributed to the people of Canada. Nevertheless I do not think that the government has been able to convince many Canadians to change their minds. I do not know what they have been able to accomplish so far as MPs are concerned. In their advertising they said that members of parliament should vote according to their conscience and not according to what their constituents want. They said this because they knew that a high percentage of the Canadian population is in favour of retaining capital punishment, according to the latest polls. In my riding the percentage in favour of retention is 84 per cent, and I believe it is 80 per cent across Canada. So, in their advertising the government is appealing to members of parliament not to vote in accordance with what the people of Canada want.

I do not believe they have been successful in convincing Canadians through this advertising program, and it is certainly not convincing many members of parliament to change their minds. In fact it seems that there is a hardening of attitudes among people in Canada with regard to this bill. We know, and much has been said and written on this, that there is to be a free vote on this issue. We also know that this is a government bill and that the peace package was brought in as government legislation. Bill C-84 deals not only with capital punishment, but with other matters as well. It is certainly the feeling of many of us that there will not really be a free vote on the government side, especially since we have been told that the cabinet will vote solidly for the bill.

Since I have been here we have had two votes on capital punishment in nearly two years, and since 1966 we have had four votes in the House on this issue. It appears to me that the vote will be quite close one way or the other, with the government making every effort that it can to ensure that the legislation is passed and that capital punishment is abolished in Canada, in spite of what Canadians want.

It is because of this conflict, and because I am not positive that this issue will be finally solved with the vote on this bill, that I am in favour of having a referendum on this issue. I do not favour government by referendum, but on an emotional issue of such importance it appears to me that if we are to solve this problem for any length of time we should let the people of Canada decide, not just the 264 members who are sent here to represent them. I would not want this practice to be extended to other issues, but I would certainly favour it in this case. If we have to bring forward bill after bill on capital punishment, eventually the government will be forced to carry out a referendum on this issue.

I made a speech on capital punishment in October of 1973 and at that time I outlined my reasons for being a retentionist. One is the fact that not much emphasis is placed on the relatives of victims of murder and all the attention is focused on the murderer after he has committed the deed. We hear a lot about the deterrent aspect of capital punishment. Many abolitionists say that the deterrent aspect of capital punishment must be proved beyond a shadow of a doubt. I really believe that capital punishment is a deterrent and I think I can use as many arguments as the abolitionists put forward to convince others that capital punishment is a deterrent. More emphasis should be placed on the fact that retentionists also have a conscience, certainly, this is true of a greater number than the abolitionists are prepared to admit.

[Mr. Whittaker.]

Then there is the subject of parole. Here again, if the government really wanted to demonstrate that it is going to tighten up the law and order legislation by doing what Canadians really want, then murderers would certainly not be let out of prison on parole after only a short period of incarceration. I think that Canadians have come to the conclusion that capital punishment is necessary because of the large number of murders that have been committed by people out on parole.

● (1120)

The matter of second offenders is a matter which should be considered in detail because many murderers have committed the offence of murder a second time. These people, under the rules of law and order we have in Canada, are not doing very much to convince the people of Canada that we should not have capital punishment. Second offenders most certainly should not receive anything less than the death penalty.

Those are the reasons I feel that capital punishment should be retained in Canada. I think the courts should decide, when somebody is found guilty of the type of murder for which capital punishment could be the penalty, what the penalty should be. That penalty should be carried out, and the Cabinet should not be permitted to decide that capital punishment should not be carried out.

I will close by saying that I do not believe retentionists are cold-blooded, hard-hearted, cruel or have no regard for human life. I believe it is easier to be an abolitionist than a retentionist. If capital punishment is retained, each of us voting for retention will have to bear some measure of responsibility each time capital punishment is carried out.

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have followed with considerable interest the debate on Bill C-84 to this date, and in particular, I paid very close attention to the statements made by the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Allmand) when he presented a brief on May 3, 1976 on the abolition of capital punishment. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) stated that the government of Canada, the ministry of the Solicitor General and he, personally, sees it as our first task in the field of criminal justice to protect the Canadian public against violent crime. I applaud the Solicitor General, as I am sure all hon. members of the House applaud this minister, since all of us in this House believe that the protection of the law-abiding citizen should be the first principle in the administration of criminal justice.

The minister further stated that capital punishment does nothing to protect the public, and those who argue that capital punishment does protect the public are using emotional, illogical and rhetorical remarks. Let me just pause at this point and quote from an interview with Ernest van den Haag, a psychoanalyst and adjunct professor at New York University. Professor van den Haag recently stated that he was in favour of the use of the death penalty for

certain types of crimes. He said that it is indispensable. He said that the federal prisons—and he was referring to the federal prisons in the United States—now have in custody a man sentenced to life imprisonment who, since he has been in prison, has committed three more murders on three separate occasions, and these murders included both inmates and prison guards. The professor said that there is no further punishment that man can receive and that in effect, he has a licence to murder.

Professor van den Haag dealt with another case and said that when a man is threatened with life imprisonment for a crime he has already committed, what reason has he not to kill the arresting officer in an attempt to escape? His punishment would be the same. In short, the professor said there are many cases where the death penalty is the only penalty available which could possibly deter.

In deference to the Solicitor General, that was not an emotional, illogical or rhetorical statement made by the professor. The professor disagrees with the Solicitor General. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that the statement made by the Solicitor General regarding deterence is open to question and interpretation, and that his statement that capital punishment does nothing to protect the public can be taken as a personal opinion rather than as a statement of fact.

In the statement on the abolition of capital punishment made by the Solicitor General there is a further reference to violent crime. Statistics have been brought in to show that the murder rate, as reported by the police in Canada, climbed since the last executions were carried out in 1962 from 1.2 murders per hundred thousand population to 2.4 murders per hundred thousand population by 1974. This is an interesting statistic because in the 12 years during which capital punishment was not carried out the murder rate has doubled. However, I must be careful because the Solicitor General states that those citing the increase in murder rates and concluding from those statistics that the lack of executions in Canada since 1962 is the reason, run the risk of deluding themselves and those who listen to them. I certainly do not wish to delude the House, because the minister went further and stated that the real problem is the growth in the rate of all violent crimes, and indeed, the growth of crime of all types both here in Canada and throughout the world in recent years.

I find little consolation in being told that I should not be incensed or distressed by the growth of the murder rate in Canada because violent crime has also been increasing. Could it be that the growth in the rate of violent crime in Canada and the doubling of the murder rate in a 12-year period just might be the result of a breakdown of deterrence in our criminal system, and that those who cause violent crime are very well aware of this breakdown?

Recently when touring the B.C. penitentiary, I and several of my colleagues were informed by the prison staff that approximately 80 per cent of the inmates were repeaters. In other words, they had not committed only one crime, but a succession of crimes. In all seriousness, is this an argument for making deterrence lighter or heavier? Are Canadians less law-abiding than they were 50 years ago, or are the same people perpetrating crimes, receiving minor sentences and being turned loose on society again?

It would be interesting to learn from statistics whether there are more people committing crime or whether the same people are being convicted on more than one occasion. Unfortunately, statistics tend to be rather dry in the reading, but to put the trend of murder in Canada in a better perspective, let me state that in 1955 there were 118 murders, while in 1974 this figure had risen to 539. I am afraid the trend of attempted murder is even worse than murder, according to Statistics Canada. In 1961 there were 74 attempted murders in Canada. In 1974 there were 524 attempted murders, so that in that 13-year period attempted murders increased seven to eight times, which I think is rather frightening.

It is not my intention to criticize the Solicitor General, but he stated that if those who suggest that capital punishment is an effective method of fighting crime were serious, they must argue that we should reinstate capital punishment for many more crimes and many more murders. I would only point out that in my humble opinion if the deterrents to all crimes were harsher, then those who prey upon the law-abiding citizen would have two choices. First, to be deterred by more stringent enforcement of the Criminal Code with longer sentences or, second, to be incarcerated for a period of time that would in effect protect the public at large. In those cases wherein the crime was so heinous and repugnant to our society that the ultimate deterrent should be provided, then the ultimate protection would be provided.

● (1130)

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to agree with the Solicitor General that the concentration on the issue of capital punishment does not serve Canada well and that ultimately the peace and security legislation embodied in Bill C-83 is of much greater importance. I realize that by stating this I will be in conflict with some of my colleagues and the general public in Canada, since they perceive the capital punishment issue much as a mariner would view an iceberg. The tip of the iceberg is an awesome sight and which can be clearly perceived; however, the main bulk and danger remains below the surface where it cannot be readily identified. Bill C-84 is a high profile bill. I would recommend that all hon. members of this House proceed with the speedy dispatch of Bill C-83 through the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs and third reading through this House, since the matters dealt with in this bill will ultimately have a greater impact on the protection of our Canadian citizens than will Bill C-84.

The hon. Solicitor General has quoted Professor Wilson who said: "It is a matter of dispute whether any penalty will have a deterrent effect on murderers, but surely the prospect of a long prison term will have as much as others." As a layman, I cannot dispute Professor Wilson but can only quote in rebuttal Isaac Ehrlich's recent article in the *American Economic Review*, where he stated: "Over the period 1933 to 1969 one additional execution per year may have resulted on the average in seven or eight fewer murders." My dilemma, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not know whether Professor Wilson or Isaac Ehrlich is correct in their statements and I doubt whether any of us in the House can make empirical judgments since experts disagree on whether capital punishment is a deterrent. Professor Wilson's thesis is that surely the prospect of a long

prison term will have as much deterrent effect as capital punishment. The hon. Solicitor General has apparently heeded the words of Professor Wilson, since C-84 establishes the punishment for premeditated murder as life imprisonment with a minimum of 25 years incarceration as the answer to the protection of society from those who would commit premeditated murder.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote Mr. William F. Phipps, Chairman of the Penal Reform Task Force of the United Church of Canada who states:

> We submit that the very extensive prison sentences will put even greater pressure on the penal system. The legislation seems to eliminate most of the current incentives, and when the incentives are lost, the pressure inside the institutions will be considerable.
>
> These terms will also create a different class of prisoner, who will be living in a different "head space" from other inmates. Therefore, we would predict a negative impact on other inmates as they see their colleagues having no chance for parole. Some well informed people are predicting that these kinds of sentences will increase violence within the penitentiary system. A more isolated and dangerous "subculture" will surely develop.
>
> Many of the programs within our prison institutions will be irrelevant because they are geared to inmates who are getting out of the institution. There seems to be no accompanying legislation regarding rehabilitation for such long term prisoners.
>
> There will be an increase in prison population and therefore increased human pressures as well as increased cost.

He made a very interesting comment which struck me as something that I should certainly look into when he stated:

> What happens to the inmate when he gets out of prison after serving 25 years? Most sociological data in this regard would say that the person would be more dangerous coming out than going in.

These are not my comments but those of William F. Phipps, Chairman of the Penal Reform Task Force of the United Church of Canada. I must say it is a rather chilling prospect to find that, according to his group, we are creating a dangerous situation within our penitentiaries and throughout our penal system if we adopt the provisions of Bill C-84 as they have been brought before the House. I think hon. members would agree that whichever way we vote on this, the object of the legislation is to not create more problems than we already have.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to quote further remarks made by Mr. Phipps but I think that is really the sum and substance of his remarks. I think the dilemma that we as members face in voting on C-84 is that we are told on the one hand by experts that life imprisonment should deter murders that are not crimes of passion. We are told again that by incarcerating a premeditated murderer we have removed him from our society therefore he is no longer a danger. On the other hand, Professor Van den Haag states that you run into an additional risk if you fail to execute the convicted murderer. In that case, since executions have had an additional deterrent effect, you have failed to spare the lives of a number of future victims. Mr. Van den Haag also states that between the two risks, first, of failing to impose the death penalty because it does not have an additional deterrent effect and thus by failing to execute the convicted murderer failing to spare the lives of future victims, he would much rather execute the convicted murderer than risk the lives of innocent people who could have been saved.

Mr. William F. Phipps, the Chairman of the Penal Reform Task Force of the United Church of Canada, although not in favour of capital punishment, has clearly stated there is a disadvantage to long prison terms and that the pressure inside the institutions will be considerable. He predicts there will be additional violence. It would be fair to say that not only is there no concurrence regarding the deterrence of murder by the establishment of capital punishment, but that there are also varied views regarding whether life imprisonment or the 25 year sentence will protect our society or merely lead to acts of further violence by the establishment of long prison sentences. This, Mr. Speaker, is the quandary in which I find myself; the dilemma the government has to face and the decision that we, the members of the House of Commons must make and there is no clear evidence on either side.

Mr. Speaker, our system of criminal justice is based not only on deterrence but also on fairness. A person who has committed a crime, I believe, must be punished in proportion to the seriousness of the crime. When you kill a man or a woman with premeditation you do something which is irrevocable to the victim; his or her life is lost forever. The society which does not deal swiftly and justly with premeditated murder detracts from human dignity and in fact argues against the sacredness of life.

One paradox, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe has been raised during this debate is why, in one of the most affluent countries in the world, during a time of almost undreamed of prosperity—undreamed of by our forefathers—are we experiencing a rapid rise in crimes of all types, including crimes of violence? In a society in which there is no class distinction, where anyone can rise to the potential of his or her own abilities, why should crime be increasing? Throughout the ages, the oppressed, the landless, poorly educated, those who have no material goods have traditionally taken to a life of crime because they could not obtain by honest pursuits what they could obtain by crime. Is this the case in Canada today? Are our children deprived of education? Are there oppressed people in our land? Is our society so stratified the people cannot succeed by ability? Surely, the answer is no.

● (1140)

Why has crime in Canada increased? I am sure there are many components to the answer. Could one component be that our society has turned the penal system and Criminal Code into an inconvenience rather than a deterrent. Should we not consider this? It is not our object, surely, to make the punishment for crime a mere inconvenience, which will leave the criminal free to pursue his course when he returns to society because we have not put road blocks in his way. I am no authority in this field. I merely bring to the attention of the House one of the causes for the breakdown of law and order in society.

In my opening remarks I agreed with the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), that the first priority of any member of parliament when dealing with criminal law is the protection of the public. Since experts have expressed grave doubts about life sentences, I must vote against Bill C-84. As an idealist I regret that our society is in many ways barbaric and cruel, as evidenced by the murders taking place in society. As a pragmatic legislator I abhor the taking of life. Nevertheless, the penalty must fit the crime. The Canadian people must feel that the legal system does not condone premeditated murder.

Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, a philosopher rightly showed that the more education gives a man liberty in his judgment, the more complex and shaded every issue appears to him. He sees the valid reasons both for and against, and becomes all the more incapable of taking sides. Obviously, this is a position that many members of parliament find themselves in on the question of capital punishment. Unfortunately for the politician, while he may philosophize with the philosopher, he must take matters one step forward, to decision and action. For many months and years now I have maintained the philosopher's position without coming to a full and real decision. However, having been forced to make a decision, it is my intention today not to outline both sides of the issue, both of which I have sympathy for, but rather to rationalize the side of the decision I have taken.

First, most of us have our own visions of what Utopia our society should hopefully evolve toward; then we rationalize and legislate toward such a better lifestyle for mankind. In the Utopia, there is obviously no requirement for capital punishment, because man becomes a self-actuated, self-responsible individual, maximizing his individual capacities in a creative and productive way born of respect for himself and for the individual rights of others around him. Such a society would require fewer externally imposed laws by government, because enlightened reason would have replaced force and irrational violence. In view of the affluence of our society, virtually total literacy, a population which has, on average, more than 12 years of formal education, securely and firmly based churches and our democratic government, one might expect our society to draw close to the reality of such Utopian objectives. But the reality of the situation finds us straying far, perhaps even regressing, thereby necessitating an agonizing and pragmatic reassessment.

The question of retention or abolition needs to be considered in a common sense way fitting the time in which we find ourselves, a time, hopefully, leading to man's upward ascent. As we move through time and space there will be stages in social evolution when punitive factors need to be imposed; at other times of greater order and enlightenment punitive factors can be moderated or even eliminated. While I prefer to support an upward or progressive evolutionary movement, in order to uphold the fuller, long-term interest and approach Utopia sooner I must accept that at times it will be necessary to recommend backward, punitive, even regressive measures.

When a democratic society attempts to move beyond the commonality of its moral ethics at a pace too fast for the overwhelming majority, such a democracy or government deserves its own inevitable self-destruction. Therefore it is necessary, in my opinion, to take into account the contemporary moral ethics of our society. It does not take an oracle for politicians, who are moulding our laws, to recognize that the basic moral ethic of today's society is that the most precious value is human life and the safeguarding of the free continuation of such life. If one person takes the life of another without a just cause, and the just cause is commonly defined as approval by the state, as in war; and if these two lives are weighed equally before the court, the death sentence is inevitable for the murderer.

A regulation against capital punishment would necessarily value the life of the murderer more than the life of the victim, since the life of the murderer would become untouchable. This, in my view, does not conform with the aspirations of justice maintained by Canadian society. Hence, capital punishment should remain as a possibility, no matter how rarely used, in order to further safeguard our lives and preserve the ethical equality before the law of all human beings. The victims of brutal murders had a right to life. The crime of murder is equally on the hands of the state as it is on the hands of the murderer himself. An individual living in a non-state or a state of anarchy carries his own responsibility for his personal protection and security. In an organized state he subjugates and passes his right of self-determined security by any means, including murder, to the state. In transferring this authority the individual expects to gain from that society the guarantee of his right to life, personal safety and security.

The state by allowing, for whatever reason, the murder of the individual has become itself a party to the murder and thereby has an obligation, not only to the victim of murder but to those other individuals who remain in society, to demonstrate the equity of the value of life to the state by providing that the value of the life of the victum is no less than the value of the life of the murderer. Society owes not only the victim but other members of society who have abrogated their rights of self-determined security to the state a demonstrated expression of equity in the form of capital punishment. That the state has the right to take life is necessarily obvious in that, in order to defend the sovereignty of its law, a state must maintain the right to defend its territory and laws from an aggressor. If a state does not maintain the right to kill in a defensive war, the law and thereby the state itself has no force, authority, or security. If a state maintains, as it must, the right to take life, particularly in face of an external threat to its sovereignty, then it too has an obligation and a right to take life internally when the right to life has been violated within the state.

● (1150)

When the state or its individual components, basic security or right to life or law are violated, the murder of an individual component of the state is in fact murder of the state itself. The killing of a murderer by the state is not revenge, it is rather self-preservation and the ultimate statement of intent to guarantee, as far as possible, the security of both the individual component parts, the people of the state and the state itself. The strongest instinct that man is born with is the instinct of self-preservation which, in turn, formulates his understanding of his most basic right and that is his right to life.

If the state refuses to uphold his most basic right with the ultimate penalty for the ultimate crime, why should the individual within the state continue to abrogate his right of self-determined protection to the state? If the state will not protect his right to life, does the individual regain by default the right of self-determined protection? Will the policeman or the prison guard or the individual not take this law then back into his own hands?

Killing is a natural part of the balance of the environment. Murder, on the other hand, is offensive to the environment. Murder is wanton, wasteful killing that upsets

the social balance of the environment. One of the most basic reasons for man collectivizing to form a state is to ensure his own personal security in a balanced, lawful, and orderly society. Murder upsets the social environmental balance. The killing of a murderer stabilizes and re-establishes social balance and order within the environment of the society.

The acceptance and adherence to law is a matter of a broad and general public perception. Some enlightened people obey the law because they perceive the law to be right and just and because they know that because they live in a democracy, they have the opportunity for direct participation in the formation and changing of these same laws. However, the majority seem rather to obey the laws that they perceive; that should they break the law, justice will be certain and swift. I am more certain to be caught, more quickly caught and convicted for over-parking at the airport than caught and convicted for premeditated murder.

Unfortunately, the broad perception of law and order in today's society is that justice is unsure, uncertain and even improbable. This negative perception is enhanced when governments are either unwilling or unable to uphold and enforce their own self-made laws, or when the law makers themselves, even in a minority, are perceived to be dishonest and corrupt. Unfortunately, this negative perception is the perception that abounds in Canada today.

Through the focus of this debate, the problem is further compounded in that the broad perception in the minds of Canadians is that this vote on capital punishment is a symbol of the intent of the government to re-establish the upholding of law and order. If the retentionists win the battle by defeating this abolitionist bill, the abolitionists still win the war because the limitations of the existing act then remain in force, and while the government of the day remains temporarily in power it will, in all likelihood, continue its abolitionist stance through the commutation provisions still available to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet. The retentionists will, however, have some solace knowing that they have raised the level of perception of the intent of the government to uphold the existing laws and order in Canadian society.

Not only must the question of the state moral ethic of the nation attempt to be determined, but also the church moral ethic requires examination. This is a considerably more difficult position to ascertain because of contradictions between and within the various Christian denominations.

The Pentecostal assemblies of Canada quote, amongst other things, the Bible, Numbers 35, verse 33, and verse 31 which read:

> Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death: but he shall be surely put to death.

They also quote Genesis 9, verse 6 and Romans 13. Ephesians 4, verses 31 and 32 and Matthew 5, verses 38 and 39 might well be cited by those on the other side of the question, the United Church of Canada which comes out clearly for abolition. They cite Matthew 5, verses 38 and 39 which read:

> Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

[Mr. Wenman.]

They may also quote Exodus 20, verse 13:

> Thou shalt not kill.

I could list other examples.

In the face of such contradictions by the various church establishments, the individual member of parliament is, even on the moral question presented with both positions, left personally to make his judgment as to the broad consensus of the Christian Church.

In the research and consultation that I was able to undertake, it seemed clear to me that while the establishments and hierarchy of some church organizations speak strongly and clearly in favour of abolition, an interdenominational broad poll from coast to coast would show that Christians in general are in favour of retention of capital punishment and, taken as a group, would exceed the percentage reported by the various polls in the nation's news media. While I cannot fully substantiate this claim, I doubt that there are many neighbourhood church leaders who would refute this probability.

Abolitionists tend to centre their case around the question of deterrents and varying forms of empirical statistical analysis. Between the years of 1970 to 1974, during which time Canada was in a situation of de facto abolition, Statistics Canada provides the murder statistics as printed in the text I speak from today. While from these statistics I could claim that the murder rate had increased 25.9 per cent across Canada and claim that the reason for the increase was because the death penalty was in fact not invoked during this period, I reject that claim in the same way that I reject the claim of the abolitionists who will produce alternative sets of figures and interpretations to make their case. In my opinion, all these statistics indicate is that the murder rate is clearly up but the reason for the increase in the murder rate is not solely due to the effectual abolition of capital punishment, as currently practiced, but is rather only one factor in the increase in murder rate; the actual causes being the sum total of the many variants relating to the lifestyle, economics, morality and values prevalent in our society during any given period.

Similarly, comparing murder statistics in abolition countries and non-abolition countries of wide cultural and value differentials lacks considerable credibility or validity. Comparisons of different regions to ascertain the deterrent value of capital punishment must reckon with such factors as the homogeneity of the society and its traditions, and whether these have been lawless or law-abiding. Even regions within a country indicate variations. It is not surprising, therefore, to see that in the Northwest Territories the increase between 1970 to 1974 was 14 per cent, while in British Columbia the increase was 47 per cent. New England also, as another example, as might be expected, has had a low murder rate over the centuries. Rising racial animosity in Boston and its suburbs seems likely to change this tradition as it has drastically altered the social climate of Philadelphia and San Francisco.

● (1200)

I make these points, not to make a case for the retentionists but, rather, to question the cornerstones of the abolitionist argument. I suggest that the bric-à-brac of the statistical by-play game has little real value and is invalid, or at the least misleading and inconclusive.

Abolitionists often attempt to discredit retentionists by claiming that they are emotional and non-objective. I suggest that more often the opposite is true. If we were to shun emotional response and look for objectivity and reason, the argument might well follow in this manner: living on a small and delicately balanced life support system, mankind, through his unbridled consumption and over-population has embarked on the irreversible self-destruction of his environment; the obvious end to this process is a lawless and chaotic struggle for depleting life support systems. Murder statistics show that where the population is extremely high, with extreme affluence at one end and extreme poverty at the other, the incidence of lawlessness, including murder, is also extremely high and increases rapidly. In order to restore a balance within the life support structure, society requires discipline, law and order and balance. If we could be totally objective and emotional, logic would accept the elimination of murderers from that society.

Those who argue against deterrence as being a factor in the prevention of murder seem, somehow, to categorize murderers as some sort of non-persons. We have become so preoccupied with distorted sensationalism in our thinking about criminals that we have almost succeeded in persuading ourselves that all criminals are radically different from other people; that they are utterly indifferent to rewards and incentives, and that they are capable only of response to fleeting impulses or passionately uncontrollable forces from within. As police superintendent Tom Flanagan said in an interview:

> Don't believe for a moment that they do not prize their lives as much as you and I. They have families like you. They have jobs, albeit illegal ones. They enjoy living and put a high value on their lives ... Anyone who thinks criminals do not weigh the possibilities of getting caught and do not understand that they could be executed is talking absolute balderdash. Every sane person thinks about the consequences of his actions. Some of these people are brilliant strategists and there isn't any way you can be that if you don't consider consequences and accept the risks involved.

Some abolitionists claim that no one in his right mind would purposely plan to kill another human being. There is an implication that all murderers must be depraved or insane. I maintain that in many cases not only is a murderer perfectly sane and rational, but also that he may well be highly intelligent. In such cases it is not a matter of sanity but, rather, a matter of moral values. If a murderer is sane and rational, he is also capable of considering consequences and of accepting the risks involved. In the case of murders of this type, capital punishment could well be one deterrent factor which would convince such a person not to commit murder.

Assuming the rationality of the criminal and his adherence to a set of values different from that held by "normal" persons in our society, the alternative to capital punishment is limited to some form of brainwashing or life imprisonment. Are the abolitionists suggesting total life imprisonment, or some form of mind alteration along the lines of the "Clockwork Orange" solution? Or, if the deterrent of capital punishment is removed, do abolitionists support the alternative of maintaining prisoners who pass their lives in drug-induced docility in root-cellar prisons?

Another favourite and typical statement made by abolitionists is this, "We must be very clear in our thinking and our motives must be objective and unemotional." Then, in almost the same breath, they quote the line about Madame La Farge taking her knitting to the guillotine. Or else they hurry to this description of a hanging and its aftermath:

> Two wardens would then cut the corpse down, lay it out on the table in the pit for the coroner to tuck the tongue back into the mouth, plug all orifices with cotton batten and then, while we stood around the body, proceed with the inquest.

It is interesting to note how on one hand an abolitionist will condemn emotionalism, while on the other using it for his own purposes. Mr. Speaker, murder is emotional and it is impossible to consider the subject without emotion. As a consequence, it is not my intention to discredit abolitionists who use this emotional approach. At the same time, I would not expect them to put down retentionists who use similar emotionalism to express the retentionist point of view. The question remains: What about the victim found in a bush area off the parkway who had been bludgeoned and stabbed several times with a screwdriver, or the two little girls who were raped and then strangled with their own blue jeans?

Those who hope that alternatives to capital punishment might have been found and presented to the House must be dismally disappointed in Bill C-84. There is nothing in this legislation to indicate that prisons will be changed so as to ensure that they are more than merely warehouses for convicts. There is no indication that the social and economic costs of locking people up for long periods have been considered. There is no indication that the government has a clear conception of the objectives it wishes to achieve in administering punishment by incarceration.

How can an abolitionist, who condemns capital punishment on the grounds that it is nothing more than revenge and an expression of the retributive urge support, proposed sentences of 25 years mandatory for first-degree murder, and ten years for second-degree murder? These proposals guarantee a prison system populated by men and women without hope. There is no evidence to support the notion that spending ten years in prison guarantees that a woman who shot her husband will emerge a better and happier person for that decadent experience.

If the abolitionists were truly humanitarian, they would call for indefinite sentences, recognizing that one man's rehabilitation might well take place in one year and that another's might never occur in a hundred years. They would call for punishment to fit the crime and the criminal, rather than a process of fitting the crime and the criminal to the punishment. They would recognize that one man's punishment might well be another man's pleasure, and vice versa. They would urge that those with maximum potential for rehabilitation should be identified and the full rehabilitative capacity of our society brought into effect; that justice be tempered with reason, emotion, mercy and love. The 25-year provision is arbitrary, illogical and self-defeating and I oppose it firmly in favour of the rehabilitative principles I have just enunciated.

In a complicated and diversified society such as ours, the 25-year provision will have little more effect than to restrict the parameters of justice by limiting the flexibility now given to judges to make allowance for the multiplicity of variants in the nature and individuality of the crime and the criminal. Our system requires a broad and full

range of options for punishment and rehabilitation—from pardon to parole, to prison, to solitary confinement, to capital punishment.

Like many other MPs, I questioned constituents regarding their views on the retention or abolition of capital punishment. While earlier questionnaires to the constituency elicited a return of approximately 8 per cent, the results of my last questionnaire showed that of 48,300 sent out, 7,885 were returned, for a percentage of 16.3. The tabulation indicated that 95.1 per cent of those who returned the questionnaire wanted capital punishment retained. Certainly, the value of such polls is not absolute. But whether the result showed 85 per cent or 98 per cent, the fact remains that it is a clear indicator of the broad, general feeling of my constituents and, in my opinion, of Canadians in general.

Like other members of parliament, I believe polls are only one of the factors which lead members to a decision on this subject. While I certainly did not agree with all the statements made in the hundreds of letters, telephone calls, conversations, interviews and public meetings, I might put on record a number of typical responses from constituents. Some thought there should be a national referendum and that the government should be bound by its results. Others pointed out that it cost between $10,000 and $15,000 a year to keep a prisoner in jail—money which might well be used to rehabilitate prisoners with a greater potential for return to the community.

● (1210)

Others say that we should strike a bold new step and bring back the noose; that until some better deterrent comes along we must retain the death penalty; that punishment must be swift and certain; that capital punishment is a deterrent. It is said there is a fundamentalist revival that recognizes revenge and retribution as valid motives for capital punishment; that we should vote secretly to avoid party pressure; that 25 years is a slow death; that capital punishment is justifiable homicide; that murder is an act of free will and the perpetrator must and should be held accountable with his life.

Others liken capital punishment to animal management and say that an animal that must be destroyed is destroyed without animosity or emotion but, rather, with cold, rational management. It is said that protection of the public is the most important consideration. Some ask, would the subject of capital punishment even have been raised if existing laws were enforced? Others say that responsible government is outmoded due to massive government intervention, that therefore there is confusion, and that consequently members of parliament should vote on a representative basis. Some feel the abolitionists should tell us how they will protect us. Still others claim that abolition has proved unsuccessful and they are tired of permissiveness, that now is the time to try severity. Some say that to propose the abolition of capital punishment for treason is treasonable; that we should not let the minority point of view of abolitionist members of parliament repress the will of the majority of Canadians. And so on and so forth, Mr. Speaker.

I could go on listing this typical kind of response that comes directly to all of us from our constituents. While I certainly do not endorse all of the sentiments expressed by my constituents in letters to me, the mood of the country is frightening, yet clearly expressed. In the final analysis, the government must reflect, at least to some degree, the tenor of the times, however much this distorts the priorities of reason. After all, Mr. Speaker, democracy can prevail only if the law reflects the will and tolerance of the people. It does seem clear from any broadly based assessment of public opinion that the tolerance of the people for a humane and, in the short run, somewhat riskier penal system is being strained to the point of breaking.

In casting my vote for retention I do so with considerable regret. The responsibility of a judge is heavy when he finds a criminal guilty of premeditated murder. But how much heavier is the weight and pressure of responsibility on a member of parliament whose vote is cast for legislation that will put a man to death?

As I cast such a vote for retention, I feel regret and sorrow both for the criminal and his family. I feel anger at the failure of the institutions of our society and the inadequacy of my own efforts within these institutions. I feel anger that the schools, after 14 years of education, have been unable to teach the young people of our community self-respect for themselves, let alone self-respect for others in the community. I feel concerned that the church that has preached loud through the centuries has been unable to achieve its objective. I feel concerned and disappointed that the home that is supposed to provide the base of security and acceptance for the individual has, instead, in too many cases, rejected the individual; and with the community rejecting the individual, resulting in criminality, that we then allow that condition to continue.

It is with great regret and responsibility, Mr. Speaker, that I shall cast my vote thus; and it is with a pledge to work hard to improve our society, to move it forward so that perhaps another day another time will come when I, along with others in the House of Commons, will find that the time has come to vote for abolition.

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I feel it is regrettable that members of parliament should be put in the position where this very serious matter is being debated once again. I feel this way because I think the responsibility for this must fall on the shoulders of the government. If the existing law had been upheld, as everyone in Canada expected it to be, we would not be discussing this bill in parliament today. When this bill comes to a vote, although I should not be prejudging the outcome, if it is defeated, then having spent many weeks debating this very serious issue we will again find ourselves in the position of having to live with the existing law and wondering whether the government is in fact going to obey it.

The second reason I am on my feet this afternoon is that I want to restate some of the views I hold about this legislation and to put forward a view that I think is held by the majority of my constituents. We are discussing Bill C-84 which seeks to amend the existing legislation, which provides that a murderer can be sentenced to death for the killing of a policeman or a jail guard and that all other cases of murder are regarded as second-degree murder. I say again that if the government had fulfilled its responsibility to the people of Canada, we would not be discussing this bill today.

The points I wish particularly to discuss this afternoon have to do with the arguments that have been presented on both sides of this issue; the arguments presented by the abolitionists from various articles available to us and to the public, and the arguments presented by the retentionists. The abolitionists advance the argument that the death penalty is not an effective deterrent to prevent murder. The second point they make is that the imposition of such a penalty is contrary to all concepts of Christianity. Their third argument is that the hanging of a murderer is nothing more than an instrument of revenge. Their fourth argument is that all forms of capital punishment are objectionable and repulsive, and that the alternative to capital punishment is life imprisonment and a rehabilitative program.

To take the first argument of the abolitionists, that the death penalty is not an effective deterrent in the prevention of murder, I suggest that the deterrent effect of a certain punishment has two aspects: deterrence as it applies to the convicted prisoner, and deterrence as it applies to others who read about or otherwise learn of the imposition of such a punishment on a prisoner convicted by the courts. I suggest that such a penalty is the only deterrent that will guarantee that a murderer will not commit a murder a second time. Life imprisonment is certainly an assurance that for a given period a second murder will not be committed, but with the government doing some of the strange things it has done in the past, that is not much of an assurance.

Life imprisonment does not mean that a convicted murderer will spend the remainder of his life in custody. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, all it means is a lengthy term in a penitentiary. But let us suppose that life imprisonment really does mean life imprisonment and that it would be enforced as presently proposed in Bill C-84. There is still a danger, and no guarantee, that a lifer will not again commit murder in attempting to escape from prison. Surely there is ample precedent for this view, and the possibility of prison murder increases as the number of lifers in prison increases.

The second argument that the abolitionists put forward is that the imposition of such a penalty is contrary to all concepts of Christianity. It seems to me that there is a conflict here. It appears to me that those who would make such a statement have not read three particular passages in the Bible to which I might refer. The first is Exodus, chapter 21, verse 12 which states:

● (1220)

He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death.

The second passage, Leviticus, chapter 24, verse 17, states:

And he that killeth any man shall surely be put to death.

The third passage, Deuteronomy, chapter 19, verses 11 and 12, states:

But if any man hate his neighbour, and lie in wait for him, and rise up against him, and smite him mortally that he die, and fleeth into one of these cities; then the elders, of his city shall send and fetch him thence, and deliver him into the hand of the avenger of blood, that he may die.

Surely the aforementioned passages are the wish of God, who is the divine ruler of the world, and anyone who does not want to abide by his ruling should not say that he believes in God, because if he does not want to abide by God's ruling how can he believe that God will save him from eternal suffering? Furthermore, as the Fifth Commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill". That tells you what not to do. The aforementioned Bible passages are warnings concerning what shall happen to anyone who kills a fellow citizen. It does not mean that they should get royal accommodation and royal service. Surely they should not receive the kind of treatment this government has been dispensing since the middle 1960s.

The third argument that is raised is that hanging a murderer is nothing more nor less than an instrument of revenge. I think the simple answer to that argument is that if the murderer has so little respect for the life of the victim, then it certainly does not appear to me that if society has no more respect for his life, that is revenge.

The fourth argument the abolitionists put forward in respect of capital punishment is that it is objectionable and repulsive. I must say that that statement is true. But, Mr. Speaker, so, also, are wars repulsive. Surely wars in the defence of one's country are not nearly as repulsive as wars fought to save political face, as has been the case in recent times where hundreds of thousands of "cream of the crop" young men have died to save the political image of politicians.

Yes, killing in any form is repulsive. It is as repulsive to take the life of a murderer as it is for a murderer to take the life of an innocent victim. But if that is the law of the land, then each one of us as an individual has the responsibility to abide by that law. So that is a valid point. Killing is repulsive. Killings by murderers are even more repulsive. In wartime, a Christian may kill an enemy in battle to prevent the enemy from killing other persons. Under the guise of self-defence, a Christian may kill an assailant who intends to kill another human being. Therefore, why may not a Christian government provide a law for the killing of a convicted murderer in order to protect its innocent citizens? I submit that killing of all kinds is repulsive, but capital punishment is not in the nature of revenge; it is, rather, a punishment justifiably prescribed by law, a punishment aimed to have effective deterrent results which I am thoroughly convinced it has.

As a retentionist, I believe that the repeal of capital punishment could unleash on society a greater number of criminals to murder innocent people, to rape, to maim, or to betray their country. I firmly believe that many the capital murder offenders are beyond the rehabilitative process. Surely not all, but many are beyond the rehabilitative process, and therefore the risk is too great. I believe that without the deterrence of capital punishment, the lifer would be much more violent toward policemen and authority, and there is a possibility that the people responsible in institutions would have to have their authority extended for the purpose of greater retaliation and this, reasonably, could lead to a greater upswing in violence and murder.

I suggest that 25 years in jail, as proposed by this bill, is less humane than the death sentence. Life imprisonment, particularly where there is little or no hope of parole, itself creates tension and anxiety. Custodial officers are forces to segregate or watch lifers most carefully. This places upon those officials an onerous and difficult responsibility, with a constant awareness of the danger to themselves.

I have on my file letters from people who have suffered through having lost loved ones who are prepared at this point in time to take the law into their own hands unless the government takes very serious action in this regard. To the extent that this government has not obeyed its own law, there has been, to a degree, a breakdown in our moral values. How does a government expect the populous of a nation to respect the laws this parliament passes, when the government fails to obey them?

It is true that in many instances the death penalty is not a deterrent. A person who is mentally deficient cannot conceive of his own death. Capital offences are usually of an emotional, spur of the moment nature. They are acts which are not planned. That, again, suggests temporary insanity, and in most cases that kind of murderer will not hang. It has been suggested that juries, in the knowledge that a man may die, are less likely to convict. Therefore, the culprit often is acquitted, which makes a travesty of justice. I have more faith in the jury system of this country than I have in a minister of justice or a solicitor general who will commute a death sentence when there is not a recommendation of mercy from the jury.

In conclusion, I wish only to say that my concern is not mainly in respect of murders of passion, murders that are not planned—because they cannot be controlled. They will not be controlled by Bill C-84. They will not be banned unless we ban the association of human beings one with another. What I am concerned about is the premeditated murder, organized crime, the hitman, so-called, and the destitute who deliberately plans to commit a robbery or a felony, and does so. I think to them it is a deterrent, because they are indeed very astute people in the pursuit of their trade. If weaponry is part of that pursuit, then the penalty for the crime should be the ultimate penalty.

I think the proposals in Bill C-84 are inhumane. Recent surveys have indicated that lifers who have been interviewed would prefer the death penalty to a 25 year sentence without hope of parole. The rehabilitation process is expensive, slow, tedious and uncertain. There is an everlasting risk of recidivism. Some way that capital punishment is archaic. Well, so is murder. The only thing modern about murder is the modern weaponry used to mow down a policeman or a bank teller. On the basis of that brief statement, I intend to vote against Bill C-84.

● (1230)

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko) and the members who spoke before him. They conveyed many of the sentiments that I wish to convey to this chamber. I am deeply concerned as I take the opportunity to participate in the debate this afternoon on Bill C-84. I do not propose to speak at great length on this legislation because, as I have said previously, many of my colleagues have already put forward many excellent arguments and any detailed remarks on my part would only prove repetitious on points that have already been made by these members.

However, I do wish to voice some of the sentiments and views of the constituents of Wetaskiwin on the extremely controversial issue of capital punishment. Nearly 90 per cent of the individuals who answered the recent question-

naire I sent out voted in favour of the reinstatement of the death penalty for all premeditated murders. Of the constituents who responded, 88.3 per cent said they wanted retention of capital punishment, 9 per cent favoured abolition of capital punishment, and 2.7 per cent agreed with the present law on the death penalty.

I found these results very interesting, particularly in light of a comparison between the current feeling and that of few years ago when we debated this issue. A poll of my constituency conducted in 1973 revealed that 74.3 per cent of the individuals who responded favoured reinstatement of capital punishment. Yet a large percentage—some 47 per cent—were willing to consider life imprisonment as a satisfactory substitute for capital punishment. Today, only 17.7 per cent believe that long prison terms would be an acceptable alternative to the death penalty.

Emotions in Canada are running extremely high because of the steady increase in violent crimes, in particular crimes in which the victims have been innocent, law-abiding citizens or law enforcement agents. Naturally, in view of the number of horrible murders and violent crimes committed recently in this country, the current major concern of all Canadians is the prevention and reduction of crime in order to protect our society. I believe that much of the strong feeling in my riding in favour of capital punishment stems from a concern over the lawlessness that individuals see everywhere today, and frustration over the fact that the law as it now stands has not been carried out by the present government.

I do not intend to involve myself in a discussion of the possible deterrent effects of the death penalty. Others have argued against the arguments of the abolitionists. The hon. member for Edmonton East recently put those arguments on the record. Rather, I would like to say a few words about the general scope of this bill. The government is presenting the citizens of Canada with an ill-formulated and, I believe, an unjust piece of legislation containing provisions on two aspects of conflicting principles which should more properly be dealt with in their own right.

The gist of the legislation is, first, to abolish capital punishment entirely in favour of lengthened imprisonment terms; second, to impose mandatory sentences of 25 years and 10 years to be served for first-degree and second-degree murder, respectively, without any consideration being given to the crime itself and the circumstances surrounding it. Little room is left for the exercise of judicial discretion. I think I am correct in saying that most retentionists would not advocate the death penalty for second-degree murder, say for a murder of passion resulting from a domestic dispute. The majority of these killings are unpremeditated, even accidental; the murderer would probably never again commit such a crime and therefore poses no threat to society or the safety of others.

While no one can condone the taking of life, for whatever reason, I believe that few people would maintain that a person who has no previous criminal record and who committed a crime of passion should be incarcerated for a minimum of 10 years. The punishment should be dependent upon both the individual's past behaviour and the circumstances surrounding the crime itself. To imprison a person who may contribute something of value to society and whose freedom constitutes no threat to the well-being

of others seems both unfair to society in general and to the individual in particular.

I believe in the premise that if you put someone in prison, he can be rehabilitated. The same can be said of individuals who commit first-degree murder. Will a mandatory 25-year sentence really prove of concrete value? During the 25 years in prison, the prisoner constitutes a burden to the Canadian taxpayer. He is a potential escapee and poses a danger to other prisoners and prison officials. On the whole, I think that a blanket 25-year sentence is not the answer for all first-degree murders. Some individuals deserve harsher treatment, others could be treated more leniently. Again I reiterate that the punishment has to be suited to the crime.

It seems to me that there are, indeed, instances where the death penalty is warranted: for mass murders perpetrated by organized crime syndicates, for treason killings, political assassinations, ritual slayings, killings of policemen and law enforcement officers. Even for some cold, calculated murders planned for financial gain, the death penalty would not be unreasonable, dependent upon the circumstances involved in the crime. But there may well be mitigating circumstances in some first-degree murder cases, and these should be carefully examined before sentence is passed.

Let us consider, for example, a man who plans to slay his wife's lover, or who plots the murder of a drunken driver who has seriously injured or killed his child or spouse. This man would be extremely unlikely to ever kill again, and could doubtless contribute more to society outside the prison walls, after he has been punished, than by being incarcerated for 25 years. Certainly he must be punished, but the punishment must suit the crime.

The Canadian people are indeed concerned, with justification, about the recent rise in our crime rate. They want action, and this is something the present government has failed to give them thus far. Even though the law at present calls for the death penalty for murderers of policemen and prison officials, the cabinet has commuted every death sentence. Likewise, rehabilitation efforts on the government's part have proved minimal, at best. Once again, with the introduction of this legislation the government has failed the citizens of Canada and has failed to show leadership in this very important area.

● (1240)

We are faced with only one alternative: abolish capital punishment and enforce lengthened prison sentences, with no regard for the nature of the crime. Imposition of the death penalty and prison sentences should be discussed separately. They should not be part and parcel of the same piece of legislation. The circumstances surrounding each crime must be carefully examined before sentence is passed, be the sentence the death penalty or imprisonment.

However, the enforcement of harsher penalties after a crime has been committed cannot, alone, lead to a lower crime rate. More effective correctional and rehabilitation programs are essential for both juveniles and adults which will, as much as possible, ensure that a prisoner upon his release from prison will be fully rehabilitated and declared fit to join society again. The government must concentrate its efforts on providing valid, constructive rehabilitative programs in our prisons.

The entire peace and security package is supposedly designed to bring about a decrease in Canada's crime level. I fail to see how this legislation will prove effective in so doing, just as I fail to see how Bill C-83 will help in this area. Rather, I view this bill particularly as a thorn in the side of Canada's criminal law and jurisprudence system.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that capital punishment is a very difficult subject with which to deal. This has been amply demonstrated. There is the humanitarian standpoint and the standpoint of law and order in the state. A society without guidelines and ways and means of applying justice to those who would offend has nothing but anarchy and disorder. Justice must be meted out well and fairly to both the offender and the offended. Generally, in those cases the offender's peers sit as a jury and listen to all the evidence presented by both sides, and the judge sums up the case. The jury then carefully weighs the evidence to see that justice is done and that the judicial laws of this country are carried out. However, with this legislation I believe the government is trying to trade off capital punishment for long prison sentences to appease the people because of the long list of murders which have occurred since the government has failed to carry out any executions for the murder of prison guards or police officers since 1961. Let us look at the trend of murder from 1961 to the present time. We see that murders have doubled and that attempted murders have quadrupled. This is over a period of years when never have we given more to help social well-being in the community. Never have we spent more on housing, education and health. I am sure this is why the people of Canada have said they have had enough. They say that we have tried another plan and found it wanting. In my own constituency, people are overwhelmingly in favour of capital punishment. I feel that regardless of my own beliefs, I represent the thoughts of those people and in no way would I be responsible if I did not consider those wishes.

The carrying out of capital punishment should not be done by hanging. I think there are far more humane methods than hanging. A life can be taken in the quietness of a chamber with a minister or priest, prison officials and a judge present and giving the prisoner a period of time to make his peace. As an alternative, I could not be cruel enough, in any way, to sentence any man to 25 years in prison or a longer term if necessary—and that will be necessary because very few prisoners who receive a term of 25 years could be reformed or rehabilitated. All such a sentence can do is frighten or frustrate a man because of the long road ahead with nothing but hopelessness, walls and cells. Much better it would be to have the little white chamber and a quiet exit, than the Chinese water torture method of destroying a man's soul a little bit each day.

The minister states that cases would be reviewed in 15 years. At least all hope will not be taken away from prisoners. But 15 years is destructive in itself. A man going into prison at 35 years of age would be released at 50 years of age into a vastly different and rapidly moving world. Rehabilitation of this man would be beyond one's fondest dreams. Even if I was an abolitionist, there is no way I would have the heart or cruelty within myself to impose a

prison sentence of this length with the hope of rehabilitation, knowing full-well that rehabilitation would be nearly impossible. If we take an active individual and sentence him to 25 years in prison, he will become a robot with no hope for the future.

I want to substantiate that statement with the statement of Dr. Boyd, who is the head of the institution for the criminally insane. Incidentally, Dr. Boyd was an abolitionist, but he now says that he is forced into taking the position that we must have capital punishment and he has retired entirely from his position of being an abolitionist. He states that it would be absolutely impossible to control or to help a fellow who is facing that long prison term, and that bit by bit we would not only destroy him, but we would also destroy any chances of rehabilitation. Further, it would frustrate the man and he could very well become an incorrigible prisoner who might lead prison riots or lead others into grabbing hostages. As I said before, never before in the history of prison reform have prisoners been treated as well as they have over the last ten years, and never before have there been so many guards taken hostage. We have seen that in the west, and we have seen it across Canada. So here we have, as reported, a man of Mr. Boyd's stature, someone intimately associated with the criminally insane, saying that this long sentence will completely destroy any chance of rehabilitation.

I remember well once seeing a fellow in prison clothes standing outside Kingston penitentiary. I went inside and told a guard that there was a man out there on the prison walk, and I was told that that fellow had been released three years ago but he did not want to go out; he was absolutely unable to face the world.

I ask, which is kindest, cruelly destroying a person day after day in a cell over a period of years, or quietly letting that person meet his maker after he has had a good opportunity to see his priest or preacher, to set himself right after the criminal acts he has perpetrated in this world and to ask forgiveness in eleventh hour repentance?

I have heard people quote the Scriptures. I think the Bible can be used to back any stand. I have here an article by John Palmer, published in the Orillia *Journal*. John Palmer is the son of a minister. He states that this humanitarian standpoint started in the nineteenth century. He says it is a good standpoint. He continues, and says that people are quoting the Bible to back their stand, and one quotation they are using is, "Thou shalt not kill." He goes on to say that it is now known to be correctly translated, "Thou shalt not murder." There is one quotation which covers murder and which I think is very relevant. When Christ was asked about taxes, he answered, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." What Mr. Palmer was saying is that you have to run this world by law and order.

● (1250)

I wanted to point out that it is probably a failure of society and probably a failure of the church that there is not enough contact with families who need help. Perhaps a young man could be saved from a life of crime, or a young girl from a life of prostitution. On the whole, society has treated its citizens well, but over the past several years we have had many prison riots and anti-social behaviour in the prisons although social workers and others try hard to improve the system. How many prisoners have been killed within prisons in the last few years? This government imposes long prison sentences and total confinement for psychopaths, which just means that more prisoners will be killed. It just means that we will have to employ more security guards and this should be a priority.

At the same time as we are doing this, however, we are closing hospitals and firing staff, which means that we do not properly provide for the sick and severely afflicted. Some of the sick and afflicted are really under a sentence of death because they are going to die of the disease from which they suffer. On the other hand, the bank robber who laid plans and carried a gun with him at the time of the act, and knew that he might either kill a policeman or be killed by one, has in effect accepted the possibility of death. If he killed one or two policemen, the possibility is, today, that he would be sentenced to 25 years behind prison walls. But, Mr. Speaker, this also destroys a man day after day.

Many years ago, when I was a medical student, we took clinics in the penitentiaries and observed that long prison sentences destroyed any chance of rehabilitation. Many prisoners told us that they would rather have been shot when robbing a bank than land in prison. To me, the ultimate cruelty is 25 years behind bars. With a short prison sentence there is a chance for reform. If a prisoner gets out within five years, I believe there is a good chance of keeping him away from crime—and particularly if he is crime-free in five years.

Psychiatrists, doctors and social workers have never been able to determine what goes on in a man's mind. I remember the famous "Red" Ryan who escaped from Kingston penitentiary in 1922. He had killed someone during a bank robbery and was sentenced to life imprisonment. After his escape he was recaptured and returned to the prison under guard. For some time he caused all kinds of trouble, and then was put in the "hole", on bread and water. He started a whole destructive process in the penitentiary, through chants. I remember being in the prison hospital one day treating some prisoners, and the chanting was so loud that we could not hear ourselves speak. All the prisoners, even the one we were treating, were chanting.

That is not an easy thing to handle. Eventually, Ryan began to reform and he became an orderly. He was good looking, bright and intelligent, with an IQ of, I believe, about 150. He worked in the library and then in the works department and became a model prisoner. He was a Roman Catholic and the priest declared that he was reformed and could be paroled. I remember that R. B. Bennett was prime minister at that time. After "Red" Ryan's parole he went out speaking to service clubs and to boys' clubs, telling them that crime did not pay. He was a real success story. In time, a series of murders were committed in the Toronto area where Ryan lived. He also had a cottage at Jackson's Point. At Stouffville, which is near Toronto, a man discovered that his garage was being robbed and tires taken. His dog had been shot, so he went out himself to stop the robbery, and he was shot. He left a wife and three children. Some months afterwards, "Red" Ryan was shot dead in the process of robbing a liquor store in Sarnia.

What I am trying to convey, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no way a psychiatrist or anybody else can look into the mind of man and say what he is going to do. Man has a computerized brain and we do not know what starts the computer or what stops it. That just has not been discovered, so there is no way that we can predict a man's future.

Then there was the O'Donnell case in Toronto. A young school teacher had been murdered, her skull crushed. She had also been raped. O'Donnell was picked up. He had already served a term in Kingston for the same thing.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock, at which time the House will resume routine proceedings.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

SUGGESTED RESTRUCTURING OF APPEAL BOARD PROCEDURES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, relating to immigration appeal board procedures and departmental policy. Some months ago, an appeal board consisting of Rachel Tremblay, widow of former Liberal cabinet minister Rene Tremblay, Jean Rochon, a former Liberal MP, and Carmel Carriere, a former executive assistant to the then minister of transport, rejected the appeal of Czech ski champion Frantisek Charvat who had opposed the 1968 occupation of his country by the Soviet Union and consequently was harassed and jailed. In order to escape his country he used bribery and subterfuge and our appeal board used the astonishing rationale that because he had used deception to escape from Czechoslovakia any punishment he would incur there was deserved and he was, as was his countryman Jan Morcinek in another instance, ordered deported. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro):

That this House instruct the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to restructure application and immigration appeal board procedures in order that refugees from oppressive régimes will in future be treated with more understanding and compassion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DR. JOSE CASAL, MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT FOR VENEZUELA

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I know that hon. members will wish to join me in extending a warm welcome to Canada of a very distinguished visitor, Dr. Jose Ignacio Casal, the Minister of Development for Venezuela.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INCREASE IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX—REASON ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM NOT MORE EFFECTIVE

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the sad news for Canadian consumers contained in today's announcement relating to the Consumer Price Index and noting that the minister stated on three or four occasions in his budget speech that the anti-inflation program had begun to take effect, I now ask the minister how he can reconcile this point of view in view of today's figures showing an alarming rise in consumer prices?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have noticed as well in the budget statement that I referred to the fact that the reduction of beef prices in particular had been one of the bases for the reduction in the Consumer Price Index. Of course, one of the principal factors in the change in the month of May was an increase in that item. The two major elements of increases are two items not covered by the control program, namely farm prices and the budgetary policies of provincial governments. Unless the hon. member is suggesting that we should attempt to exercise control in those areas, I would have to express my regret that there has been the increase in the past month, but it seems to indicate more than ever that we will want the program to be effective in that part of the economy which is under controls.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: This is more than just an ordinary increase, Mr. Speaker. The minister's very credibility is on the line.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grafftey: The government has statutory authority to protect the Canadian consumer. Considering that today's news as published by the Consumer Price Index indicates that the government had been relatively successful in controlling wages and low income salaries, but not successful in controlling prices, something very serious especially for low income Canadian consumers, what immediate

action can we expect on behalf of the beleaguered Canadian consumer from this government today or before the budget debate is over?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, may I first draw to the attention of the hon. member the analysis of the figures as follows: Higher beef prices, up 12.4 per cent on average over the previous month, were the largest single contributing factor to the 1.5 per cent rise in the food index. As to the non-food price increase, increased prices for tobacco and alcoholic products which were mainly brought about by various provincial budgetary measures accounted for most of the 0.6 per cent rise in the index for all items excluding food. Unless the hon. member is advocating control of farm prices, which this government has chosen not to do, and unless he is advocating that provincial budgetary decisions should be subject to the control of the federal government, regrettably I feel there is nothing can be done about that kind of increase. It does indicate that greater support should be given to the controlled part of the economy.

● (1410)

Mr. Grafftey: The minister will not get off the hook with that kind of sophistry. Can he assure the House that the price increase is related to food before it left the farm gate? Is he completely unaware of the policy our party has proposed in connection with food prices?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The price increases are, of course, related to the price of beef generally. With regard to salary and wage costs involved in the food processing and distribution industry, may I point out that a moment ago the hon. gentleman objected to the notion we should exercise control over wages and salaries; the fact of the matter is that at least with regard to the major packers these are subject to control under the anti-inflation program. With regard to the basic cost of livestock, it is not the policy of the government to control this as it affects the farm community. In that respect I think I would have the support, if not of the hon. gentleman, then at least of some of his colleagues.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

NUMBER OF CASES AWAITING DECISION—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO REDUCE BACKLOG

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance with respect to the effectiveness of the Anti-Inflation Board. On April 30 he told the House that the majority of the 3,900 wage settlements awaiting ruling by the Board should be, and I quote, "cleared in the relatively near future". Since the AIB has reported that a ruling is still awaited on 3,000 wage settlements, can the hon. gentleman tell us what he meant by the phrase "relatively near future" and can he provide the House with a revised estimate of the date by which the backlog will be reduced to more manageable proportions?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Many of the cases under consideration at that time have been disposed of but naturally, in an ongoing program, cases are added from time to time. The necessity of scrutinizing individual cases with great care and of re-examining some of them—I have in mind, for example, the re-examination which was pressed upon us by the hon. member's colleague with regard to the situation in Thompson, Manitoba—naturally means that the Board must spend more time on individual cases and is therefore not able to get on as rapidly with the others.

REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF SIZE OF STAFF REQUIRED THIS YEAR

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): My supplementary is based on the fact that the staff of the AIB now exceeds 850, which is more than double the figure of 398 for which provision was requested in the main estimates. Can the minister provide a revised estimate of the Board's staff requirements for the current fiscal year—an estimate which will bear a closer relationship to the actual number of personnel required to administer the program?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): It seems to me the hon. gentleman is contradicting himself. The Board has a heavy volume of business before it. A few moments ago he was complaining because it has not dealt with all the cases on which decisions are pending. Now he is critical because the staff has grown, even though a large volume of work remains to be done.

Mr. Alexander: I asked a simple question. Can the minister give us some indication of the staff required to deal with these matters? Has he a new figure to give to the House?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I do not think one can provide such a figure in precise terms, because I cannot tell which agreements will fall within the arithmetical guideline. The Board will have to respond to the pressures placed upon it as a result of collective bargaining settlements throughout the country.

* * *

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR MEASURES TO CONTROL LAND SPECULATION AND MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the most recent consumer price index shows that the cost of home ownership rose by 14.5 per cent over last year and by .9 over the past month, and since home ownership is one of the few areas left completely uncontrolled by the anti-inflation program, can the minister inform the House what measures he intends to take to assure Canadians they will not continue to see land speculation and mortgage rates drive home ownership further and further beyond their reach?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): While it is true that some parts of the real estate sector of the economy are not subject to the control of the Anti-Inflation Board, insurance prices are now subject to con-

trol. Municipal taxation is not, nor indeed are rents. However, rents are subject to provincial rental control. In general terms, the government has proposed to deal with actual ownership charges as opposed to rental charges, of the kind such as the program that my colleague has set forth, so as to bring down interest rates for those in the lower range of income levels.

Mr. Rodriguez: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that not just lower income Canadians are finding that home ownership is beyond them but so are the middle income Canadians, in view of the fact that mortgage interest rates charged by the banks are completely uncontrolled, and since we were hoping that the minister would have included a measure in the budget respecting mortgage interest rates, is the minister contemplating, now or in the very near future, to establish some kind of controls or rollbacks of mortgage interest rates so that middle income Canadians can also afford a home?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, a formal ceiling on interest rates would only make certain that less funds were put into mortgages for real estate purposes than is the case at present. My colleague the Minister of State for Urban Affairs has put forward, under the assisted home ownership plan, specific measures designed to bring down interest rates for those at the lower end of the income scale, the group within the community that has very high priority with us.

Mr. Rodriguez: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While I am in some agreement with the minister in that the fixing of interest rates might result in less money being put into housing, would the minister consider what this party has always suggested, that legislation be implemented which would force the banks to set aside mortgage funds for those who would like to build their homes at reasonable rates of interest?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the rate of interest is the price of the money borrowed. Of course, if one starts setting interest levels which are below the rate of inflation in Canada, one can be certain that funds will not be coming forward from the many millions of Canadians who are depositors and investors. So in that sense an over-all ceiling would be counter productive in terms of having additional mortgage funds made available.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INCREASE IN PRICE OF SUGAR—REQUEST FOR INQUIRY

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. However, I think he is not in his seat. Perhaps the minister who replaces him or his parliamentary secretary could then answer my question.

As a matter of fact, this question relates to another question I asked him on May 11, concerning the increase in the price of sugar. Considering that companies also take advantage of the conversion to the metric system to reduce containers while retaining the price of old containers, thereby raising the price of sugar, can the minister tell the House what steps have been taken or what investigations have been made concerning the rise in the price of sugar?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will take note of the hon. member's question and as soon as he returns, the minister will give an answer. However, if it is possible, I will answer the hon. member's question myself before the return of the minister.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

RECOMMENDATION FOR NATIONAL FOOD POLICY—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that is supplementary for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the president of Canada's largest retail chain has predicted that food prices in Canada this year could go as high as 10 per cent, and further went on to recommend the development of a national food policy to co-ordinate the interests of consumers, producers, processors and distributors, may I point out to the Minister of Agriculture that a similar recommendation was made by the special committee on food prices in 1972. May I ask the minister what steps the government is taking to bring in a co-ordinated food policy for Canada that would serve the best interests of Canadian producers and consumers?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to remind the hon. member that the country that has the cheapest food in the whole world is the United States of America. Call it what you want, food policy or not, with the distribution system and climatic conditions, food in Canada costs only one per cent more. I have not seen any great move in the United States to change over to a food policy in that country. So we are not doing all that bad in Canada, but if there is room for improvement we will do it. The food index after declining for four consecutive months rose one and one half per cent between April and May to account for nearly half of the over-all consumer price index. This index is 6.2 per cent higher than one year ago as compared to 10 per cent for all items, excluding food index. So, we must get the facts straight concerning what really has increased the market.

● (1420)

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a supplementary question and remind him of a statement made to the Retail Council of Canada by the vice-chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board in which she predicted that there would be a serious increase in the price of food in Canada in the months ahead. Can the minister tell us, in view of the prediction by Mrs. Plumptre and in view of the projection of the President of Dominion stores of Canada what policies he is proposing to his colleagues in cabinet to coordinate the food policies in Canada or are we to continue to suffer from the ad hoc policies of the minister which hurt both the consumer and the producer.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the food producers in Canada are the envy of the world, not only the small countries but many of the large countries also. Food prices are virtually the same as they were in October. The all-items excluding food index rose some 5.2 per cent. What I am saying is that we must be realistic about this whole thing. The income of farmers actually went down last year. The hon. member quotes the head of a supermarket as a source of information. They share over 60 per cent of the money that the food consumers of this nation pay. Maybe this is a place where expenses should be curtailed. Perhaps he should be asking them more questions because we made the same prediction in our department that the vice-chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board made, that food prices would go up because the farmers are still getting less return than they were last October.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE TO CO-ORDINATE FOOD POLICY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a final supplementary in view of the fact that we cannot get an objective, rational response from the Minister of Agriculture.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: May I ask the Prime Minister, who has the over-all responsibility for coordinating government activities, if he will undertake to determine what became of the Interdepartmental Committee which was supposed to have been set up by the Minister of Agriculture quite some time ago to make recommendations regarding a coordinated food policy for Canada.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the premise of the question. On the contrary I think the Minister of Agriculture is giving very rational answers on these points. I am surprised that the hon. member seems to be disappointed with the position the minister adopts in defence of the farmers.

* * *

INDUSTRY

POSSIBLE DATE FOR INTRODUCTION OF PRODUCTIVITY INCENTIVES

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the minister's exhortations on Monday to the Canadian Manufacturers Association that they should sell considerably more products to try to revive Canada's sagging trade balance and put it on the plus side of the ledger, and as the main reason our sales have fallen so badly in recent years has been a steady decline in the last four years of industrial productivity, I would ask the minister does he intend now at long last to introduce productivity incentives to be paid in direct proportion to increases in industrial productivity so that we can lower costs and prices and thereby make our products more competitive to sell in the kind of increased volume the minister has requested.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as I said in my comments on the budget debate a couple of days ago, we are directing a great deal of our attention to the question of productivity. The summary the hon. member has mentioned might work for some sectors, specifically manufacturing and processing, but would not be effective in others. But, as I think the Minister of Finance also indicated earlier on, we are prepared to listen to and receive representations from business concerning how in fact such incentives can be applied. In other words, the principle is a very sound one but I am sure the hon. member will agree it is not just a simple matter that can be stated in a couple of moments, which is what he suggested it is.

Mr. Hees: As I listened very carefully to the minister's speech in the House and found nothing positive regarding the introduction of productivity incentives, and as I have been asking for the past two or three years about the introduction of just this kind of incentive, does the minister mean to tell the House that he and his predecessors have waited until now to ask businessmen for some suggestions as to how the kind of productivity incentives that I have been suggesting, and which businessmen all agree would make very good sense, could be put into operation?

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Speaker, we certainly have not waited until now. Futhermore, the hon. member is using the word "businessmen" as if it incorporated everybody in the country. I can assure him that there is a wide variation of opinion among businessmen as to the form which the incentives should take. If you adopt it purely for manufacturing and processing on the one hand, what do you do for those industries which are extremely valuable and important to the country but in which it is not as easy, indeed it may be almost impossible, to assess what the productivity gains are. It is that kind of issue which we are trying to resolve.

Mr. Hees: Let us see you start with industry and I will give you the other answers later.

* * *

ENERGY

ALLEGATION PLUTONIUM IN HANDS OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF NUCLEAR POLICY

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

An hon. Member: Back to your seat, Pierre.

Mr. McGrath: Behave yourself because she is a lady.

Miss MacDonald: My question relates to the affidavits signed by the president of the Greenpeace Foundation that

he was offered an ounce of plutonium, indicating that the most lethal substance is in the hands of non-governmental agencies. Given that the Minister of Justice has called for an immediate check into the possible existence of a black-market operation dealing in plutonium, would the Prime Minister say what action the government will initiate to get to the root of this vital matter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, the hon. lady is informing me that the Minister of Justice said he would inquire into this. I think this was a very speedy response from the Minister of Justice, and I support him wholeheartedly.

Miss MacDonald: I would think that on an issue of this magnitude the Prime Minister would be better informed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss MacDonald: Given the serious implications of this incident and the fact that the Minister of Justice did not spell out any pattern by which he would follow up such an inquiry, would the Prime Minister undertake to ask the government House leader to put down a motion to refer this matter to committee where it would be possible to call witnesses and to have a meaningful public hearing on the safety aspects of Canada's commitment to nuclear energy, both at home and abroad?

Mr. Trudeau: On the first part of the question, I must tell the hon. lady that I am not informed about all the things my ministers do. I can assure her that they do not jump to the telephone every time they have an important decision to make. This indicates that they are strong men and woman able to take their own initiatives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I do not know how the hon. lady could really expect that I would be informed that some person somewhere is taking an affidavit that he has been offered an ounce of plutonium.

Miss MacDonald: It has been on the news for a day.

Mr. Trudeau: I am sorry; I do not listen to the news.

An hon. Member: You don't listen to the people, either.

Mr. Trudeau: As I have explained to my backbenchers, that is why I do not have ulcers or insomnia.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: That is a free bit of medical advice which I address to the hon. lady.

Miss MacDonald: I don't have them either.

Mr. Trudeau: It is of course an extremely important topic and I hope that the opposition, on one of its days, will want to discuss this question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: We have already done so.

Mr. Clark: Perhaps you missed that, too.

● (1430)

Miss MacDonald: Given the fact that the Prime Minister indicates that he has knowledge of ulcers, headaches or whatever else it might be, I wonder if he has any understanding of the implications of plutonium on the health of the people of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I know that you cannot do much with plutonium unless you have a great deal of expertise and devices at your disposal. If the hon. lady has some plutonium or knows where to get some, I would ask her to inform the police.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: By its very nature this must be stolen property, and I suggest that the Greenpeace person report this to the police.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED FINANCIAL AND MEDICAL HELP TO COMORO ISLANDS

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Lafontaine-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the disastrous sanitary conditions prevailing now in the Comoro Islands and the visit to Canada of a delegation from that country, and the refusal by CIDA to respond to their request for immediate financial or at least medical assistance, can the minister tell the House whether other means are considered in cooperation with CUSO to help the Comoro Islands, especially considering the intention expressed by the Secretary of State for External Affairs to be more active in those countries of the Third World that are French-speaking?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the question of assistance has been drawn to my attention by a number of hon. members, including my parliamentary secretary and the hon. member for Saint-Denis, and I know the interest of the hon. member is added to theirs. I want to tell the hon. member and the House that at present I have these representations under consideration and will ascertain whether it is possible within the over-all strategy for international development, which has already been laid before the House by the government, to make any form of assistance available to this particular country.

REQUEST OF UNITED STATES BROADCASTERS AND GOVERNMENT FOR DELAY IN FOREIGN ADVERTISING TAX LEGISLATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External

Affairs. Would the minister tell the House if he shares the opinion expressed by Senator Keith Davey, who described as a regrettable intrusion on the business before the Canadian parliament the move by U.S. Ambassador Thomas Enders and New York and Washington State broadcasters calling for a delay in the implementation of part of the government's foreign advertising tax legislation?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should explain that I did pass on what Ambassador Enders regarded as a correct version of the opinion of the United States government on a particular matter which was before the Senate Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. I believe that it was within normal practice for my department to act in this way, but at no time did we take the view that the proceedings on this bill, either through the House of Commons or through the Senate, should be either facilitated or held up because of representations made by the United States, as a look at the record of the proceedings of the bill would indicate.

Mr. Wagner: In the light of the minister's remarks in Quebec City a few days ago calling for a permanent dialogue with the United States, is it the government's intention in this particular matter to have a dialogue and to listen to what the United States have to say on this subject?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We had discussion earlier in the year—in January, I believe—and it was at this particular early discussion between Canadian and American officials that the suggestion that possibly the passage of this particular bill might be delayed was raised. Further dialogue will be held on this subject, as on all other subjects in play between Canada and the United States, and I assure the hon. member that the degree and intensity of the dialogue between the two countries is very great and increasing very rapidly.

POSITION OF PRIME MINISTER ON ACTION OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN INFORMING SENATE OF POSITION ON FOREIGN ADVERTISING TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister on the same issue. Yesterday morning at the request of the United States American ambassador, the United States government's summary of its position on Bill C-58 was tabled before the Senate banking committee in which that government expressed the view that the legislation should not proceed at this time and that the United States could achieve some other, more positive arrangement with the Canadian government. Does the Prime Minister accept this unwarranted intrusion of the American government on this Canadian legislative process?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker I have the impression that this was already dealt with by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but beyond that I say to the hon. member, and perhaps to some of those behind me who have been applauding, that I wonder what we would do if some Canadian interests were being jeopardized in the United States. I think we would probably make representations to them, and that is what they are doing to us. We do not have to follow their advice, but we certainly can hear what they have to say.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Symes: I think that there is a difference between affected individuals making representations at the request of the Senate committee and a foreign government taking the initiative to table its position. Will the Prime Minister make it known to the United States ambassador that it is considered, if not unacceptable, at least irregular, for this kind of procedure to take place and that the government has every intention of passing Bill C-58 unamended in the Senate?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not think it would be proper to comment on the proceedings in the other House and to say what we would do in some hypothetical situation. However, as to the representations, I am assured they were made in a very proper fashion through the Department of External Affairs and the minister, and this is the way we proceed in Washington when we want the administration there to be informed of something which is of interest to Canada. We act through the State Department.

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF AGREEMENT WITH EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY—DISCUSSION OF ACCESS TO RESOURCES WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the announcement that Canada and EEC officials have reached agreement with respect to the terms of the so-called contractual link between the EEC and Canada, does the minister intend to table the terms of the agreement in parliament? If so, when, and if not, why not?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the agreement was initialled ad referendum on June 2 by officials of Canada and the community. The agreement is now before the community and the Canadian government, and when and if the agreement is concluded, I will obviously consider tabling it. I hope that the signature can take place at an early date, hopefully in Ottawa.

An hon. Member: Unamended?

Mr. Balfour: To what extent do the terms of the understanding arrived at provide access to Canadian resources by member countries of the EEC, and has the question of access to Canadian resources been discussed with the provincial governments?

Mr. MacEachen: The question of access obviously has been the subject of discussion and interest in the course of these negotiations, but the framework agreement itself does not create any new rights or obligations with respect to access to supplies of raw materials or access to markets. That has been a position taken quite strongly and successfully by the Canadian government, that the agreement should not create any such undertakings.

However, in the future it might be that in specific projects questions of this kind can be discussed between Canada and the community, but the agreement itself does not do any such thing.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

INCLUSION OF MINISTERIAL LANDINGS IN TOTAL NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Immigration figures released by his department today show an immigrant flow of some 187,000 for last year. The minister went to some lengths to explain that refugees were included in the sponsored, nominated or independent categories. Could he tell the House whether the 21,000 plus landings under ministerial order were dealt with in the same manner by his department?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I did not follow the gist of the question. The order in council landings are always included in the totals. Apart from that, I am not sure what the hon. member is asking.

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): The minister answered my question by saying that they are included in the 187,000. I take it that that is affirmative. I would like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. With reference to immigration, in his press conference on June 1 the Prime Minister indicated that we have a moral responsibility and that it is politically right for Canada and for the world to increase immigration. In view of the decline in Canada's immigration in the last year by some 14 per cent does the Prime Minister feel that flow is in keeping with Canada's present labour needs or in view of the statement he made at Habitat, does he feel that flow should be increased?

● (1440)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member refers to the rest of my statement he will see that I indicated that naturally any immigration—of which we always wanted more—would be acceptable in varying degrees depending on the economic conditions in Canada and depending on the rate at which we could absorb it. The hon. member knows that at this particular time we are making a particular effort to assist immigrants of Lebanese origin. At other periods in history we have made efforts to assist people from Chile, Hungary, Tibet, Uganda and so on. When there are special circumstances we make a special effort. Year in, year out Canada has been accepting immigrants and will continue to do so. We will do it at a rate which is compatible with the economic welfare of the immigrants themselves and, of course, Canadians.

POST OFFICE

REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR MICHAEL LUCHKOVICH, FIRST UKRAINIAN MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Postmaster General I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that Ukrainian Canadians from across Canada will be assembling in Edmonton next Sunday, June 13 to dedicate a memorial to the first Ukrainian member of parliament, who represented the riding of Vegreville, Michael Luchkovich—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Skoreyko: —who was elected in 1926 and served with distinction until 1935. Would the Prime Minister feel disposed to issuing a stamp in memory of this notable Canadian?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General is always open to suggestions of this kind and I hope the hon. member will address himself to the Postmaster General. His parliamentary secretary is present and he is almost as able as the Postmaster General himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Don't insult him.

Mr. Trudeau: Able as he is, however, I am sure even he would not make that kind of commitment outright. He knows, as I do, that we receive hundreds of representations every year from people who would like to see a stamp in memory of a particular event. They all have to be put in perspective. Is that not right, Paul?

An hon. Member: What did he say? No?

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

ALLEGATION GOVERNMENT CREATING EMERGENCY AS BASIS FOR ESTABLISHING PROGRAM

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to get into this multicultural discussion but I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question supplementary to the first one asked today. In light of the statistics issued today, is the Prime Minister considering requesting the Supreme Court to reconvene to hear additional argument as to the constitutionality of the anti-inflation program—the argument being, of course, directed to the way in which the government, in collaboration with the Anti-Inflation Board, is engaged in creating the emergency which would justify its original formation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to inform the House of a very important piece of news. I will be making a speech this afternoon on the anti-inflation program and the budget—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Where?

Mr. Trudeau: —in the House of Commons at around 3.45. I am not sure if we will have a quorum but if we do, I shall continue—

An hon. Member: You mean you are going to do it in the House?

Mr. Trudeau: Therefore, I shall not be able to avail myself of the invitation of the hon. member to invite the Supreme Court to reopen the case. I will convey his request to the right hon. member for Prince Albert; perhaps he would want to contact the court.

An hon. Member: Cheap.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

ALLEGED BORROWING OF PERSONNEL FROM BANKS AND TRUST COMPANIES—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance is related to those asked by the hon. member for Hamilton West. On May 31, at page 13968 of *Hansard* the minister undertook to make inquiries into the practice of the Anti-Inflation Board approaching major banking and trust institutions to lend personnel to the AIB on the basis that the employers would be reimbursed for salaries paid to their personnel in their absence while working for the board. Can the minister now report to the House on this matter, can he outline the extent of this practice, the actual cost to the government and can he say whether the figure of 853 AIB employees as reported in today's *Globe and Mail* includes personnel who have been obtained on this basis?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I had an answer in my book for several days after the hon. gentleman asked the question. Perhaps I could dig it out from my office and send it to him. With respect to the number of AIB employees in this category I shall be glad to make that inquiry.

ALLEGED REFUSAL OF UNIONS TO LEND PERSONNEL TO BOARD—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): A supplementary question. Can the minister confirm that the AIB has also attempted to second personnel from the trade union movement and that this effort has been singularly unsuccessful? Can he tell the House why, if this is the case, the unions do not wish to participate? What is being done to change their attitude?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think the views of the Canadian Labour Congress at least with respect to the program are well known. While we will be meeting with the Congress for the purpose of discussing broader economic questions, I am not sanguine at this stage that we will be able to persuade them to take a more positive approach to the fight against inflation in Canada.

[Translation]

FISHERIES

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO REMEDY THE LACK OF REDFISH AROUND ÎLES-DE-LA-MADELEINE AND GASPÉ

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State (Fisheries).

In view of the critical state of fisheries in eastern Canada, especially around the Îles-de-la-Madeleine and Gaspé, owing to the scarcity of redfish, a fact which could last three years leaving the population in very uncertain economic conditions, could the minister, as a result of his meetings and those of his officials with fishermen and producers, tell the House and distressed Canadians what he intends to do to relieve the hardships of those who really are in desperate straits?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, without accepting entirely the pessimistic description of the hon. member, I recognize that there is a real problem caused by the scarcity of redfish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and this is why we have asked that large trawlers withdraw from that area. To solve the problem we are also trying within the framework of the North Atlantic Council to reach an agreement which could allow an exchange of redfish for a certain quantity of capelin caught by Russia. I hope that this agreement which seems to be effective will be concluded and accepted by the international community. If so, it would help relieve the problem to which the hon. member referred. I must say however, that this year and next year there will be no magic solution to the problem under consideration.

[English]

DISCUSSIONS WITH UNITED STATES TO SETTLE BOUNDARIES RESULTING FROM EXTENSION OF FISHING ZONE 200 MILES

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs I should like to put my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. On the anniversary of a great political event which occurred 19 years ago today and which is soon to happen again—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crouse: —and in light of the announcement by this government that a 200 mile limit will be declared on January 1, 1977 while the United States government has stated it will declare a 200 mile limit effective March 1, 1977, can the Prime Minister tell the House what steps will be taken by this government to resolve the controversy between the United States and Canada over ownership of Georges Bank which is one of the most prolific fishing grounds off the east coast of Canada and which falls within the 200 mile limit of both Canada and the United States?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, this matter is the subject of considerable discussions between the United States and Canada at the present time. In fact, I had occasion to discuss the question with the head of the United States delegation to ICNAF

last night and talks will be continuing. The problems are being identified. The fisheries aspect of it might be more subject to reciprocal arrangements. The boundary problem will be difficult for some time to come and may require intervention at a very high level.

* * *

● (1450)

CUSTOMS

REQUEST FOR SERVICE FOR INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS AT REGINA AND SASKATOON

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of National Revenue follows on a question raised some time ago by my colleague from Regina East. In view of considerable interest in Saskatchewan in the continuance of customs services, with respect to which representations have been received by the Minister of Transport, among others, and since all members from Saskatchewan are interested in seeing this kind of service continued, can the minister now confirm that service will be provided for international flights to airports in Saskatchewan, particularly Regina and Saskatoon?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I understand that no scheduled international flights use, as their first port of arrival, Regina or Saskatoon. Probably between ten and 15 such flights a year occur in this particular area. Because of the inconvenience being caused to a comparatively small number of people, a team of officials, both from the Department of Transport and the customs branch, are looking at the matter to see if facilities can be fixed in such a way as to accommodate people who travel by charter.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—BASIS OF INFORMATION ON WHICH MINISTER MADE STATEMENT ABOUT MR. STOPFORTH

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Supply and Services. Since Mr. Stopforth has firmly denied reversing his position on the subject of financing the Orion project and made the statement that he reports directly to senior officials who, in turn, report to the minister, will the minister say if Mr. Stopforth in fact did report on this or other matters directly to him, the minister, or whether the statement the minister made about Mr. Stopforth was based on information received from other officials in his department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I believe the statement I made in the House is quite clear. I personally checked some facts with this senior official of my department.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE ON WHICH PRIME MINISTER AWARE OF VERBAL AGREEMENT ON FINANCING AND AMOUNT OF INTEREST PAYMENT

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I gave him notice of it. Can the Prime Minister tell the House exactly when he became aware that the financing agreement between Lockheed and the Department of National Defence was purely verbal; can he also tell the House when he was informed that the interest payment on the financial arrangement would be about $100 million?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had the file checked on this and am speaking from the knowledge conveyed to me by the file. I cannot claim to have a precise memory of what particular phrase was said at what particular time in the long sequence of events concerning the choice of an LRPA by the Canadian government. But, having checked the dates and, particularly, the statements made in the House by the Minister of National Defence, that he had become aware of this after his return from NATO in mid-December, I can only conclude that some time between December 15 and December 22 I became aware that the assurance that Lockheed could provide the bridge financing had been given verbally. It would be in that period when I became aware of that.

As for the second question, Mr. Speaker, as all the ministers involved have said repeatedly, they were aware some time in the fall and even before that, in the summer of 1975, of the difficulties of the Department of National Defence with financing the purchase of the long-range patrol aircraft. Indeed, we took a decision in the early fall, I believe, to increase the capital expenditures of DND in real terms by 12 per cent a year, in order to facilitate such purchases. So, we were aware of the cash flow difficulties with some precision toward the end of November, on November 27, when we realized we would have to do some borrowing—in other words, that there would have to be some bridge financing and that we would have to pay interest on it. At that time an approximate amount was established, but it was only decided by Treasury Board in mid-December, on December 15, that $100 million-odd would be authorized for interest payments.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. I take it from his answer that he was aware that the verbal financing agreement had broken down on December 15. My question was, when did he first become aware that there was in existence only a verbal agreement between Lockheed and DND? I call the right hon. gentleman's attention to page 14107 of *Hansard* where he is reported to have said, when discussing the decision made on November 27:

> . . . we were hoping that the LRPA bridge financing would be provided by Lockheed . . .

Further, in the next column, quoting and approving what the Minister of National Defence had said, the Prime Minister is reported to have said:

> . . . perhaps we acted imprudently, but we did so in good faith based on this verbal agreement.

That answer left the impression that he knew then that there was a verbal agreement. Today I should like the Prime Minister to clarify if he knew on December 2 that the arrangement with Lockheed was purely verbal.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I have just given the answer to that. The closest dates I have been able to ascertain would be between December 15 and December 22. I would have known then that the agreement we had from Lockheed was purely verbal. Before that, of course, the people who had received that agreement, presumably one or more people in the Department of National Defence, knew the nature of that agreement. But, from reading the answers of the Minister of National Defence himself, it is apparent that he indicated that he, himself, only knew the agreement was verbal when he returned from NATO in mid-December. I repeat, until then we knew there would have to be bridge financing. We had been assured that Lockheed could supply it. It is only when it came to saying, "O.K., to whom do we pay the $100 million-odd in interest" was it realized that Lockheed had only made a verbal agreement, had given some verbal commitment, and that there had been some misunderstanding. Those are the dates.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY IF DEFENCE MINISTER GAVE CABINET ALL INFORMATION RELATIVE TO NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Is it the position of the Prime Minister that the cabinet received from the Minister of National Defence all of the information relative to any aspect of negotiations with Lockheed that was in the possession of the Minister of National Defence and that was germane to a decision to be taken by cabinet?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to that would be, yes, if the import of the question is to know whether the Department of National Defence had held back any information. I am certain that they held no information back from the cabinet. As I have just indicated in my answers and as has been repeated many times in the House, the assurances we had from Lockheed turned out not to be forthcoming. When we asked "why?", we then found that there was a misunderstanding and we could not refer to an item in writing because it was said that this understanding was purely oral, purely verbal. I just said, Mr. Speaker, that that, as far as I am concerned, was after mid-December. That is also what I understand the Minister of National Defence told the House.

* * *

[Translation]

INDUSTRY

POSSIBILITY OF POOLING SHOE IMPORTS—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS FOR TARIFF CONCESSIONS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

[Mr. McKinnon.]

When the Canadian Shoe Manufacturers Association submitted its last brief, it requested the establishment of quotas for foreign countries exporting shoes as well as a guarantee that no new tariff concession be made. Could the minister tell us where the negotiations of his officials with exporting countries representatives stand in terms of obtaining export quotas and could he also give us some information about the tariff issue?

[English]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, there were two elements in the suggestions made during my meeting with the Shoe Manufacturers Association. The first was that I would make representation to the Minister of National Revenue, with a view to speeding up unquiries and actions coming under the Anti-Dumping Act. I have already made those representations and am sure my colleague will deal with them expeditiously. The second point was a proposal or query as to whether shoes and footwear might be embraced in the responsibilities of the textile and clothing board and be monitored in the same way. That question is now being examined. In addition, meetings are continuing between officials and the industry as to other steps which may be taken.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM, DR. M. K. TOLBA

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, may I call to Your Honour's attention the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished guest, Dr. M.K. Tolba, executive director of the United Nations environment program, successor to Mr. Maurice Strong.

● (1500)

Mr. Murta: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On two separate occasions in the House, on April 29 and May 11, I directed questions to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Prime Minister with regard to the special beef inquiry that was ordered by the Prime Minister and which the minister had in his hands. As I understand it, the minister received the report in both official languages on or about April 27. On April 29 the Minister of Agriculture indicated that he would have the report made public as soon as possible. On May 11, approximately a month ago, the minister said:

> Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have to be patient. I hope next week to study the report and discuss it with my assistant deputy minister who is in charge of it. He is now attending a preliminary meeting in Rome—

It has been over a month since the minister gave that undertaking. The report is very important and certainly very urgent as far as the general farming community is concerned. I urge the minister to table the report. If he does not do that, we can only assume that he is trying to hide something and is not prepared to table this very important document.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF REPORT "CHARACTERIZATION OF WASTEWATERS FROM THE GREAT CANADIAN OIL SANDS BITUMEN EXTRACTION AND UPGRADING PLANT"

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table two copies of the report, "Characterization of Wastewaters from the Great Canadian Oil Sands Bitumen Extraction and Upgranding Plant", as I promised yesterday.

TABLING OF REPORT "ATMOSPHERIC ASBESTOS FIBRE CONCENTRATIONS IN THE BAIE VERTE AREA, NEWFOUNDLAND"

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table two copies of the surveillance report, "Atmospheric Asbestos Fibre Concentrations in the Baie Verte area, Newfoundland".

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

STATEMENT ON UN CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In reporting to the House on the results of the UN Conference on Trade and Development, I should like to say at the outset that its immediate results represent a major achievement in the dialogue between developed and developing countries on a new international economic order, and that the longer-term impact of Nairobi will be substantial. Obviously, UNCTAD IV—like all conferences where countries are required to make compromises in order to ensure agreement—did not achieve all that Canada or other developed and developing countries might have wished. But it was, without question, a most important step in the efforts to reduce disparities between developed and developing countries which were initiated at the seventh special session of the United Nations.

At that session I stated that Canada was determined to play a positive role, to use our resources and our influence to help bring about constructive change in the international economic system and thereby to reduce the gap between rich and poor nations. Governments committed themselves at that time to work together to make changes in the international trade and payments system in order to enable it to contribute to more rapid economic development in the developing countries and to permit them to obtain a larger and sustained share in world trade.

UNCTAD IV was the first major UN conference following the seventh special session, and in its disagreements as well as in its accords it reflected these new dimensions. There were efforts to address these questions at a practical level; there were some important new commitments; there was agreement to create a program, timetable and framework for the central issues in which the many essential decisions can be taken.

In my statement to the conference on May 7, I touched on the four areas Canada considered would be the main issues to be dealt with: the problems of stabilization of commodity trade, the alleviation of the debt servicing difficulties of many developing countries, liberalization of trade to benefit developing countries, and the transfer of technology to developing countries. Of these, the commodities issue proved to be the central focus of the conference. Indeed, the adoption, by consensus, of a resolution which established an integrated program proposes a list of 18 commodities of particular interest to the developing countries for consideration, describes the international measures to be taken in the context of the program, and establishes procedures and a timetable for pursuing it.

On the important question of a common fund, the resolution provides for a negotiating conference to be held next year and for a series of preparatory meetings. As a major importer and exporter of commodities, we shall be actively involved in these international discussions and shall work with the other participants to resolve the problems of commodity trade which concern developing countries. These discussions and negotiations will provide the appropriate basis for examining the parameters of a common fund and for a decision regarding its establishment. As I stated in the House earlier this week, and as stated before that by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), if we are satisfied in the course of these commodity meetings and negotiations that the common fund will be effective and useful, Canada will make a contribution to it.

The conference also took an important decision on the subject of the financial problems of developing countries by adopting, again by consensus, a resolution on the debt problems of developing countries. The resolution calls for appropriate international bodies to identify features relating to debt servicing problems which could provide guidance in the future for dealing with them. In addition, a ministerial session of the UNCTAD board will be held in 1977 to review this work and a group of experts will be established to assist in this review.

We had hoped that some further steps would be taken on the broader subject of financial transfers, which is of fundamental importance to many developing countries, but this was not possible. We had hoped, for example, that the conference would agree to improve the international standard for official development assistance so that developing countries would receive such assistance on softer terms than they do now. Although this was not agreed, we shall continue to pursue this objective.

Apart from these two issues of particular importance, the conference also adopted resolutions on trade liberalization, the transfer of technology and a number of other subjects. One remarkable, and encouraging, aspect of the conference was the fact that 12 of the 13 resolutions approved were adopted by consensus. No previous UNCTAD conference has reached such a broad measure of agreement.

Canada supported all of these resolutions, offering explanatory statements on a number of them. We also, together with other industrialized countries, supported a proposal for further study of the concept put forward by

the United States. Dr. Kissinger had proposed to the conference that early consideration be given to the establishment of an international resources bank to facilitate resource development in the poorer countries. While we have not reached any final conclusion on this idea, we believe that it fully merited further consideration and we regret that it was narrowly defeated by two votes, the great majority of developing countries abstained on the resolution.

Despite the difficulties which arose at the conference and the problems which still need to be resolved, I believe that the outcome augurs well for the continuing dialogue between the developed and developing countries. Most especially, the positive results of the conference, particularly in the commodity area, should provide a useful and constructive basis for pursuing the work of the Conference on International Economic Co-operation in Paris.

At UNCTAD IV, Dr. Perez Guerrero stated, on behalf of the developing members of CIEC, the Paris conference, that failure in Nairobi could bring into question the continuation of that dialogue. The 19 developing countries which are members of CIEC have now assessed the situation. In light of the progress made on a number of important questions at Nairobi, they have indeed judged it useful to continue the dialogue in Paris.

● (1510)

I fully share the view that there is a satisfactory prospect for balanced progress in CIEC during the remainder of the year. In July, the CIEC will be reviewing the progress it has made and setting its course for the second half of the year. I am confident that the results of UNCTAD IV will help the conference in Paris to pursue its essential objective—the strengthening of international co-operation for the benefit of all.

So far as Canada is concerned, we shall pursue the work outstanding from UNCTAD IV in UNCTAD, CIEC and other bodies. We shall pursue our interest in improving the international standard for official development assistance. Together with other countries, we shall consider further the balance of payments and debt problems of developing countries and the appropriate measures for meeting them. We shall continue to support the principle of joint producer-consumer financial responsibility, on a mandatory basis, for buffer stock financing within commodity agreements containing such stocks. We shall be actively involved in consultations and negotiations on individual commodities and on the common fund. We shall devote efforts to see that the developing countries achieve additional benefits in the course of the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva. We shall take an active part in the elaboration of a voluntary code of conduct for the transfer of technology which is universally applicable.

While the decisions taken by UNCTAD IV mark an important stage in our common efforts to reduce disparities between developed and developing countries, our progress toward that goal, to which the government is fully committed, will not be easy and will require hard decisions. As we proceed along that course, there will be costs for Canada and for individual Canadians. Their support will be essential, but with it, and the support of this House, we may approach these decisions in a confident and positive manner.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, first of all, why is UNCTAD IV so important as to merit this statement in the House?

UNCTAD'S purpose and principal aim is to transform a global economic environment that is most unfavorable for the poorest two-thirds of humanity. It seeks to do this through the process of negotiation, that is, hard bargaining as distinct from rhetorical expositions on the state of the world. It is, therefore, an essential forum to put into practice the trade reforms necessary to close the widening rich-poor gap in the world. But many nations are in great danger, and Canada is no exception, of becoming victims of procedural intricacies while losing sight of our real objectives.

The message of UNCTAD, the message of Habitat now in its closing hours in Vancouver, the message of the UN conferences in the past few years on the environment, population, food and the new economic order is that we must set in motion a process of restructuring the world economy. This will require more than an expansion of growth, more than better control over cyclical fluctuations. As the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, has said, this restructuring requires a well-defined time-table of economic cooperation to bring about—

—a more equitable share of developing countries in industrial activities beyond their present mere 7 per cent of the world's industrialization.

—self-sufficiency in food in developing areas.

—indigenous capacity in science and technology.

—serious progress in the eradication of mass poverty and unemployment.

All this is why the parliamentary subcommittee on international development issued an interim report, prior to UNCTAD IV, urging the Canadian government to exert leadership "in seeking creative solutions to the problems of commodities trade which will be acceptable to producers and consumers in both developed and developing countries." Canada's leadership is essential, not only because UNCTAD IV is itself a crucial element in international negotiations, but because Canada is a bridge between the developed and developing countries. This special role is reflected in the fact that Canada is co-chairman of the continuing Conference on International Economic Co-operation.

The subcommittee therefore suggested that Canada make a clear statement at the opening of UNCTAD IV committing this country to a phased, co-ordinated approach to increase and stabilize the prices of primary commodities exported by the developing nations. Such an approach would include the selection of an agreed list of commodities for action, the establishment of a timetable for negotiations, and emphasis on the possibilities for linkages among commodity agreements such as integrated or common buffer stock financing.

What the government did, however, at the opening of the conference was merely to repeat our worn-out position that "we are prepared to continue examination of the proposal for a common fund . . ." In other words, continued

study but no action. Yet the Scandinavian countries and The Netherlands were able to go into UNCTAD and immediately pledge a commitment to the common fund principle around which the success of UNCTAD IV was clearly seen to turn. That was the kind of leadership that I expected from Canada. Why was that firm leadership, leadership we are capable of, not given?

Canada has a five-year strategy—between 1975 and 1980—on international economic co-operation, yet the government fails to implement it. In fact, most Canadians do not even know of the existence of this multidimensional strategy which recognizes that aid, as such, is insufficient in our relations with developing nations. The reason the strategy is not being implemented—and why we were so weak at UNCTAD IV—is that the government cannot get it all together. Some of the policy-makers want to participate in integrated commodity agreements, and others say that our domestic economy would be adversely affected and that we therefore cannot move on new agreements. But not to move is to perpetuate the economic discrimination which is at the heart of the problem. For this debate is not about charity, not about the $1 billion CIDA spends in a band-aid approach to poverty; it is about new, equitable economic relationships. This point is acknowledged by every serious student of the rich-poor gap. Last Monday, the *Globe and Mail*, expressing its disappointment at UNCTAD IV said:

> The reality is that, setting aside the oil trade, the rich countries are taking out of the poor countries in excess profits from five to ten times as much as they are putting in foreign aid.

The *Globe and Mail* put its finger on the problem:

> Thanks to grossly unequal access of capital, to the third world's lack of market leverage, the vulnerability of economies that depend on a single export, and to barriers set up by the rich against the manufactured products of the poor, it is the industrial world that takes most of the profit from what the third world has to sell.

So UNCTAD IV lumbered on as the pressure mounted. The Canadian NGO representatives kept sending back reports on the impending failure of UNCTAD IV. This group should be commended for its serious efforts to mount public opinion in Canada. Questions about Canada's commitment to a common fund were raised in the House. Finally, on May 27 the cabinet responded to the pressure and committed Canada to a common fund, if in fact there would be a common fund.

Why did this commitment have to be dragged out of the government? Why did the cabinet have to be pulled, kicking and screaming, to the reality of what UNCTAD IV was all about? Why does the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) talk about a "conspiracy of love" to solve the problems of the developing world, when the government cannot back up sentiments of love with a commitment to action? Are we to assume that if the NGO community had not escalated the pressure on the government, there would have been no final commitment at Nairobi? Are we to assume that Canada finally acted because it wanted to save face at CIEC but without alienating the United States which was more committed to a new bank than new rules of trade? What a sad way that is for the government to lead!

Finally, UNCTAD IV ended with Canada giving its approval in principle, along with 15 other countries, to an integrated commodities program which calls for a negotiating conference on a common fund to be held before the end of March, 1977.

● (1520)

We urge the government to play a more active role in these negotiations, and to do this by first of all building a climate of support within Canada for this action, which is clearly in the interests of our own country. We want to build better and more diverse trading partners, and this can be done by equalizing economic opportunities. This approach is a far more positive one than relying on the CIDA budget to do the job. When this policy is fully explained to the Canadian people, the government will find support for some brave, new action.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the minister's statement and are glad that he has been able to make such an optimistic statement about the results of UNCTAD IV. We share the views that he has expressed, and action on the various aspects of the new economic order is urged. The well-known Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal, put it very well when he declared that we have been living during one of history's most abrupt reversals of political climate. UNCTAD has been an important step in that essential reversal of policy. The minister himself said at the UNCTAD conference that we need action with an unprecedented sense of urgency. He then went on to say:

> I believe that we have passed that stage of analysis and assessment of issues. We must now get together to devise workable and dynamic solutions.

I must say I share, with the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche), the view that these bold words were not effectively followed up; there has been a degree of hesitation. I would give as an illustration the common fund, of which mention has already been made. The common fund is essentially a means of getting funds for a buffer stock to stabilize commodity prices, and this is one of the primary requests of the developing countries. Its purpose is to procure the exchange of commodities through which they can develop themselves so that they will not be dependent upon aid from the outside world.

Instead of our delegation taking a firm stand on principle, they put it off until the very last minute. Even in his statement the minister skated around any commitment by Canada, saying there were a lot of conditions and sort of backward steps. There is, in fact, no commitment at all. May I read what the minister said in this regard. He said that we shall be working with the other participants to resolve the problems of commodity trade which concern developing countries. He went on:

> These discussions and negotiations will provide the appropriate basis for examining the parameters of a common fund and for a decision regarding its establishment. As I stated in the House earlier this week, if we are satisfied in the course of these commodity meetings and negotiations that a common fund will be effective and useful, Canada will make a contribution to it.

As has been pointed out already by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, many other countries were able to make a firm commitment. It is true that the details of the commitment still have to be worked out. Obviously, if a commitment was made which was impossible to carry out, or which Canada felt was a totally impractical way of

solving the problem, we would not expect Canada to go ahead; but the making of a firm commitment is indeed perfectly possible. I wish the minister had used the same sort of language as was used by Mr. Hakkvard Bakke, the minister for commerce for Norway, who followed the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen). He said:

> Only decisions which can be transplated into the realities of the daily life of the poor masses are real contributions. I am glad to say quite unequivocally that my government is in agreement with and supports the main elements of an integrated program for commodities... we have already declared ourselves ready to contribute to a common fund. In our view UNCTAD should have the central co-ordinating role in this important venture—

That language seems to me rather different from the language used by the minister in his statement. Perhaps the minister is just indulging in ministerial caution, which in many cases, I suppose, is befitting of his particular position. But as he described it, this is an urgent situation calling for action, not—to use his own words—analysis or assessment. I am disappointed that this caution, and perhaps the caution of some of his colleagues as well, seems to have so watered down his approach that I must agree with the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona that we have not had the real leadership we would have had. This common fund is not a backbreaking financial burden. It has been estimated that it would cost between $21 million and $29 million for Canada's share, which is about 3 per cent of Canada's aid budget.

Then there are other matters, Mr. Speaker. There is a vague reference in the statement to a resolution on liberalization of trade, but not a word more is said about that. Apparently the minister has overlooked the fact that the committee on development, which was approved by the whole external affairs committee, firmly recommended that if we are serious about liberalizing trade, we should get on with the business of planning adjustment assistance for those who might possibly be affected.

Has anything been done in this regard? I shall have to ask some questions of the minister about that later, but there is no mention of it in his statement. We are told that there was a resolution. Are we serious about this, or not? If we are serious, we should look once again at what the committee recommended, which was a tripartite body composed of government, employers and employees working together to work out adjustment assistance. This means that if, as a consequence of trade liberalization, we face competition from overseas which destroys job opportunities, something ought to be done about it. I am just wondering why so little is said on that particular question. UNCTAD IV is only a beginning, but an important beginning, leading to what may take months or years to hammer into shape so that practical action can be taken.

In closing, may I say there is needed a far greater and continuing effort on the part of the government, members of parliament and those who have the role of leadership in the community to make clear how vitally important is this whole new movement. If we are to build a stable world based on co-operation, greater justice and equality for men of all races, then we will have to start putting into practice some of the noble words we have been using for quite a while now.

[Mr. Brewin.]

I know that we are committed, but we need something to evidence that commitment a little more so as to arouse the Canadian people who must give it their support. If they do not do so, it will fail and fizzle. We have to do more to warn the people of Canada that we are in an era of drastic change; that justice as well as our own future stability and economic security depend upon a real change of opinions and upon action being taken in this field.

● (1530)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, first I should thank the minister for having been kind enough to send us a French copy of his statement before the opening of the House and we wish that this practice will continue in every other similar circumstances.

UNCTAD IV that was held in Nairobi in Kenya from May 3 to 28, 1976 enabled more than 2,000 delegates from over 150 countries to meet and try to find answers for the establishment of a new international economic order, which means that the old economic order that we knew is no longer appropriate.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) was very careful in his statements concerning our commitments to the developing countries and he was right because when we know the pressions between industrialized countries and poorer nations we realize how difficult it is to find an easy answer without offending one or the other of the countries that give or ask for help. Furthermore, an action program at the international level is highly impracticable because of important differences between the nations which can help and those which rely on that help. As the minister said, two particularly significant resolutions have resulted from this conference. One establishing an integrated program for basic products and the other concerning the debts of developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is unusual and it surprised me that even at the international level we discuss debts even before we talk about development. Even undeveloped countries have managed to get into debt. It is again an obvious sign of the illogicality of political economy principles which typify the financial management of those countries which have debts even before growing to maturity. Several external help programs have already been created by various international groups and by some countries, including Canada, the United States and others, and unfortunately the helping countries are too often criticized to the same extent as their generosity. But I am pleased by the minister's statement and I hope, as he said, that this conference will eventually give long term positive results.

[*English*]

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a couple of questions. Why is it that Canada changed its position during the course of UNCTAD? In the minister's speech during the opening days of UNCTAD he merely said we would give our assent to a study of the common fund principle around which the success of UNCTAD IV was turning. Indeed, on May 11 when he reported to the external affairs committee he said he was not yet convinced of the need for a common fund. Yet on May 27 the cabinet met and gave its assent to the principle of the fund, which was subsequently

announced in the House and relayed to Nairobi, enabling us to sign the statement of the resolution with 15 other countries at the conclusion of UNCTAD.

I ask the minister, now, what evidence was put before the federal cabinet to enable it to change its mind and give its assent to the principle of the common fund, evidence that was not available at the opening of this conference and which would have enabled Canada to go into the conference at the beginning and give the commitment in the opening stages so that we would have been able to give the leadership that UNCTAD so desperately needed?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I do not regard the comments made in the House by the President of the Privy Council as any change in the Canadian position. It was merely an evolution of a position that had been taken by myself in my opening statement when I said we were quite prepared to examine further the concept of the common fund. We merely advanced that proposition to the point where we stated that as a result of discussions and negotiations, if the common fund justified itself in terms of usefulness in the solution of commodity problems, then we would be prepared to contribute to it.

I do not regard it as a change of position, because these contingencies obviously were in our minds as we prepared for the conference and as we considered the various attitudes we could take. I do not regard it as any change. Our delegation, headed by Mr. Bruce, had been advising us of the developments in the discussion and it was in response to our own convictions on this point and the developments of UNCTAD that caused us really to carry forward the policy which had been indicated in embryo in my opening statement.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see there was such a speedy evolution in the government's thinking during the course of UNCTAD IV, which only shows what can be gained by escalating pressure. That brings me to the question of public understanding of what this conference is all about and, indeed, the understanding and the commitment of the House itself.

I ask the minister why the report of the subcommittee on international development has not yet been tabled in the House, despite an expressed public desire by the minister that it be so debated in order to bring up the level of understanding by the Canadian people concerning the structural changes required in international relationships that are highlighted in the report. Those structural changes can be most significantly demonstrated by reference to two figures. Canada's aid to the ten leading recipient countries in bilateral assistance last year was $330 million, yet our trade surplus with those same ten countries was $368 million, which led CIDA to confirm today that there is a greater benefit to Canada in economic relations with these aid partners. In other words we gain more than we put into the developing countries, which is at the heart of the problem. The subcommittee reported on this, yet that report continues to be buried.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should correct a false impression under which the hon. member seems to be labouring, namely, that the whole matter of the common fund was escalated as a result of public pressure. Obviously, we had considered the view made known by the subcommittee. We had listened to views in the House of Commons. We were listening in Nairobi, and we acted in conformity with our own understanding of the realities and not as a result of any public pressure directed to us from Nairobi particularly.

I do not regard public pressure as distasteful or undesirable, but I think the hon. member would agree that there certainly was not an outcry among the Canadian public on the common fund that would cause the government to react to a groundswell in its favour. Unfortunately, the Canadian public up to the present time has exhibited only marginal interest in the subject we are discussing today. I had intended today, in my statement and in other ways, to draw to the attention of the House and the public these important questions that are so vital to the future of the world. I would be prepared to debate the subcommittee report at any time, but as my hon. friend knows, we are rushing pell-mell in this House to deal with all kinds of important matters and it is not easy to fit in every subject matter. That is the only reason.

Mr. Roche: I have a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The reason the Canadian public has a marginal interest in these questions is that the Canadian government has not laid before the public the full exposition of what this question is all about. I ask the minister specifically, with reference to the speech he made at the opening of UNCTAD, when he referred at page 5 of his speech to using aid funds to establish a trade facilitation office to assist developing countries seeking to export to the Canadian market, what did he mean by "trade facilitation office", and to what extent is the Canadian government prepared to move on that?

Mr. MacEachen: I thought that was a particularly positive proposal that was made in my statement. We did make several other important proposals that were not accepted by the conference, including a proposal to increase the grant threshold, including a proposal to have a debt conference and a proposal for support of mandatory joint producer and consumer financing operations. All these were distinct Canadian proposals which were not accepted and were, in my view, somewhat ahead of some of the proposals which were accepted. The purpose of the trade facilitation office is to assist developing countries to penetrate the Canadian market. We are taking that proposal seriously and it is being studied at present. It is a new proposal, but it has not yet been implemented.

● (1540)

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, it is not easy, on the strength of 8½ pages of generalities, to formulate questions: rather, this invites comment. There are two specific questions which I should like to ask, one relating to a comment that is made, and one relating to an omission. On page 5 the minister speaks in glowing terms of how happy he is that there was such a broad measure of agreement in that 12 of the 13 resolutions were adopted by consensus. I wonder if this is not a way, perhaps, of avoiding standing up and being counted. When you have reservations in a consensus procedure, you do not actually have to say you agree or disagree; you can virtually abstain.

This is unusual in UN procedure. I wonder whether the minister would care to comment on this point, because it seems that the whole thing is a means of befogging the issue and, as two or three of my colleagues have suggested, there are no clear, positive actions aside from the decision to study something further. This matter has been studied for years now. On the matter of consensus, I wonder if the minister could comment on why he considers this more desirable than a voting procedure, because on the next page he says that something was missed by a couple of votes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With all due respect, the hon. member has no difficulty in putting precise questions. He has put this question two or three times.

Mr. MacEachen: I have not advocated consensus in preference to voting on the resolutions. What I have been saying is that consensus is much more positive than confrontation, which has been a real possibility in the course of the conference. It was only as a result of 48 hours of intensive negotiation that the developing and the developed countries agreed to go along with the negotiated resolutions by consensus.

In the case of the American proposal there was a vote. A vote was taken because the majority of those who voted were opposed to the American idea of a resources investment bank. We voted for that. I think it was a mistake to have turned that proposal down simply because it had not been fully explained or fully considered and it seemed to have been unwise for the conference to have turned down, without serious examination, a proposal made by the major industrial power whose co-operation is vital if we are to make any changes in the international economic order. I think that was a mistake.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): My second question refers to an apparent omission. I believe that one of the objects—I may be misunderstanding the purpose of these ministerial statements—would be to make the Canadian public aware of what went on, not just to justify the position of the government. For example, there is complete neglect of the matter of the transfer of technology in agriculture with a view to improving or helping those countries which seek self-sufficiency in the matter of food, water and fertilizer—those three things together. They are basic even to the generation of commodities for trade, particularly renewable commodities. No reference whatever is made to this question. Would the minister care to comment either on the purpose of the omission or on the matter itself?

Mr. MacEachen: Three resolutions were adopted at the conference on the general question of the transfer of technology. I agree with the hon. member that agriculture is a very important item of development. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, through the world food council, through the world food conference, through the world food program, is addressing himself to the general question of agricultural production in the developing world. It did not receive special attention at this particular conference or in my statement because it was not a subject matter of special attention even though it is quite important. I did not omit it because I regard it as unimportant. As the hon. member knows, it has been highlighted as one of the areas to which we attach priority in our international development strategy.

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister about the resolution on trade liberalization. I have not seen the resolutions yet. I think the members of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, and perhaps all members of the House, would like to see them. However, I think trade liberalization is a very sensitive subject and I should like the minister to tell us the nature of the resolution passed on that subject.

Mr. MacEachen: There were three resolutions passed by the conference on trade matters. One provides for measures to improve access to developed country markets for improvement of the generalized system of preferences and tariff reclassification. Another resolution calls for measures which will give added impetus to multilateral trade negotiations. The third resolution dealt with transnational corporations. I have received all of these resolutions. They require a good deal of study, and I believe it would be very useful for the standing committee to take a look at some of these resolutions which are cast in general terms. The three resolutions on trade liberalization were adopted, by consensus, at the conference.

Mr. Brewin: I should like to ask the minister about another matter I mentioned in my remarks earlier today. What steps, if any, have been taken, in accordance with the recommendation of the committee, toward working out and developing adjustment assistance to help those who might suffer economically as a result of more liberal trade measures or, indeed, help those who are suffering because even now some industries are threatened by cheap imports?

Mr. MacEachen: I realize that the subcommittee of the standing committee did make proposals on the matter of adjustment systems, and if at a certain point the Canadian government, supported by the Canadian parliament and the people, decided that we ought to admit tropical products at the expense of Canadian production and Canadian jobs, then of course adjustment measures would be essential. But up to the present time, while we have an adjustment program in the textile industry, as have most other countries, we have not yet developed new adjustment policies with respect to other industries. I say this with the full realization that the responsibility for such a program and policy is that of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I suggest that it would be useful, in the interests of the dialogue, to raise the matter with him.

● (1550)

Mr. Ritchie: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister. In view of the record of commodity agreements and the great importance some of these commodities might have on our Canadian economy, how far did the Canadian commitment go in these commodity agreements?

Mr. MacEachen: If I may attempt to abbreviate the Canadian position, we stated that we will support measures which have the effect of stabilizing commodity prices, and particularly of stabilizing the earnings of exporters. We accept, as one of the techniques, the negotiation of

commodity agreements, where they can be demonstrated as useful, on a case by case basis. For example, as a consumer we have joined the tin agreement. We made a voluntary contribution to the tin buffer stock because we believed that would be a useful approach. Some of the industrialized countries, including Canada, have supported the idea of a commodity by commodity approach and that each commodity should have its own agreement, with its own funding and with its own buffer financing formula. This has been our approach.

We then went on to say, like the French stated at the conference, that if a number of individual commodity agreements have been negotiated and are in operation, and if at that point there is a necessity for a common fund either drawing upon the individual funds or supplemented from other sources that would be useful, then we would consider it. In addition to that, we indicated at the conference our readiness to participate in the negotiations and the discussions on the common fund. But there seems to have been an idea abroad that we should create a huge common fund and that that would be an incentive, by the very creation of a large fund, for producers and consumers to enter into the commodity agreements regardless of whether the justification for these agreements had been carefully worked out. If a common fund is seen in that perspective, it certainly has dangers for the international economic system.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, on page 20 of the French copy of the fifth report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs, dealing with developing countries, it says in the third paragraph:

Debt

A crisis of accumulated debt has been brewing for years in many of the developing countries and the severe balance of payments of recent years have now brought a number of them to the brink of bankruptcy. It has been pointed out that the repayment of the capital and interests on former debts use up to 50 per cent of the total amount of financial aid received by developing countries. Some proposals consider drastic measures in all respects to alleviate the burden of debts in developing countries. Now, I do not see these proposals in the report.

Would the minister advise the House which proposals the government is prepared to make to those developing countries, since 50 per cent of the financial aid they receive are used only to service their debt?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: The hon. member asked what proposals we had made with respect to the debt question. We supported the proposal in the Manila declaration that a debt conference would be convened to consider what action could be taken and what guidelines could be used in order to overcome the debt problem. We also made the proposal that it might be better to consider ways and means of preventing countries from getting into debt or from increasing their debt. It was for that reason we suggested an increase in the threshold of assistance to developing countries.

Now, of course, there have been various mechanisms established by UNCTAD—a review, the creation of guidelines, a group of experts to consider debt questions—and we have gone along with that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 5,161, 5,233 and 5,431.

[*Text*]

PUBLIC WORKS—FIRE ALARM SYSTEMS

Question No. 5,161—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the government and, in particular, the Department of Public Works and the Dominion Fire Commissioner aware as to whether or not the Library of Parliament is the only part of the Centre Block of the Parliament Buildings with a fire alarm system connected to a central station and, if so (a) since what date has the Dominion Fire Commissioner been aware of the existence of this situation (b) have any recommendations been made on the matter by the Dominion Fire Commissioner or anyone else in the government and (i) if so, to whom and on what dates (ii) if not, for what reason?

2. Does this same situation exist at the (a) Lester B. Pearson Building (b) l'Esplanade Laurier (c) Journal Towers and (i) if so, on what dates and to whom have any recommendations been made on the matter by the Dominion Fire Commissioner (ii) if no recommendations have been made, for what reason?

3. Is the Department of Public Works and, in particular, the Dominion Fire Commissioner responsible for testing the fire alarm system in the Centre Block of the Parliament Buildings and, if so, on what dates during the past five years have such tests been made?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes. (a) November 10, 1967; (b) (i) a recommendation to directly connect the fire alarm system to a central station was made by the Dominion Fire Commissioner to the Department of Public Works Capital Region Director in July 1973. However, due to the fact that a manually operated direct connection was provided to a central station, and to avoid unnecessary response by fire apparatus to the building in the event of false alarms, the recommendation was reconsidered and the present procedure whereby all alarms are monitored by a 24-hour guard service is considered adequate. (ii) Not applicable.

2. (a) Yes, in the case of the Lester B. Pearson Building where there are security personnel on duty at all times capable of taking appropriate action in the event of fire, the direct automatic connection from the fire alarm to the central station has been waived. Alarms are transmitted directly to the Ottawa Fire Department by operation of a direct line telephone. (b) The l'Esplanade Laurier is a leased building with qualified security personnel on duty at all times in the fire control room, which is equipped with an emergency telephone for use in reporting fire or other emergencies. (c) The Journal Towers are leased buildings with 24-hour security guard service. On receipt of a fire alarm the guard in the lobby immediately telephones the fire department. Any requirement for an automatic direct connection to a central station system from a

leased building (items b and c) would have to be made by the Municipal Fire Authorities having jurisdiction.

3. The Dominion Fire Commissioner is responsible for testing fire alarm systems in the Centre Block. The most recent test of the complete system was conducted by the Dominion Fire Commissioner and Facilities Maintenance personnel on 21 to 23 January 1976. The fire alarm system in the Centre Block has been tested every three months over the past five years by contract.

OLD AGE SECURITY OFFICE, DON MILLS, ONTARIO

Question No. 5,233—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What are the reasons that inquiries to the Old Age Security Office in Don Mills, Ontario, by the Member for Leeds, have taken in some cases up to fifty-one days to complete investigations and specifically in the case of File Number 415 164 821?

2. Will the Department of National Health and Welfare conduct an investigation into operations of the Old Age Security Office in Don Mills to determine reasons for such slowness and will it take the necessary methods to drastically improve services in reply to inquiries from Members of Parliament?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Enquiries from the public and Members of Parliament, directed to the Old Age Security office in Don Mills, Ontario, are dealt with by an enquiries section set up specifically to ensure that a quick response is provided. Office records indicate that telephone enquiries from Mr. Cossitt concerning File Number 415 164 821 were answered promptly. Due to technical difficulties associated with the adaptation of the new Spouse's Allowance program to existing computer systems, there was a delay in producing a cheque in the correct amount for normal cheque delivery. To offset this problem, cheques for account 514 164 821 were produced manually and were delivered when due.

2. The technical difficulties mentioned above have been identified, and action is being taken to eliminate these problems. Enquiries from Members of Parliament always receive high priority.

MONTREAL PORT AUTHORITY AND HALIFAX PORT AUTHORITY

Question No. 5,431—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What is the government's best estimate of the (a) total (b) individual amount spent in support of members of the Montreal Port Authority in respect of attendance at meetings, for travel and other purposes during 1975?

2. What are the comparable figures for the Halifax Port Authority?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. (a) $31,254; (b) Fees for Meetings, $4,700; Travel, $3,241.50; Honoraria, $23,312.50.

2. (a) $18,909; (b) Fees for Meetings, $7,300; Travel, $2,609; Honoraria, $9,000.

[Mr. Drury.]

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,423 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

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

[*Text*]

MANPOWER CENTRES, QUEBEC

Question No. 5,423—**Mr. Matte:**

1. How many Manpower Centres are there in the Province of Quebec?

2. What are their addresses and telephone numbers?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed, from Wednesday, June 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this budget comes at a crucial stage in Canada's fight against inflation. Because of tentative—and I am referring to the period between now and October as compared with the earlier period—early signs of success in reducing the rate of increase in the cost of living, there are some who would abandon the fight now, before the anti-inflation program has had a chance to exert a deep and permanent effect upon the inflationary expectations of the nation.

There are others who would divert our attention from the battle by proposing that the government should spend its way toward full employment. Such a proposal would not only fatally compromise the government's adoption of spending restraint as an essential weapon in the fight against inflation, but by stimulating inflation would also impede the private sector's long-term ability to create jobs for the jobless.

It is a mistake to consider inflation and unemployment as mutually exclusive problems. The unemployment problem cannot be solved by abandoning the anti-inflation effort. If economists and the governments of the industrialized nations have learned anything from our post-war experience, we have learned that the cyclical switching of our attention from inflation to unemployment and back again has not only not cured either problem but has worsened both.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: It is for just that reason that all our policies—spending policies, over-all fiscal and monetary policy, and the policies governing price and income restraint—are aimed at gradually bringing inflation under control without jeopardizing renewed growth of output and employment. The only way to bring down the rate of unemployment is to restore the economy to a state of health and vigour; and the only way to do that, in the present circumstances, is to remove inflation as a major obstacle to our economic progress.

● (1600)

[*Translation*]

And this is one of the reasons why we must strongly object to the diversion manoeuvres of our opponents.

When I announced the creation of the prices and incomes control board last October, I said clearly to the Canadian people that we were launching a three-year restraint program because it would take us that long to get back on our feet again, to return to steady prices and a balanced growth rate, and because we would need all that time to bring down inflation gradually and surely without putting the country in a situation of economic paralysis.

The government's viewpoint has not changed since then. We see no reason to give up our efforts today or in the near future, now that our hopes to bring down the inflation rate are just beginning to materialize. Despite the strong objections of some particularly restless unions and businesses, objections which their spokesmen in the opposition are echoing, we will not give up until we succeed in our attempt.

[*English*]

I am not surprised that some powerful interests are crying out for an early removal of restraints on the exercise of their free-wheeling power in the marketplace. But the plain, simple and hard fact of the matter is that there is no way in which inflation can be brought more quickly under control without resort to Draconian measures—measures which would seriously impede, if not abort, the present recovery of the economy and lead to substantially higher unemployment. Some may be prepared to pay that price. We are not. Nor do I believe the vast majority of Canadians are prepared to pay that price. I am surprised that the special interests of these powerful groups should be pleaded so blatantly by opposition members who have been elected to serve the powerless as well as the powerful.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: Pure bunkum.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, my speech is important and serious but not very funny, and if hon. members opposite want to contribute a bit of levity, it is on their shoulders.

Mr. Paproski: You are laughing; we are not; we are serious.

Mr. Trudeau: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am especially shocked by the New Democratic Party. In trying to give the appearance that it is serving simultaneously the incompatible interests of powerful unions, which oppose the controls program, and powerless low income families, who need and support the program, the New Democratic Party presents the absurd spectacle of having both feet planted firmly on the ground on opposite sides of the fence.

Mr. Blais: It is a pretty low fence.

Mr. Trudeau: I had expected a little more courage and a little more honesty from the party which so often and so self-righteously has proclaimed itself to be the social conscience of the nation.

I am less surprised by the contradictory performance of the Progressive Conservative party, which in its predictable effort to identify itself with every competing special interest group in the country is not representing any interest very well, least of all the public interest. It is perhaps too much to ask the Tories where they really stand on the issue of controls and spending restraint. I would be satisfied if they would just tell us which fence they are currently sitting on.

For an example of the Tories' attempts to be all things to all men, we need look no further than the remarkable speech given in this House on May 27 by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). I am sorry he is not here. If he had known I was going to speak, I am sure he would have been here to understand the remarks I am going to make on the subject of his speech. After criticizing the government for the level of its spending and the size of its deficits, he proceeded, without so much as an embarrassed blush, to plead for more government financial assistance for farmers, small businessmen, energy consumers, exporting companies, job creation, industrial research, medical research, big business and the taxpayers in general.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Heward wrote that for him.

Mr. Trudeau: The next time I hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) complain about the damaged credibility of parliament, I will know exactly what he means.

It was to be expected that some business and labour leaders would object very strenuously to controls on their freedom of action. In fairness, however, it must be said that hundreds of thousands of union members have voluntarily agreed to settlements within the guidelines, and that the bulk of business criticism has not been directed against controls in principle but against the details of their application. That kind of criticism has usually been both constructive and welcomed by the government. It is more in sorrow than in anger—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Oh, yes!

Mr. Trudeau: —that I listen to otherwise responsible people demanding restraint in government spending but objecting to restraint in programs in which they have a special interest. That kind of myopia has made the government's job more difficult than it need be. I have no quarrel with those who plead the special worth of one or other of the very many worth-while programs for people in which the government is engaged, whether it be regional development, housing, the Local Initiatives Program, museums, dairy subsidies, or many others. This afternoon we heard

special pleading for UNCTAD. We have no objection to these; they are all worth-while programs and that is why this government is pursuing them.

But the harsh fact is that we do not have the billions of dollars which would be needed in order to give immediate and adequate support to all those and other priorities. We will have to learn to choose more carefully and pay for some things over a longer time period than we have been used to in the past.

I ask for public understanding and support of the hard spending decisions which are being forced upon us by economic circumstances. It seems to me that there comes a time in the affairs of the nation when a particular public policy is so much in the public interest, so crucial to the stability of the country, that it requires members of parliament and citizens generally to lay aside narrow private interests and stand up for Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Now is such a time, and the anti-inflation program is such a policy.

[*Translation*]

For in this fight against inflation, we have only one alternative: success or chaos. A failure would be a gross injustice towards our most disadvantaged citizens and would jeopardize the hold we must have on our future. I urge opposition members to think about it when they are tempted to use the House of Commons as a forum for powerful economic interests. I said it many times, an effective control of prices and incomes is possible only with the support and cooperation of all of us. That is why I am pleased not only because Canadians have supported this program from the outset but because they have not changed their minds since, despite the well financed and well organized hostility of our opponents.

What is to be feared is not that willing Canadians will finally take a negative stand as a result of the continued propaganda of groups which serve particular interests, but that public support weakens because some people would be led to conclude, on the strength of favourable statistics on the cost of living, that the fight is already won, or because others, reassured by the same figures—I will quote them in a moment—would feel that this problem is not as serious and consequently that restraints are no longer necessary. Both attitudes, if they were to become widespread, might be fatal to the success of our program. This is why those who are in a position to influence public opinion have such a responsibility. Those who, among influent and academic people, contribute to make people believe that it is less important today than last October to strongly restrain prices, salaries and public expenditures are doing the nation a very bad service.

● (1610)

[*English*]

Of course I am gratified that the increase since last year in the consumer price index declined to 8.9 per cent in April and May from 10.6 per cent in October. I am pleased that the seasonally adjusted CPI, which had increased at an annual rate of 11.7 per cent in the six months prior to last October, declined to 6.4 per cent between October and May. While this sharp rate of decline is very welcome, I am the first to admit that it is not due solely to the anti-inflation program, and that it is not sustainable over the long-term in the absence of some basic structural reforms in the economy.

I have said many times before that success in the fight against inflation is not to be looked for in short-term movements of the CPI, but in the progress we make in effecting necessary changes in our attitudes, expectations and economic institutions. That takes time. If we do not give ourselves the time by reaffirming our resolve to see this battle through to the end, we cannot succeed. I realize that in the context of the double-digit inflation which Canada has suffered for the past couple of years, the 8 per cent rate which we confidently expect to reach this year must seem to many people like the fulfilment of a dream, negating the need to continue the struggle.

Mr. Stanfield: A bad dream.

Mr. Trudeau: A bad dream, as the hon. member opposite mumbled.

Mr. Stanfield: I did not mumble. I said it quite distinctly.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member dreams quite distinctly. I apologize.

It is because of the potentially dangerous consequences of such an attitude that I am appealing today to all who have an influence over public opinion to tell it like it is. I realize that in order to sustain public support for the anti-inflation program it is necessary for the people to understand not only that it must remain in force until it is successful, but it is also necessary for them to see that the program is fair.

In furtherance of that second objective, the government has consistently and seriously offered to make changes in the rules when we are convinced that such changes will contribute to greater equity. Our desire to be fair is the reason wage settlements above the arithmetic guidelines have been allowed in special cases. But it is important to note that even with those exceptions above the arithmetic guidelines, settlements subject to the Anti-Inflation Board's jurisdiction have shown an average increase of only 12.1 per cent. This compares with settlements which were running at average rates of about 18 per cent during the first three quarters of 1975.

I wish to stress that point. More and more we hear people—usually they are theorists—say that inflation was going to come down anyhow and the government only brought the program in to take the credit. Inflation was not going to come down anyhow. They say that now because it has been coming down. Settlements have been reduced from an average of 18 per cent in the first three quarters of 1975 to an average of 12.1 per cent since we brought the controls program in.

The desire to be fair is the reason behind changes in pricing regulations announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) on budget night. We are confident that with the new rules all companies will be treated more equitably. No one in the government has ever claimed that restrictions on the way we do business in this country are

attractive to us or easy to apply. We have claimed only that such restrictions are necessary and can work. Mr. Speaker, they are working and they continue to be necessary. They are working because millions of Canadians have generously subordinated immediate self-interest to the longer-term common good of the nation. In that spirit of generosity lies the greatest hope that the program will continue to attract the support of Canadians and will be ultimately successful.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, it never occurred to me, when I was slated to be the first speaker for the Conservative party this afternoon, that it would be my lot to follow—and I say this in a neutral sense—the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). It is difficult to predict the course of events in this House. On this quiet, early summer afternoon I wish to make some comments on the budget and offer some suggestions.

The Prime Minister set a good example for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) by delivering a short speech. I say this as I wish to comment on the length and dullness of the budget speech; and I assure you I will not indulge in carping criticism. Although the minister's speech did little for the Canadian economy, it did something for me. Speaking as one who may have bored audiences, as I suffered throughout that marathon of platitudes which the minister delivered I felt purged of all sense of guilt. I no longer felt guilty for what I may have inflicted on my audiences during the past 25 years or so.

I am puzzled why the government House leader, whom I regard as an honest and straightforward man, would wish to see the speech televised. Perhaps the hon. gentleman wishes to destroy not only the House of Commons but Canadian television as well. The truth is that the speech would never have been made on TV. Some generously describe the speech as realistic. A more accurate adjective is "soporific." I do not believe anyone could be that dull for so long without really trying. I know that I could not have been so dull for so long without working hard at it.

Mr. Trudeau: You must be trying now.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not know if the minister was trying to put the House of Commons to sleep. I suppose the government's strategy is to tranquillize the Canadian people. Its strategy is also to leave it to the Americans to bring prosperity to Canadians after the next election: Do not raise any disturbing issues in Canada. Prepare your ground well with a few well chosen fights against the big, bad wolves, like certain big labour interests and certain special interests in the country. We saw the Prime Minister start to prepare that ground very nicely this afternoon.

● (1620)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: It surely indicates something about this government, and in fact this country, that the Minister of Finance could have delivered that fatuous speech in the year 1976 in the world as it really exists. I am afraid it says something about the Canadian people. Some of them think that speech was not too bad because there was not anything in it to disturb them. I wondered that night, and I still wonder, whether the minister and I are living in the same world. Is he right to ignore the reality that I see, and content himself with a policy of inertia associated with some tricks, devices and sleight-of-hand such as monkeying with the estimates, unemployment insurance and controls?

I wish to say a few words about the tricks. The Prime Minister emphasized the importance of telling it as it is. There is no need for me to dwell on the basic dishonesty of the government on the issue of controls. The government and its supporters have shown a degree of cynicism that was previously not thought possible in this country. It is just as simple as that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The Prime Minister spoke this afternoon about those members of parliament who are not prepared to help the little fellow whom they were elected to support. I ask the Prime Minister seriously, does he remember anything at all of what he said in 1974? Does he really expect anybody to take him seriously when he attacks any member of this House for failure to defend the little fellow or defend controls?

Consider what the government is doing in the area of unemployment insurance. Changes are being adopted that the government resisted, fought against and repudiated, hoping to convince the electorate that they were prepared to be tough toward unemployment insurance and hoping that the whole issue of the cost of unemployment insurance would quieten down and go away. That is the whole point. Consider the sleight-of-hand with the spending estimates. The Prime Minister made a big fuss, pleading for support for the efforts of the government to cut back on its expenditures. As far back as December last, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) was swearing by everything that is holy that spending for the year ending March 31 last would not be more than 16 per cent higher than in the previous year. He stuck to that story in a pamphlet issued to us in April, just a couple of months ago.

On budget night, however, we learned that spending during the last fiscal year was in fact 18 per cent higher than in the previous year; some $700 million higher than the President of the Treasury Board swore it would be. That may have made a monkey out of the President of the Treasury Board, but it was very convenient for the Minister of Finance and the government as a whole. Having spent that money last year, they not only do not have to spend it this year but it gives them a better basis for comparison in terms of this year's spending. It enables the Minister of Finance to say that expenditures this fiscal year will not grow faster than the gross national product, estimated by him to be about 14 per cent.

The government spent hundreds of millions of dollars during the fiscal year ending March last. It advanced hundreds of millions of dollars to Crown corporations toward the end of that fiscal year, hundreds of millions of dollars which did not need to be advanced or spent in that fiscal year. The government seems to have deliberately inflated last year's spending so that it will look better this year. Thsi is the sort of jigging around, tinkering and dishonesty which one has come to expect from this government.

Some may say I am making a big fuss about very little. What difference, they may ask, does it really make wheth-

er the government spent money in the last fiscal year or the current fiscal year? Just this, Mr. Speaker. Quite apart from making a fool of the President of Treasury Board—and that is his business, with all his fine talk—it puts the Minister of Finance and the government in a position where they may well argue this time next year that expenditure growth did not exceed the growth of the gross national product during this fiscal year. It is just more manipulation.

The Prime Minister pleads for us to co-operate with them in their very earnest effort to control expenditures. He does this, of course, completely forgetting the totally irresponsible commitments made by the government during the election campaign. How can anybody take the Prime Minister seriously? Who can have any confidence, now, that this government will do what it says it will do, that its word is worth the paper on which it is written? Who can really believe that this government believes in anything?

This destruction of confidence is serious. Our challenge in Canada, as in other western democracies, goes far beyond working our way out of this recession. If we look around us, we see that western-style democracies and economies are under attack for lacking a sense of purpose, direction and cohesion. They are under attack for being too materialistic and lacking ideals, under attack for the range of their inequalities, inflation and unemployment.

In Canada, today, we lack a sense of common purpose. Distrust is prevalent. There is distrust of big business, big labour and big government. Citizens do not believe their national government is telling them the truth. Unfortunately, they are too often correct in that regard. The Minister of Finance is not to blame for all of this. However, this is the context in which he ought to have prepared his budget, although you would never recognize that from reading his speech.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) emphasized the need for a budget to set objectives for a period substantially longer than the year for which this budget has provided. We must improve our economic policies. We must re-establish trust between the citizen and his national government. We must ease, rather than aggravate, tension and confrontation that exists within our country.

I am not suggesting that we should abandon our institutions because those institutions are under attack. I am not suggesting that we should subject ourselves, as the Prime Minister said this afternoon, to deep-seated structural reform. The kind of talk indulged in by the Prime Minister around the end of the year is both incoherent and unsettling for many Canadians. He did not do much here this afternoon to throw any light on that question. Of course our institutions must evolve as conditions change. However, our system of a mixed economy, with heavy reliance on private enterprise, is better for us than anything we see abroad. That system may not be the best for certain developing countries, but it is best for us.

Government ownership has a role to play, providing certain national services as our history and our experience shows us. However, public ownership as a means of giving people control of their economy has been shown to be a gigantic illusion. I suspect the most difficult corporations for government to control are Crown corporations where we see a paradoxical lack of control by the government, associated with great difficulty by those corporations in any hard decisions taken.

I say that our system is best for us. However, if we are to preserve it, we must see that it works satisfactorily. It is not working satisfactorily. This is partly due to external conditions, but it is dishonest to blame most of our troubles on the rest of the world, as the Prime Minister and the government have been doing for the past several years. What we need in the post-control period is not more government intervention but more restricted, intelligent, honest and better-defined intervention.

● (1630)

We should define the aims and priorities of government policy for the years ahead. The Leader of the Opposition has emphasized the importance of this. Not only have governments been expanding too rapidly, but they have been unable to solve or deal effectively with the problems they suggested they could solve. The national government in particular has been trying to do so many things that it has not done anything well. This has led to disillusionment and distress. Moreover, government has been taking an increasing proportion of the gross national product, and this in turn has generated inflationary pressures. Then, again, we see the federal government launch, with the provinces, costly programs which the national government now wishes to stick the provincial governments with, thus increasing distrust between the federal and provincial governments. I shall not elaborate on the con game involved in this; I have done so before.

Let me sum up in this way. The federal government has plenty to answer for. Instead of the Prime Minister coming to us and asking us to tell it as it is; instead of coming to us and seeking our support for some program of restraint, let the government tell it as it is, let the government try to be honest with the people. Certainly, the government must slow down the rate of growth of its expenditures if it does not wish to foster continuing inflation as taxpayers try to maintain their position after taxes.

It is clearly not good enough for the federal government to transfer costs to the provinces. That may ease the financial position of the federal government, but it solves nothing. Moreover, it places a heavy strain on confederation. We should recognize that the increasing share of the gross national product taken by the government presents a basic problem for our economy and our society. If that is what the Prime Minister was saying this afternoon, though he did not put it in those terms, I would agree with him. We must face that issue.

I think the hon. member for York-Simcoe did face it. He put before the House a number of proposals for large cuts in expenditures. It is true he did suggest using a small part of that money for certain specific purposes about which the Prime Minister made fun this afternoon. If the Prime Minister and members opposite are serious about the importance of controlling the rate of growth of government expenditures, the situation has gone far beyond hurling challenges at the opposition to say what we would cut. It has gone far beyond that. We must face this problem of the government taking more and more of the gross national product. But we should not regard government restraint as

being in itself a policy of economic management, though this is crucial if we are to preserve our mixed economy, with its heavy reliance on private enterprise, and if our citizens are to regain confidence in what the government says it can do and in what it does.

But I emphasize that government restraint, of itself, will not cause our economy to work satisfactorily. Government restraint is only a precondition. Flexible fiscal and economic policies, as opposed to rigid doctrinaire conceptions, will continue to be essential tools of economic management.

It may have been naive to believe that Keynesian techniques could achieve perfection, that they could produce a perfectly balanced economy with full employment and no inflation. But it would be even more naive to believe that our economy would regulate itself if only the government would control itself, important though that is. Surely we are not going to revert to a pre-Keynesian world. I remember what that world was like, and I do not wish to go back to it. Surely we are going to learn from our post-war experience and not simply throw it out of the window because we have made mistakes. Let us learn from our mistakes. We might even go back and reread Keynes, who never advocated bigger and bigger governments taking an ever-increasing share of a gross national product. In any event, we still need flexible fiscal and monetary tools for economic management, associated with a longer-term policy of economic restraint.

The question is: what additional tools will we need to provide the stability and growth required to enable our institutions to work? That is the question which is worth discussing, not some murky question about changing our institutions. Nearly everyone agrees that price and income controls are not a permanent solution, that they can only be used effectively to deflate inflationary expectations. I say, after long and considerable thought, that the length of the program of controls adopted by the government is both stupid and tragic.

I am sorry the Prime Minister is not in the chamber to hear me say this, but I hope my remarks will be brought to his attention, for what they may be worth. I say the duration of the control program contemplated by the government is both stupid and tragic. In the first place, controls will not work satisfactorily for that length of time. Then, the restriction on collective bargaining, for example, for so long a period will create fear and resentment among organized labour which will subject the economy to severe and unnecessary strain. I say to members of the government over there, "Please stop thinking of maintaining controls for three years or more." I say this is an irresponsible attitude, partly because the government probably has no intention of maintaining controls for that period of time any more than it had any intention of not imposing controls when it was arguing that controls should not be imposed.

The correct policy of the government would be to emphasize its firm intention to drop controls as soon as possible and seek the co-operation of labour, business and other economic groups. The correct policy at this time is for the government to give labour and business an incentive to prove that controls are not necessary. Maintaining the position that the controls are to be kept in place engenders confrontation and tension. The control operation carried out by the government is cynical and is certainly harmful as far as the aspect of its duration is concerned. Controls will not provide a solution to anything except in terms of deflating inflationary expectations on a short-term basis. Nor will controls take care of any competitive disadvantage which may exist in the manufacturing sector of our industry.

● (1640)

The Economic Council has already outlined the reasons for our competitive difficulties in this world of large trading blocs. One problem basically is that, with few exceptions, our manufacturing industries do not have free access to large markets and consequently are not competitive with manufacturing industries which do have free access to large markets. The Economic Council has documented this difficulty.

Why do we not face this problem? Why do we try to pretend that we can perhaps overcome these competitive disadvantages by the imposition of controls? The problem is real, it exists, it will not go away; controls will not drive it away. We will not get rid of it just by cutting or controlling government expenditures. We will not drive this problem away through any approach of Canadian ownership. Nor will we solve the problem by adopting miscellaneous programs to encourage research and development. We will only solve this problem by attacking it in the way the Economic Council indicated.

This, however, is not my main point this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. The main question is: what direction should the government be taking? What direction are we taking? There has been debate about where we should go in the post-controls period. With all due humility, I express the view this afternoon—it is a very simple approach basically, though certainly not easy to carry out—that we should make another effort to run our economy along what I would call orthodox post-war lines; that is to say, we should try to get back to where we were before the government became overcommitted. There is much more force to this than just trying to put the clock back.

I should like to see us adopt a firm determination to reduce somewhat the proportion of the gross national product going to governments in Canada. I say that without any delusions about its difficulties. Associated with this move, however, I wish to see neither the adoption of rigid concepts, such as the necessity of a balanced budget every year, on the one hand, nor, on the other hand, resort to Galbraithian concepts, analyses and solutions.

I should like to see us take another crack at the approaches that seemed to work reasonably well after the war and which we have moved away from substantially during the past ten years. That, I think, is a simple, realistic approach that is worth trying. I believe that if the government were to back off somewhat in terms of expenditures and what it is trying to do in this country—such as to stop taking, for example, more of the working man's pay in taxes, and if the government and the Bank of Canada were to abandon the sort of stop-go policies that we have had in recent years—and took a somewhat longer-term view of economic policy, realizing that policies take time to take effect and have the additional advantage of creating

an atmosphere of more certainty for those involved in our economy, the workingman as well as the businessman—the Leader of the Opposition referred to this—we might achieve, not Utopia but something we could live with. I think it is worth trying and it is urgent that we try it. I believe that all Canadians generally would support this kind of effort.

I am not this afternoon attempting to write a blueprint. My time will soon expire. Certainly, anything I have said this afternoon would have to be supplemented by specific programs, such as attacks on structural unemployment. Nor am I suggesting conditions have not changed in the last ten years, that life in Canada 10, 15 or 20 years ago was the same and that our economy in that period was working perfectly, because I know it was not.

My basic point is that our post-war economic policies worked reasonably well until we got off the track; until, as I have put it, the government became overcommitted, not simply in terms of what it was spending but in terms of what it was trying to do, usually without success. I believe we should make a very determined effort to get back on the track, that the national government should outline a firm, believable set of objectives and policies for, say, the next five years, and try to convince the Canadian people that it is both serious and determined to carry out those policies. One of those policies, of course, would be a very firm attitude toward the rate of inflation, having clearly and firmly delineated its direction. We would then follow the course that had been charted.

I must say that I have not seen evidence that this government is capable of that, and if it is not capable of such an effort, or if it lacks the credibility to put forward such an effort, then the people of Canada will most certainly turn to the Leader of the Opposition for the kind of straightforward, challenging leadership which our country needs. I want to say to my hon. friends opposite, and through them to the Prime Minister, that I believe trickery has run its course in Canada.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in this third budget debate since becoming a member of parliament. I should like to say at the outset that I have never been prouder to be associated with a finance minister and his budget presentation than in this particular case. I think we should all be aware that Canada is in the midst of some troubled times and that there is, indeed, the need for a steady hand on the rudder. I believe that our current finance minister has indicated very clearly that that steady hand is now being applied.

I think it is worth remembering at this time, Mr. Speaker, as we enter a phase with a new finance minister, that he is joining a group of seven able and capable finance ministers which successive Liberal governments in this country, under four prime ministers, have placed in this onerous responsibility since the early days of World War II. I suggest each has acquitted their responsibility with a degree of ability and aplomb that I suggest has been the pride of Canadians and has had much to do with the continuing strength of successive Liberal governments over 30 years of this 36-year period.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

I think it is significant, in the context of today's problems, Mr. Speaker, to bear in mind the importance that must be attached to the direction being given in the area of economic policies. The success of past finance ministers under Liberal governments has brought us through various periods, including a general period in which the population of the country has doubled. It has brought us through a wartime period, a crisis that has never before or since been equalled. It has brought us through a post-war boom, with all its ensuing difficulty as the economy moved ahead at a very rapid and unusual rate.

Liberal government finance ministers were then called upon to take over following a six-year period of Conservative rule during which our national and international reputation, which had been built up so successfully over past years in the area of the management of our economic affairs, was brought to a new low point and almost completely destroyed.

A more recent situation facing the country, of which we are all aware, has been the raging inflation that has beset Canada, and the need eventually to impose strong, central controls when it became evident that voluntary measures were not going to suffice. Finally, it was under a Liberal government that a finance minister has been responsible for implementing a most difficult and challenging set of amendments to our Income Tax Act, which has resulted in a greater degree of equity and fairness under our over-all taxation system.

● (1650)

These were some of the challenges faced by the government and by men of the stature of Ilsley and Abbott, both of whom held the finance minister portfolio for a period of some 14 years, and by people of the stature of Harris and of Gordon, the man who, in spite of problems besetting him and his government, was the single Canadian in high political office who was finally able successfully to pinpoint and bring into public focus one of our most continuing and besetting national problems, the degree of control over our Canadian economy exerted by people beyond our borders. The list goes on.

It is with this background, and in this context of 30 of the past 36 years, that our current Finance Minister, a man of proven ability and strength of character, as evidenced in his previous portfolios, particularly that of energy, mines and resources where I came to know him best, now takes over during an exceedingly difficult period. I suggest he has approached his first budget in his current mandate as Canada's Minister of Finance with a background that is second to none.

On the other side of the coin, what has parliament to offer? At the present time, the financial critic of the official opposition is spending a good deal of his time comparing fiscal expenditures with those of the past 100 years. It seems to me this is an exercise equally as futile as an endeavour to point out that General Motors is today an inefficient operation because its capital expenditures are so much greater than at the time that organization was built up. It is so ridiculous a comparison as to be discountable without any further thought on the part of any Canadian to attempt to follow the rationale of the finance critic of the official opposition.

The position of that finance critic is one which I think we must assume, under the parliamentary system, does indeed involve responsibility to bring intelligent criticism to bear on government economic policies as brought forward in a statement so important as the budget. While I do not envy the task of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens)—it is an arduous task he has been given, to poke holes in an honest and straightforward finance policy brought forward by such an experienced and able minister as the hon. member for Rosedale—I must, however, take him to task for seeking sensationalism in his unfounded accusations, based as they are on the potential media value of the rhetoric contained in them rather than on their actual material content.

He mentioned the so-called 7 per cent growth factor which apparently has been lost over the past two years. Has he examined the picture in other western industrialized countries over the same time? Obviously not. Or if he has, for purposes of his own choosing he has refrained from including these comparisons in his speech. I must assume that he is both too intelligent a person and one who properly prides himself on the research capabilities of his office not to have appreciated that the real GNP for OECD countries dropped by 2 per cent in 1975, far from any gain at all, let alone a 7 per cent gain, and that as a result of, and contributing to this decline in economic activity, was a 6 per cent drop in over-all volume of world trade.

It is inconceivable for a responsible person to suggest that Canada, a country which lives by trading, could remain insulated from this worldwide trend and be expected to fly completely in the other direction, particularly to the extent suggested by the hon. member, the official opposition's financial critic. On one hand the hon. member for York-Simcoe complains of the extent of government control in the economy—and I presume he is referring to all levels of government, including the massive involvement of the government sponsored by his own party in Ontario in the affairs of that province—while on the other hand he moans about the lack of further government involvement in the federal economy in 1976 in his reference to what he chooses to call a "heal thyself" philosophy that he attributes to the federal government's position in relation to economic matters within the country at the present time.

He simply cannot have it both ways. The member indicates concern over what he regards as no real stimulus to employment. Yet he must be aware of the intent of the government to use any funds saved by the changes in the unemployment insurance legislation for job-creation programs. This will obviously operate as a form of stimulus. This may turn out to be something the opposition financial critic may find difficult to accept, being a seemingly confirmed anti-stimulant where the stimulus is to originate with the government.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult to really know where the hon. member stands or even to adequately define the side of the fence on which he appears to sit. The hon. member goes on to talk about lack of tax cuts and a probably horrendous deficit. Surely, tax cuts would result in an even higher deficit. Once again his economic arithmetic is difficult to fathom. The opposition financial critic indicates that we are counting too heavily on the U.S. economy to cure the Canadian economy of its ills. Again, as a businessman, surely he understands the position of the United States as Canada's largest customer. Is it not rational to assume that an improvement in the financial condition of your largest customer is bound to help your situation, when you are indeed its main provider of merchandise?

His reference to lotteries is nothing but a cheap shot. If, indeed, the lotteries of the day at both federal and provincial levels are, as he indicates, a poor remnant of what went on in the seventeenth century, one must assume that the lotteries of those days represented real bonanzas, based on the current success of the current Olympic series of lotteries. Here, again, the official opposition's financial critic is obviously seeking a point that lacks substance, in his attempt to make a publicity score on the government. This sort of meaningless criticism, once again, does him and his party little or no credit and the Canadian people, I suggest, simply will not buy it.

The arguments of the member for York-Simcoe on the anti-inflation program are similarly disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, he continues to argue for the implementation of the controls some 18 months earlier. Yet it seems to me that the government of the day, and the people of Canada, demonstrated quite clearly that they were not prepared to go for controls at that time without benefit of further attempts at consultation among government, labour and industry in a final effort to see if some voluntary means could be found to achieve the desired objective. As stated on many occasions, and surely as heard and noted by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, such efforts at voluntary resolution were not successful.

In the interim, the rates of inflation grew beyond all reasonable limits, reached double-digit rates and thus demanded more concerted and direct involvement by government than voluntary means could possibly have provided. Yet we have the spectacle of the hon. member for York-Simcoe, the official opposition's financial critic, leading his group in opposing that controls legislation when it was finally brought into the House. As to the post-controls period, the financial critic for the Conservative party decries the absence of meaningful discussion over this. Yet what has his own personal contribution been in this direction? When our distinguished Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made even the slightest reference to changes that might be necessary in the future, the best that spokesman for the Conservative party could do was dash off in a form of blind hysteria. I ask whether this really can be considered a responsible position. In my view, it cannot.

I could go on and on analysing and answering criticisms levelled by the hon. member for York-Simcoe in his capacity as the official opposition's financial critic. However, I would like to move for a few minutes to comments made even more recently in this past week by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark).

● (1700)

In one area—that of proposed changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act—the distinguished Leader of the Opposition on the one hand indicates general concurrence with the position advocated by the Minister of Finance

(Mr. Macdonald), but then later in his speech equivocates as to his position when he further examines the matter.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition indicates that the minister fails to provide leadership. Surely this is far from the case, Mr. Speaker. Any real understanding of the term leadership will appreciate that there is a time and a place for holding a firm hand on the rudder and charting a course that lies straight ahead. Stated in another form one might say that, when in a small boat on rough waters and surrounded by alligators, it is no time to stand up and move around. I suggest that the present Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Rosedale, has shown a most direct and meaningful act of leadership in bringing down a budget that might quite fairly be described in a general sense as neutral in its over-all impact on the Canadian economy, a most appropriate stance at this particular time, in my view.

I could continue to pick apart many of the specific criticisms made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech earlier this week. However, I feel that in fairness I must respect the fact that this is his first opportunity to react to government leadership in the area of Canada's economy, in his new and responsible role as leader of his party. Although the Minister of Finance was also presenting his first budget in his new portfolio, I think his most creditable performance must at least in part be attributable to his extensive background in major positions of responsibility within the present government—in each of which he has acquitted himself with a high degree of ability and success. I do appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition has not had the opportunity for serving in anywhere near equivalent positions of responsibility or experience, and no doubt we can expect more from him in the years ahead as he entrenches himself in the role of leader of the party that I am sure Canadians will be pleased to leave in its current position of official opposition for many years in the future.

I have chosen to enunciate in my comments today the underlying strength which I think has been evident in the positions taken and the leadership shown by finance ministers in Liberal governments since World War II. I say again that into this picture enters our current Minister of Finance as he presents his initial budget before the House of Commons and the nation at large. I am sure the House recognizes the obvious ability of our new minister to follow in the illustrious steps of his predecessors. Nowhere is this more in evidence than in the seeming inability of the opposition to come forward with any real, meaningful criticism during this budget debate.

Turning for a moment to the immediate area of the economy that must continue to be of concern to Canadians I want to speak briefly on the matter of the balance of payments situation. In 1973 our current account with other countries was in balance. In 1975 the situation had deteriorated to a $5 billion deficit. In 1976 we are hoping that this deficit can be reduced to $4 billion. Mr. Speaker, we all understand the extenuating and world-wide circumstances that have led to this unfortunate state of affairs. The severe drop in the rate of increase of our 1975 exports to our two major trading partners; the international and national problems in the area of oil and gas—resulting in significant contraction of our exports in these commodities; our continuing deficit in the non-merchandize trade area; all of these contributed in a significant way to the $5 billion deficit which had then to be made up through the importation of substantial amounts of capital—both of short and long term nature. Unfortunately this capital has both to be serviced and repaid in future years, and it really provides an unsatisfactory solution to the problem over the long term.

It is important to point out that this current account deficit was occurring at a time when our Canadian economy continued to perform better than those of most other countries. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the $5 billion cash problem is there, but I believe there is every reason to be optimistic in view of our buoyant economy. Surely methods will be found to offset this substantial cash deficit problem. Certainly improvements in the area of merchandize exports to our major trading partners, as their economies improve, will help substantially. The point is that the cash deficit problem is there and must continue to receive the concerted attention of government and persons in the private sector.

I think it is significant to note that as we discuss this current budget the rate of unemployment has dropped—slightly it is true—but nevertheless the drop from 7.4 per cent to 7.1 per cent is most certainly in the right direction.

I would like to make a brief reference to the features of the budget relating to unemployment insurance, I might add, features that I heartily endorse. By uniting the Manpower and unemployment insurance programs, by increasing the work requirements from 8 to 12 weeks, by more directly tying benefits to the number of weeks worked and granting extended benefits according to regional economic conditions, the cost of the insurance program to taxpayers will be lowered at no risk to its equity. The Canadian unemployment insurance program has been hailed as one of the most advanced in the world. The changes which have been announced will help to reduce the opportunities to violate the intent of the program.

The integration of unemployment and Manpower services will result in improved enforcement of the provision that recipients be actively seeking work. I think that is important, and the length and eligibility requirement should discourage over-reliance on unemployment insurance as a principal source of income. Like other forms of justice, social justice must not only be fair but must be seen to be fair if it is to retain the support of society as a whole.

In conclusion, there are no claims that this budget would be a panacea for all our economic problems. However, the decision not to attempt extensive remedies should not be confused with indecisiveness. Rather, it represents a mature recognition of the limits of effective government intervention and of the importance of individual initiative. That problems will persist, there can be no doubt. Neither an unemployment level of 7.1 per cent nor an inflation rate which approaches 9 per cent is compatible with a healthy economy. Both undermine the foundations of an open society. The increased levels of investment which are essential if we are to avoid an early relapse are likely to await further improvements in business confidence.

The demand for housing continues to outstrip the supply. Credit conditions play a particularly important

role in the housing sector, and mortgage rates which are near the 12 per cent level make it all the more difficult to finance the construction or purchase of a home.

I might add that I do not share the views of those who suggest that the average Canadian should no longer be expected to own his own home. Whenever the opportunity has been available, people have unequivocally demonstrated their preference for their own piece of property and their own backyard. It is therefore essential that there be further improvements in the housing industry.

There are many positive signs on the economic horizon. A careful review of the minister's speech and accompanying documents most certainly gives legitimate cause for an optimistic if cautious attitude on the part of all Canadians. It is this kind of positive attitude that we on this side of the House feel is the appropriate and justifiable stance to hold. I am personally thankful that the prophets of doom and gloom, epitomized in the little thought out and almost desperate tone of the official critics of the opposition, do indeed occupy the benches opposite.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, it is great to get into this debate finally after waiting for so many days. The fact that so many cabinet ministers have spoken in this debate is an indication to me of its weakness. I do not believe the House has witnessed so many cabinet participants in a budget debate for many years.

● (1710)

The intervention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) today can be classified as a painful exercise in generalized vagueness. In fact if the parade of cabinet ministers continues, we may have a new entry for the Guinness Book of Records for the most cabinet ministers to speak in support of a budget which was so lacking in content that it needed their contribution to prop it up.

Recently the Prime Minister was quoted as saying that it would take a miracle for the anti-inflation controls to be removed. Let us say that if the budget presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) is any indication of the talents of the government, then we can be sure there are no miracle makers in its ranks.

This is really such a bare bones budget that one has difficulty separating the verbiage of the document from the measures which normally flow from budgets. Indeed, by 10.15 p.m. on budget night the media people in the lobby were putting their cameras and tape recorders to bed, and there has to be a message there. Watching some members of the front benches opposite, one could see them fighting off yawns.

One of the few good things in the budget was the removal of research and development from the Anti-Inflation Board regulations. This was hardly a stroke of genius because research and development should never have been placed under the AIB regulations in the first place. We will never know the full extent of the damage to the development of products in Canada. We could not calculate the number of projects which would have been undertaken but were either cancelled or moved out of the country. As it stands today, research and development projects will have to be approved by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce before they will be allowed as an expense item, and I am not too confident that that is the best procedure to follow.

Let me deal with a few items in the budget. Under the heading of energy conservation the minister announced a tax of $100 on automobile air conditioners. Any competent automotive engineer will tell us that an air conditioner uses the same amount of horsepower as power steering. In fact when in use automobile air conditioners take less than one mile per gallon from performance. If you have the wrong tire pressure in your automobile tires that can rob you of more than one mile per gallon and create a tremendous safety hazard as well.

The weight tax on automobiles must be questioned. Surely the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, which obviously put this tax in the budget, must realize the lead time required for the design of an automobile. Of course I am not surprised that the minister of that department did not think it out because he is part of the energy problem, not part of the solution.

Earlier this year the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) announced that government policy, in line with that of the United States, was to set a target of 24 miles per gallon fleet average for cars by 1980, and here again we have a conflict between the two ministers.

This budget increases the weight tax in stages to 1979. Bearing in mind the lead time required for design, and bearing in mind that the industry has accepted the 24 miles per gallon standard and adopted it as an industry standard, why have we chosen to complicate the problem further by adding a further tax?

We have a rationalized North American automobile industry, to some extent, and now we may be heading for a separate standard for Canada as distinct from the United States. While I appreciate the need for conserving energy I believe it could be accomplished in other ways without interference in the design and production of automobiles. We find the motor vehicle safety standards have added more than 1,000 pounds to an automobile.

In fact to look at the weight of a vehicle alone as the criterion for saving fuel shows the lack of in-depth study done by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Department of Transport. It is obvious to anyone dealing with motor vehicles that aerodynamics, tires, axle ratios, carburetion, engine displacement, and so on can have more effect on the efficiency of the engine performance than the weight of the vehicle. In many instances a small, light weight engine is less efficient than a larger, heavier engine.

When one considers the impact on our domestic industry and how our trade balance is affected when the industry is not at top production, one can only conclude that the provisions for additional taxation are inappropriate at this time.

The real disappointment in the budget is that the government missed a real opportunity to add a measure of confidence that would show our economy is really recovering, that inflation is being contained, and unemployment is being reduced.

Instead, we have another budget deficit of more than $5 billion, a trade deficit in high technology product of $9

billion, and no meaningful reduction in unemployment. In fact it is forecast that we will have an increase in unemployment before the end of this year, and that is tragic. The tragedy in all the economic problems we face is that it could be so different. When we travel out of the country we are told how fortunate we are in Canada with all our resources. Yet within the country we are being told we are running out of resources.

Various members on the government front bench have stated that the recovery of our economy is directly related to the recovery of the American economy. While in Japan a few weeks ago, Japanese cabinet ministers with whom we discussed the question indicated that the recovery of their economy depended to a great extent on the recovery of the American economy. In Japan I picked up an Australian newspaper and read that the Prime Minister of Australia stated that their economic recovery depended upon the recovery of the American economy. If we read the comments in the OECD releases, we will find that they continually refer to the European economic recovery linked to the recovery of the American economy.

It would seem to me that we should be working closely with the Americans to see that our economy not only recovers in step with theirs but that we put in place complementary taxation and tariff measures to see that both our economies remain strong and buoyant. Rationalization of taxation is an urgent priority for the manufacturing sector.

We have no industrial strategy. In fact much of the profit earned by industry since 1971 is a pure paper profit. The combined effect of inventory inflation and a rate of depreciation on assets that is inadequate to recover the replacement of that asset has created levels of profitability that are fictitious. In many cases companies have to borrow to pay the tax bill. The net result is that most businesses face cash flow problems. Decisions to replace machinery are deferred because of lack of cash and increased replacement cost. Plant expansion has been held off because of increased cost, lack of cash, and the high cost of borrowed money.

When you spin off the combined effect of inflated inventory prices, unrealistic depreciation allowances, lack of adequate cash to operate, and high interest rates for borrowing, you realize the opportunity missed by the government to put in place some legislation that would build a sound foundation for an economic recovery. Once in place, that type of legislation can be adjusted to achieve the national objectives of a strong secondary industrial base.

Canada will for the forseeable future be a trader in rocks and logs in the international market place. The amount of processing of our mineral resources we are able to accomplish will depend upon the acceptance of those resources in the market place. There are those who like to comment on the economy and who would have us refuse to ship our mineral resources unless they are partially or completely processed. That is an unrealistic approach. We are not the only country in the world with mineral resources for sale. We have to compete for orders in a market that is flexible and moving. Our labour rates are amongst the highest in the world. To offset this we must be more productive and more efficient in our business process. Our transportation, because of the distances involved, must be the best and most efficient to offset the distances to markets. It follows, then, that we have to operate in an atmosphere as free from government interference as possible.

The most urgent negotiation the federal government should undertake is with the provinces to work out a taxation formula to maximize the development of our mineral resources. But hand in hand with this is the development of a secondary industrial base, not only to complement the mineral industry but also to produce more of the products we import.

Each year we see the number of companies involved in manufacturing declining. Many companies find they can purchase the products they were manufacturing from a source outside the country, and merely act as a sales agent and marketing arm. There are more and more manufacturers becoming marketing organizations. It usually starts with a position that says, "We will round out our line of products with imports." From there they move to calculate the capital cost of new plant and machinery research and development against the cost of acquiring a product offshore. You can go through industry after industry and find this happening. In fact a large portion of products manufactured in Canada are aligned against similar products from countries that are classified as Third World countries that have labour rates only a fraction of our rates.

● (1720)

Looking at the decline in the manufacturing sector of our economy, one can only say that there is a death wish in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce that virtually all manufacturing cease in this country and that we become a net importer of products of other countries forever.

Certainly a look at the textile industry is a classic case in point. Our manufacturers' share of the Canadian market is dropping and has reached a level that they only enjoy 46 per cent of the domestic market. Only 6 per cent of the available domestic market is covered by quotas. In order to claim damage from imported textiles the manufacturers can appeal to the textile board, but the process is complicated and lengthy. By the time a case is heard it is too late for action to be taken.

By comparison the United States textile manufacturers have about 90 per cent of their domestic market reserved for them. The United States government has negotiated 19 separate agreements on textile quotas with various countries that produce fibres, woven and knitted products, flat goods, and apparel.

The net result of all this is that we find the Canadian textile industry in general will not invest in new plant facilities, and will only upgrade and maintain the better and newer production facilities. Plants that should be replaced will be closed down and more unemployment will result. Certainly the people responsible for including, in the first instance, research and development in the Anti-Inflation Board's regulations, and restricting the level of expenditures by a formula classifying research and development with donations to charity, promotion and advertising, displayed plain stupidity.

It is this type of bureaucratic stupidity that has frustrated manufacturing in Canada for years. We need, first, a complete overhaul and review of our taxation system. It

must be compared with that of our major trading partners to see that we are not placing our manufacturing industry in a non-competitive position because of inequities in our taxation system.

We must then examine the pricing of inventories and take a look at the method of calculating depreciation. Manufacturing profits should be stripped of inflation factors, and the profits should reflect true profits. To offset high interest rates a serious study of depreciation methods and an appropriate adjustment will do much to increase the cash flow in a business.

Profits that are earned and reinvested should not be subject to taxation. This would help the cash flow problem facing many businesses today.

Needless to say I am deeply disappointed that the budget did not reflect some of these points. We have so much potential in this country. I find it discouraging, and feel the sense of frustration that there is in this country with a government that has so little imagination that, at a time when other economies are advancing, we are still playing the short term game of finance. Is it any wonder that after the budget presentation when we asked people in business, "What did you think of the budget?", they replied, "What budget?"

There is a basic weakness in the departmental structure of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Perhaps the weakness is the fact that industry is included with trade in one department. Perhaps we would be better served in Canada if industry were separated from trade and we could then have them pursue their separate goals. Certainly a visit to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce confirms this. Talk to the people at Industry, Trade and Commerce about a product, and the first and most urgent question is whether or not it has export potential. If you say you want to serve a domestic market they lose interest.

In other words the heavy emphasis is on trade. Industry itself is only of secondary concern to the people in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Question the people at the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce about product development in Canada and you are surrounded with classic bureaucratic buzz words such as world scale, economies of scale, export—export—export. You end up frustrated and discouraged.

There has never been any real co-ordination between the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. A case in point is that there is at present a backlog of 370 cases to be heard by the Opposition Board of the Registrar of Trade Marks. Under normal circumstances the Opposition Board would rule on about 60 cases a year. At the present time the trade marks office is dealing with cases presented for adjudication three years ago. Only the registrar can give a ruling on these cases, but the new registrar is on a year's immersion course to learn French. Consequently when he returns he will be looking at more than six years of backlog. What an intolerable situation! It requires an amendment to the Trade Marks Act to allow person other than the registrar to act on his behalf.

When you look at the combined effect of all the disincentives to the business community, it is any wonder there is dissatisfaction and frustration? Let us for a moment add up the problems they face. The Anti-Inflation Board has more than 3,000 wage settlements to rule on; inflation is creating false profits that are being taxed at too high a level; the combined effect of federal and provincial taxes and royalties is holding back expansion of our non-energy resource industries; inventory pricing under existing regulations does not allow for an inflation factor; depreciation allowances do not reflect the replacement cost of capital assets; there is a basic tax penalty for Canadian manufacturers as compared to our major trading partners; before phase one of the competition legislation has had a chance to work, we will be looking at phase two; interest rates are the highest of any country of the western world; our productivity is amongst the lowest of any of the O.E.C.D. countries; we have a six year backlog of trade mark cases to be considered by the Opposition Board under the Trade Marks Act; working capital is so short that some companies are borrowing money to pay their tax bills to the federal government; we lost 11 million man years due to strikes in 1975; we lost more than 11 million man years due to alcoholism and drug use in industry in 1975; research and development are at the lowest level they have ever been.

Only two countries on the O.E.C.D. list have lower research and development than Canada; we had, until this budget, research and development subjected to AIB regulations and formulae. This alone caused cancellation of many projects. It has taken four years after the realization that we had an energy supply problem for the government to act on expense deductions for exploration costs. While we welcome the announcement in the budget we must ask, along with other Canadians, "Why did it take so long for you to act?"

We face more and more intrusion in the private sector by the federal government. Add to all the foregoing, the year-end musings of the Prime Minister on the economy, and subsequent statements, and you will begin to see the depths of despair and frustration of the business community.

Many cabinet ministers who have spoken said that the official opposition has offered no solutions but pointed out legislative weaknesses. If you examine the points I have just mentioned you must agree that solutions to most, if not all of them, could have been included in the budget. Too much goes to the government. In fact these suggestions would have gone a long way toward stimulating employment and helping to reduce the level of unemployment in the country.

Inflation can be beaten, but the action that has been taken so far I do not believe has made the impact it could have made. Our trade deficit and balance of payments problem, in spite of the buoyant words of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson), will be with us for some time. In fact his speech reminded me of a man whistling in a graveyard trying to keep his spirits up.

I have tried to set forth the real facts and problems as I see them. I have spent most of my life in business. I have had to look at the realities of economic life. If I had to choose a board of directors from the government benches I

would be hard pressed to find one person to whom I would offer that position of trust. From the Prime Minister down, there is hardly anyone who would qualify based on their eight years of lack lustre performance. This budget reflects the lack of talent available.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1730)

Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, once again I should like to bring to the attention of the House and the Canadian people the importance to Canada's economy of science and technology, which in turn rest on a foundation of research and development.

I was pleased to learn that the new budget removes approved expenditures for research and development from the list of restricted expenses under the Anti-Inflation Act, expecially so since I made representations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and emphasized this point strongly in my speech during the recent opposition day debate on science and technology. I am glad that the government showed a sensitive and sensible response to an important matter when it was brought to its attention.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It was a beginning.

Mr. Maine: Two major aspects of science and technology in our economy are vital: harnessing it and controlling it. One without the other does nothing to improve either our standard of living or the health of our economy.

The harnessing of science and technology is done in the laboratory. To this end we spend millions of dollars annually to train scientists in our universities. We have expertise in many high-technology-content areas, but we rarely reap the benefits from this knowledge via its application because we do not control the use of that knowledge. If we are to derive benefit from scientific research work, the results must be commercialized and thereby translated into the Gross National Product. The "brain drain" about which we heard so much in the early sixties remains a serious problem. There are very few significant industrial research and development operations in Canada.

If by chance a multinational corporation does become interested in a product of Canadian technology, it is unlikely that much, if any, financial benefit will be realized by Canada. It is the practice of most multinationals based in the United States to carry out virtually all research and development in American labs and limit the Canadian operation strictly to manufacturing. The auto industry provides a very good example of that type of operation. All of the research and development work in the automotive industry is done in Detroit. All that is left for the Canadian operation is assembly line jobs, while jobs which should be going to our university graduates do not exist in this country.

Occasionally there has developed in Canada a research and development facility rivalling the best in the world. One of these is the RCA Limited Research Laboratories in Montreal, part of RCA Limited. There is no better example of the problem of Canadian control of science and technology than the announcement by RCA corporation that it is closing down these labs. RCA Limited is owned 100 per cent by RCA International Development Corporation in New York. The Canadian company has 20 directors, ten of whom are U.S. nationals. The president of RCA Limited, Mr. G. Denton Clark, is a native of Montreal who has taken out United States citizenship. The company dates back to the turn of the century, became part of RCA during the 1920's, was for many years known as RCA Victor, and in 1968 became RCA Limited. In 1975 the sales volume of RCA Limited was approximately $175 million. At least 75 per cent was in consumer products or components for consumer products. Of the remaining 25 per cent a substantial amount was sales to the federal government or to Crown corporations.

For many years RCA corporation prospered under the direction of David Sarnoff, who built the organization into the giant multinational it is today. Following Sarnoff's retirement in 1970, his son, Robert Sarnoff, became president of RCA corporation. The young Sarnoff, for whatever reasons, was unable to provide the quality of leadership his father had shown. He was replaced as president in 1971 by Andrew L. Conrad, who now also serves as chairman of the board since Robert Sarnoff's resignation from RCA last fall.

Before Mr. Clark became president in 1973, the president of RCA Limited functioned largely as an administrative head. Effective line authority over the five divisional vice presidents was exercised by the corresponding executive vice presidents at the headquarters of RCA corporation in New York. With Mr. Clark as president, this situation appeared to change. The new president attempted to establish full functional line authority over the five operating divisions. In what was viewed by the government to be a significant move, the research and development laboratories were elevated to the status of an autonomous division reporting directly to the president.

In March, 1975, Mr. Denton Clark indicated to the government that the future direction of RCA Limited would emphasize Canadian autonomy, a world-wide product mandate, high technology and Canadian design capability, and the expansion of business. In an apparent reversal of Mr. Clark's earlier position, RCA announced on March 18, 1976, a restructuring of RCA Limited, "as part of an international program at RCA corporation to make its product divisions more efficient and profitable by giving them direct control of their world-wide operations."

RCA issued a further press release in April stating that, "Consistent with RCA's restructuring program, RCA Limited is undertaking a major realignment of its research and development activities." In other words, the research and development laboratories will be closed down at the end of this year, or by the end of the first quarter of 1977 at the latest. Some of the work done by the laboratories will be transferred to other divisions within the company, but only about 30 per cent of the scientists now engaged in research and development will be assigned positions in those divisions. However, those will not be research positions and will not be innovating the expertise developed at the research centre.

RCA Limited has made good use of the incentives programs which are available to industry through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The company has, during the past ten years, received at least $20 million in outright government assistance for research and develop-

ment. In addition it has benefited from $67 million of financing provided by CIDA and the Export Development Corporation toward sales to other countries through RCA Limited's government and commercial systems division, one of the five divisions in the company. Without this government assistance these foreign sales would not have been made.

What has been a successful and highly respected scientific research centre in Canada is now to be disbanded and abandoned because Ed Griffiths, an executive vice president of RCA corporation and president of RCA electronics and diversified businesses, decided that such a move would increase profits for the parent company and streamline its international operation. Mr. Griffiths was responsible for restructuring the Canadian Hertz rent-a-car company, an RCA subsidiary, so that control was centralized more completely at the American head office, leaving little autonomy for the Canadian operation. Apparently because that move was financially effective it was felt that similar actions should be taken with RCA Limited. I maintain that no matter what economic sense this realignment may make to the American parent company, such high-handed measures, disregarding Canada's needs and priorities, should not take place or be allowed to take place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Maine: Most hon. members are aware that the government updated last year its guidelines for good corporate citizenship for foreign companies operating in Canada. Those guidelines state that foreign-controlled firms in Canada should pursue a high degree of autonomy in the exercise of decision-making and risk-taking functions, including innovative activity and the marketing of any resulting new products. RCA Limited was committed to function according to that principle. That commitment has, as I have shown, been rescinded by the parent corporation.

The guidelines also ask that companies develop as an integral part of the Canadian operation an autonomous capability for technological innovation, including research, development, engineering, industrial design and pre-production activities. Here again the actions of RCA corporation show no regard for that principle.

Furthermore the guidelines suggest that the companies foster a Canadian outlook within management, as well as enlarged career opportunities within Canada, by promoting Canadians to senior and middle management positions and by including a majority of Canadians on boards of directors of all Canadian companies, in accordance with the spirit of federal legislative initiatives. The board of directors of RCA Limited does not have a majority of Canadian members. Neither does the company offer expanded career opportunities within Canada when it closes down a successful operation that will almost certainly force brilliant Canadian scientists to take employment in the United States.

● (1740)

What is to be done? RCA Corporation should review its decision in the context not only of profitability but also in the wider context of Canada's national interest bearing in mind the large amount of Canadian taxpayers' dollars that have assisted the company in achieving its reputation and sales. RCA Limited has been successful in establishing an excellent technical capability in satellite subsystem design. The recent award of the Telesat contract to RCA Limited enabled its satellite group to remain in business in Canada, and its continued viability will depend on government support.

If the company is not prepared to reverse this retrograde decision, the government should not give any further subsidy to a company which has demonstrated that it will not abide by the "New Principles of International Business Conduct", as published by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in July, 1975. Canadian consumers, too, should consider whether they should purchase products from a company that is not prepared to be a good Canadian corporate citizen.

As 75 per cent of the company's sales come from consumer products, primarily TV sales, if RCA does not change its policy, I would urge Canadians not to buy RCA. I repeat, do not buy RCA products—boycott RCA if RCA Corporation closes its research and development labs. Fight fire with fire. If RCA wants to attack Canada's future, let Canada attack RCA's future!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Maine: There is no point in the government taking measures to encourage industrial research and development if foreign multinationals such as RCA are not prepared to support Canadian research operations. But, since our standard of living is directly related to the harnessing of research and development and will be even more so in the future, it is absolutely essential that we have and maintain a viable industrial research and development community in Canada if we are to have any control of our own future.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling), indicated, this is a rather record-breaking debate in terms of participation by cabinet ministers. They have indeed been brave souls, trying diligently to make the best of this budget, hopefully trying to make it a saleable product.

I was very impressed by the attempt of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) to try to sell the sizzle in the budget, the sizzle that is not there. A number of members have participated in this debate, including the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson), the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) and other brave souls.

I listened very closely yesterday to the speech by the President of Treasury Board. He ran out of steam about half way through, talking directly about the budget. He switched to debating the Official Languages Act and policy. His comments seemed to run counter to the report of the languages commissioner.

The President of the Treasury Board went on at great length suggesting that the critics of government expenditure controls were ill informed. I trust he was not including in that category the Auditor General, having regard to the rather stinging indictment the Auditor General made about government budgetary control, improper accounting methods, and a dearth of clear-cut understandable infor-

mation contained in the estimates and the public accounts. That is very clearly documented. It is something of which the government, and indeed all members of parliament, should take serious cognizance.

In my view parliament must have a better awareness of government's anticipated spending and government's intentions both in the short and long term. Further, adequate provisions and procedures must be established in order properly and effectively to examine and scrutinize all government expenditures.

The former Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), today dwelt at great length on the cynicism and lack of trust that pervade society with respect to our parliamentary and other democratic institutions. It is something we must all concern ourselves with if we are going to preserve the kind of credibility our institutions deserve and, with it, the kind of support we must have in order that our institutions will function in an orderly and proper manner.

The budget that we are debating has been described in many ways. Don McGillivary of Southam News described it as a drifting, dreaming budget in the midst of multiplying economic problems. Doug Fisher referred to it as 90 minutes of rhetorical drivel. He suggested the government did not have two ideas to rub together. He further suggested that the manner in which the budget was presented was tantamount to a non-relevant ritual. I think we all agree there were a lot of words in the budget, perhaps a lot of unnecessary words. I think we can further agree that the speech was honed in such a way as to preserve the government's own self interest.

I see my good friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), in the Chamber. Some people refer to him these days as the "Minister of sour milk and rotten eggs", but I would not do that. He is indeed a very unique Minister of Agriculture. The fact that we taunt each other in the House from time to time does not in any way affect our personal regard for one another.

The Minister of Agriculture has been under a fair amount of pressure, and under a lot of heat lately. He adopts the same profile as the others. When things are going well in agriculture, he is the first to take credit. If things go sour and we have a rotten egg or sour milk problem, who does he blame? He blames the provinces. It is not the fault of the Department of Agriculture or the government.

Mr. Kempling: Typical Grit trick.

Mr. Whelan: If they had done what I told them, there would be no problem.

Mr. Mazankowski: There he goes again. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicates that the farmers are getting enough and they should thank him.

Mr. Whelan: They are the highest paid in the world. Heward Grafftey said we should lower the pay.

Mr. Mazankowski: I am surprised that the Minister of Agriculture has not engaged in this debate. I can only presume it is because there is nothing positive in this budget to help agriculture in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Just ask the pork producers; they will tell you.

Mr. Whelan: They are the best off farmers in Canada.

Mr. Mazankowski: I would love to get involved in an agricultural debate, but unfortunately I have to speak on other things today. There is nothing I would love to talk about more than the "blue tongue Superbull."

We need only look at the attitude the government has taken when it expresses great satisfaction over the fact that we survived with a zero growth rate in this country last year. That has been described as a successful achievement. As the leader of my party pointed out in his remarks—

An hon. Member: Which one?

Mr. Mazankowski: We have a number of leaders. Together we are building a team that will lead this country out of the doldrums, and back to prosperity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1750)

Mr. Mazankowski: As our leader has pointed out, the difference between our party and the governing Liberal party is the absence of any clear determination of growth, the absence of any clear direction. I think it well worth while drawing attention to what our leader stated as was reported in *Hansard* at page 14284, "We see sound economic growth not as a contradiction to inflation control but as a prime requisite for the control of inflation in the long term." In that context I should like to quote a passage from the latest edition of *The Economist*, that of May 22, 1976. This is from an article entitled "Out of Slump."

> In 1974 the world's six largest industrial economies marched roughly in step into slump. These big six are America, Japan, West Germany, France, Britain and Italy, which together account for 80 per cent of the output of the 24 rich countries in the Organization for Economic Corporation and Development. In 1975 two of the big six turned back up again early (America and Japan) while three others (France, Britain and Italy) turned back up again late. But by the end of 1975, industrial output in all six was rising again.
>
> In January-March, 1976, recovery continued and each of the big six achieved faster industrial growth than its longer term trend. On this reckoning, the slump is over and the boom has begun. Everywhere idle plant and capacity are being brought back into use. Everywhere unemployment has stopped rising, and almost everywhere it should soon be steadily reduced.
>
> In theory this should be the start of a long and strong boom. The world has a lot of lost ground to recover. Do the impossibly huge industrial growth rates necessary to get the world back on trend mean that there is no danger of overheating—of overstrain in capacity in any of the big six until 1981 at least? Not quite.

I think that sets out the international scene succinctly. It is obvious that recovery internationally is well under way. It seems to me that the budget we are discussing is not tuned in to the realities of the recovery on the international scene—that we have failed to take advantage of what might well be a long and sustained boom.

Look at the government's position with respect to spending. Here again we find the government patting itself on the back for the manner in which it says it is cutting back

or controlling federal expenditure. I should like to examine that aspect in some detail, but I will repeat once again that this budget is clearly not a good budget; it fails to include measures to encourage productivity or stimulate sales abroad despite the fact that our industrial plant is operating at less than 80 per cent of capacity.

It has been said over and over again in this debate, but it still bears repetition, that the government relies essentially on the recovery of the United States and its other trading partners. It intends to rely also upon the Anti-Inflation Board whose staff has now increased to 853 in an effort to deal with a backlog of 3,000 wage cases and to reduce delays which have made it an increasing target of criticism. The budget is completely lacking in vision of the full potential of this country. I find it amusing, having regard to the curt attitude the government has taken toward the United States that it should now be relying on that country as its saviour.

A word, now, about the importance of the private sector. The Prime Minister and some of his colleagues had all but written off the private sector last December, but it has suddenly become the key factor again. It is consoling that some ministers like the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) should be coming out in defence of the private enterprise system, and I hope some of their colleagues will engage in the same crusade.

What about the reckless spending habits of the government and, in particular, the position of the President of the Treasury Board who is going about the country trying to convince Canadians that the government has become the epitome of restraint and good economic management? The fact that it is content to live with a further deficit of $4.5 billion shows us how phony and misleading it is. I think this reflects a blatant failure on the part of the government to control its own spending which, in my view, continues to be one of the main factors contributing to inflation.

The government has clearly demonstrated its inability to forecast accurately its expenditures and revenues. Review the record. On November 18, 1974, finance minister Turner told Canadians that he expected a deficit of $1 billion in the financial year ending March 31, 1976. Mr. Turner returned to the House with a new budget on June 23, 1975, and revealed that the $1 billion deficit he had planned earlier was in fact to be $3.2 billion. The estimate had gone awry, he said, because he had over-estimated revenues by nearly $2 billion, having taken an over-optimistic view of the economy. Despite the drastic revision of the expected deficit of the June 23 budget, evidence mounted during the fall of 1975 that the federal government had lost control of the deficit. Presented with evidence showing that the deficit would climb even higher than Mr. Turner's estimate of June 23, 1975, the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) refused to comment. He said it would be of little value to comment on such projections.

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

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was pointing out the dismal record that the government has had in its ability to forecast. I was also leading up to the point that the Minister of Finance was not left with a very glamorous situation. While the former minister of finance may have been a glamour boy, he did not have the propensity for being able to put the nation's economic house in order. We are now faced over there with a new version, a version in the name of "Thumper". Whether he can put our economic house in order remains a leading question, but it is little wonder that he refuses to say what the predicted deficit will be.

In his budget speech of May 25 the Minister of Finance revealed that the deficit would be $4.1 billion in 1976, $900 million over the June 23, 1975, estimate. This time the fault lay not in inaccurate economic forecasting but in the fact that federal expenditures had overshot their target by close to $1 billion. The finance minister chose not to tell Canadians that the budgetary deficit had quadrupled in size since the first estimate of November 18, 1974. To make such a comment would have revealed both the wilful deceptions of previous federal economic forecasting as well as the incompetence of the present administration in controlling its own spending.

We have only to turn the clock back to the campaign of 1974, May and June, to ask how the government can stand up in a very sanctimonious fashion and preach restraint and responsibility? During the 1974 election campaign this was the government that so recklessly threw money around. Its members made election promises amounting to billions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, of your money and mine, simply to buy votes.

Today the Prime Minister stood up in this House and said, "We have to level with the Canadian people". He appealed to all members of parliament to be honest and to tell the story as it really is, and to tell it particularly to the little people. I can assure hon. members opposite and you, Sir, that many Canadians did not ask for the extravagances which were promised during the election campaign of 1974, but in the name of power, and only in the name of power, did this irresponsible, power hungry bunch scandalously pilfer the Canadian taxpayers' money.

The President of the Treasury Board failed to deal with this particular point in his remarks yesterday, and I am glad to see that he has now come into the House. He failed to justify the startling figures on the basis that they were political. It was a political game rather than an honest economic game. This particular view is shared by many Canadians, including a well known Liberal by the name of Douglas H. Fullerton who, in the Ottawa *Citizen* for March 8, in an article entitled "Dear Pierre: Who Said We Wanted All Those Goodies?" wrote as follows:

> Come off it, Pierre, did we the people really ask for all those goodies your government showered on us these past eight years?
>
> I'm awfully tired of hearing you say, as you did again recently in Vancouver, that the enormous rise in federal spending since you became prime minister has occurred because of the insistent and growing demands of an expectant public for more government handouts.

This is a phony argument, a smokescreen designed to obscure the truth. Most of your new or expanded programs were concocted by a group of your colleagues, the "liberal" or spending wing, perhaps more appropriately designed as the "drunken sailors". With your support, their schemes were powered through cabinet and caucus, despite the doubts of more cautious ministers and members.

I am not challenging the motives of this spending lobby, which I suspect range from a humanitarian desire to benefit the weaker members of our society, down to instinctual political or personal urges for recognition, glory or re-election. What is at issue is that they are much less a response to a need felt by the public than the collective decisions of a small but powerful group at the top, who believed that they knew what was best for the country.

This is elaborated further by the former auditor general in an article appearing in the *Globe and Mail* for Wednesday, April 28. I quote him as follows:

Spending public money "seems to have become almost the exclusive preoccupation of the government, with the politicians spending the people's tax money almost solely to buy votes to retain power, with little regard for parliament and no regard at all for the concept of balancing the budget or living within the country's means . . .

Unlike businesses which have to meet payrolls and make profits or face disasters, governments can never face bankruptcy so long as they have an unlimited blank cheque on the pockets of the taxpayers of the country.

Yesterday we had a long dissertation from the President of the Treasury Board, who has been making a lot of sweeping statements recently. He generated a lot of publicity across the country. *Maclean's* referred to him as "Mr. No". He has also been referred to as the fastest gun in the east. Members on both sides of the House, I know, have a great amount of admiration for the minister's capacity and integrity, but we know very well that he is very political; he is a cagey individual, and he is very canny when it comes to manoeuvring and manipulating figures. I suppose his training in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has served him well in that regard. But we know very well that in justifying government expenditure the minister has used deferrals. He used the business of transferring or borrowing authority.

● (2010)

We see a new technique in the formation of Loto Canada by which the minister is using an estimate to enact legislation which in effect establishes a Crown corporation, outlining its purpose and its method of financing, so we know very well that the minister is very capable. However, as the *Globe and Mail* has suggested in an article on Monday, May 24, some of his practices are somewhat deceptive.

The President of the Treasury Board has talked a good line about restraint, but surely with the record of increase in government spending by this administration since it took office there is a lot of room for trimming government fat. I must say that, because of the juggling of figures and the manipulation, many Canadians are not convinced that the government has seriously cut back on federal government expenditures. It has not been able to live within its own forecasts and its own predictions. On February 18, 1976, the President of the Treasury Board, during the tabling of his estimates for 1976-77, stated in the House as follows:

Government expenditures in 1975-76 will be held to 16 per cent or less over 1974-75.

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

He stated further:

I am pleased to say that there is now every indication that this target will be achieved.

I must say that this is 1 per cent over his prediction in February, 1975, when he said he would keep expenditures down to a 15 per cent level. As late as April 27, 1976, less than one month before the budget was brought down, in an address to the Toronto Metropolitan Board of Trade he heaped praise upon himself for cutting the percentage increase of 16 per cent during the last fiscal year. That was less than a month before the budget was brought down.

As I said earlier, the minister reminds me of the Minister of Agriculture who heaps praise upon himself. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not here. He is probably mourning over the fact that his good friend, Beryl Plumptre, has resigned. I think she was a political asset to the Minister of Agriculture.

The minister said further, "I will not fudge or juggle statistics", but that is precisely what he is doing. While the minister purported in the same speech just one month before the budget, to have had effective control—he declared that he managed to hold spending to 16 per cent for 1975-76—what did we see on budget night? We saw that increase rise to 18 per cent, which amounts to more than peanuts, it amounts to some $725 million. We have not received a satisfactory explanation for that.

The President of the Treasury Board waffled around the subject yesterday but, in my opinion, the explanation is far from satisfactory. If this money was spent in 1975-76, why is it included in the estimates for 1976-77? Should not the figure of $42,150,000,000 be reduced by $725 million? This is tantamount to the Minister of Finance and the President of the Treasury Board hoodwinking the Canadian people into believing that they will restrain their spending in 1976-77 to 14 per cent over the previous fiscal year. This is another example of the government's manipulating and juggling figures. Its record of forecasting and the methods that it employs make it very difficult to place any credence in its forecasting ability. If this is what the Canadian people have from their new planning, programming and budgeting system, I am sorry to say that we are in for very dismal days ahead. Perhaps that is why the Auditor General took such a dim view of the government's accounting procedures.

If we look carefully at the 1976-77 estimates we find some rather revealing information that the government has not acted with restraint in areas where it could and should have. If we compare the 1976-77 estimates with the forecasted expenditures for 1975-76 we find that the government has stated that the major components of the roughly $4.7 billion increase, which amounts to 14 per cent for total standard objects, are transfer payments and other spending items which are beyond the government's control. The most cursory examination of total spending by standard objects indicates that this statement is ridiculous and nonsensical. Increased spending on grants, contributions, and transfer payments in fact accounts for $1,944,-228,000, or 41.5 per cent of the increase. But there are a number of areas in which a more realistic approach would produce significant savings.

Let us look at a number of items. For example, in the area of salaries and wages there has been an increase in

1976-77 over the last fiscal year of $687,305,000. This is an increase of 13.6 per cent, or a 14.7 per cent increase of the total amount exceeding the expenditures of the last fiscal year. In personnel costs there has been an increase of $179,546,000, that is, 18.4 per cent over the previous year. In rentals there has been an increase of $50,759,000 or 18 per cent over the previous year. In public debt charges there has been an increase of $875,000,000, a 23.1 per cent increase over the previous year. In all other expenditures, a sort of umbrella group, there has been an increase of $392,444,000, amounting to 36.4 per cent over the last fiscal year.

It is interesting to look at these expenditures in terms of specific government activities. Most of these are highly controllable. Administration, for example, is controllable. We can go into that in quite some detail. The administrative operative expenses will cost at least $1,358,176,000 in the fiscal year 1976-77. This is an increase of $143,226,000 over actual expenditures in 1975-76, or 11.8 per cent. Some of the increases are astounding. There is much that can be done in this area and that is not being done.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I very much regret interrupting the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, in his budget speech given on Tuesday, March 25, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) stated the following:

> No miracle drug exists to provide an instant cure to these economic ills. It will take time and patience to restore price stability and a high level of output and employment. This approach is evident in our monetary policy, our fiscal policy, our expenditure policy, our energy policy and our control policy. In all of these fields, drastic action to yield quick results would be highly disruptive, damaging to the interests of the groups most affected and unlikely to be sustainable.

Mr. Speaker, such is the philosophy underlying the budget now under consideration, a budget instilled with a healthy realism which truly shows the well-understood role of a government in the management of community affairs.

Mr. Speaker, and oft repeated French adage states that the knack of governing is to see ahead. It is also to try and determine where the true interests of the people lie, and above all to have the courage to go to the bottom of things in the search for solutions to society's problems. It seems to me the main quality of this government in these circumstances is they do not try to hide the facts from the Canadian people, they treat them as adults. The government also show they believe in Canadians, because they invite them to take part in the fight against our current economic troubles.

In the budget, the Minister of Finance stated and I quote:

> Indeed, all Canadians have their roles to play in the achievement of our economic goals.

Mr. Speaker, clearly it is in the interest of workers themselves to join in the fight against inflation, because one way or another they are going to suffer most in an inflationary period. Let me say that while wages and salaries accounted for 74.9 per cent of national revenues in the first quarter of 1974, they had declined to 70.2 per cent only in the third quarter of the same year. That proportion seems to have maintained during 1975.

As for corporations, their profits rose from 11.2 to 17.6 per cent of national revenues between 1971 and 1974, an inflationary period. How can anyone blame the government for seeing to it that the rate of price increases be abated, while wishing for an upswing in the Canadian economy.

Mr. Speaker, it used to be that government had to remain entrapped in the vicious circle either of fighting unemployment at the cost of stimulated inflation, or fighting price increases at the expense of employment but those times are over. As the governor of the Bank of Canada suggested on May 29, 1975 to the members of the Canadian Association of Life Insurance Companies, and I quote:

> The time has come for everybody to realize those two complementary aspects, to be united if we are to have stability and orderly progress in the economy, rather than contradictory objectives impossible to reach together.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, a government concerned only with their popularity would have yielded to the temptation to introduce a very expansionary budget. But in so doing, they would have escaped their responsibilities. The danger must be perceived that considerably higher rates of unemployment and inflation as we are now facing might befall us if no measures were taken to fight inflation and maintain Canada's competitive position vis-à-vis the United States, which account for two thirds of our international trade.

In this connection, one must bear in mind that during the third quarter of 1975, just before the implementation of the anti-inflation program, the collective wage agreements signed in Canada provided an average salary increase of 16.8 per cent or about twice the increase awarded in the United States. If this trend had continued, we would have experienced at the same time disastrous unemployment and inflation rates, and that had to be avoided at all costs. Therefore, we must rejoice in the fact that the inflation rate has been brought back to 6.3 per cent during the first six months of the anti-inflation program while it reached 11.7 per cent during the six previous months. Salary increases have been reduced to an average of 11 per cent since the program is in force, and that can only improve our competitive position on foreign markets on which Canada relies for a number of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, whatever some people may say, it does not appear advisable in the overall economic situation to sacrifice the fight against inflation for the one on unemployment, because, and I quote once again the Governor of The Bank of Canada:

> In due course, it appears that what we get for a slight reduction in the unemployment rate—here again only for some time—is not an additional amount of inflation but indeed a fast and accelerating inflationary upswing to which there is no end in sight.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to review all the measures contained in the last budget. However, I would at least like to bring to light the uplifting from $100,000 to $150,000 of the annual profit ceiling under which small businesses can take advantage of a reduced taxation rate, as well as the increase to $750,000 of the cumulative maximum under which businesses can be taxed at this rate. In my opinion, this is a measure which was needed if the incipient economic recovery is to appear still more vigorously in the coming months. I am more especially glad as the government is thus bringing a solution to a problem I had person-

ally brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance last April in the House. Indeed we must recall that as a result of the provisions of the Anti-inflation Act concerning the payment of dividends by corporations, many corporations might have lost their eligibility for that reduced rate of taxation because they would not be able to pay their shareholders all the dividends they had to pay in order not to reach the cumulative limit which was only $500,000. In taking these measures, the government shows its concern for our small business and its desire to use it as a decisive factor of the economic recovery which will create the employment and the prosperity all Canadians want.

I previously pointed out the sense of responsibility of the government, which does not hesitate to strike at the root of the problem and which prefers to risk being unpopular in the short run so as to ensure the well-being of the people in the long run. There is no better example of that sense of responsibility than the difficult decision made recently to raise the price of crude oil. Of course, it is a measure which strikes the consumer directly, and which may look inconsistent with the government's concern for the fight against inflation. Still, it had no other choice but to so encourage the people into moderating their consumption of a non-renewable resource, while by the same token freeing additional amounts to speed up exploration in the field of traditional oil in western Canada and its tar sands. Because the fiscal treatment of oil companies should encourage them strongly to reinvest their profits instead of increasing the dividends paid their shareolders, I support that decision.

It is imperative that the people know that Canadian oil reserves are not limitless, that our country runs the risk of becoming dependent in less than ten years, on imports from the Middle East or Venezuela, if explorations in Canada are not stepped up. Then, we will have to pay the price exacted by the producing countries. If the past is any indication of the future, this cost could very well be prohibitive and lead us, for a few years at least, to yearning for 1976 price levels; let us not forget that oil products are still relatively low-priced in Canada, when one knows that in western Europe, a gallon of ordinary gas costs between $1.60 and $2.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that it is essentially because of the federal affiliation that Quebecers can obtain oil products at a substantially lesser price, a price which will reach $9.05 a barrel starting July 1 and which is less than the price prevailing on the international market, which is between $11 and $12 a barrel.

This single price policy is possible only because the federal government gives generous subsidies—the cost in 1975-76 is estimated at $1.6 billion—to refineries of eastern Canada in general and Quebec in particular, so that they can sell gasoline and heating oil for a significantly lesser price than what they would normally have to charge in relation to international costs of crude petroleum.

● (2020)

[*English*]

Mr. Paproski: Because of Alberta.

Mr. Duclos: You are going on record, Steve.

Mr. Paproski: I know.

[Mr. Duclos.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duclos: Mr. Speaker, shortly after the federal-provincial energy conference in April 1975, the director of the Montreal Newspaper *Le Devoir*, Mr. Claude Ryan, wrote this, and I quote:

> Just as the fact of belonging to the Canadian federal community enabled provinces such as Quebec and Ontario to go through the crisis resulting from the spectacular rise in the international price of oil, without being too affected so can the ten Canadian provinces view their energy future with confidence if they stay together instead of separating.

And he added very appropriately, quote:

> The most important thing is that a country has the wealth which enables it to be sure it will enjoy a great variety of energy resources and maximum security of supply. These are the guarantees offered by the Canadian challenge but they would not be available to a separate province.

Mr. Speaker, there are some ideas worth thinking over in these few lines, for those in Quebec who are tempted by the apparently captivating adventure of the establishment of an independent state, for which Quebecers generally and the workers particularly may be left to pick up the tab.

I do hope that while letting the crude oil price get nearer the international levels in the next few years, a substantial differential be maintained and that, as far as possible, the single price oil policy be maintained in Canada as a whole. Otherwise, one of the most forceful arguments in Quebec in favour of Canadian federalism would lose all its meaning.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be timely to review briefly why, in spite of the considerable benefits the federal formula brings to Quebecers, too many of them remain skeptical about the possibility for them to assert themselves as a cultural group different from the majority of Canadians. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, most Quebecers clearly see the advantages provided by the federal system or they are at least open to a frank and honest discussion. It is the latter group, Mr. Speaker, that we must convince once and for all in the years to come of the profitability of federalism and of the possibility for Quebecers to assert themselves culturally, socially and economically in such a political framework.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Speech from the Throne in October 1974, the Prime Minister stated that he hoped an agreement would soon be reached with all the provinces towards the repatriation of the constitution. That was almost two years ago but unfortunately little progress has been achieved, chiefly on account of the Quebec government's opposition. However, it seems to me that the amendment formula which was adopted in Victoria in 1971, providing for regional veto powers, one of them for Quebec, was an improvement over the current constitutional practice which requires unanimity rule for any amendment concerning the delimitation of constitutional jurisdictions. One could not reasonably claim that the repatriation of the Canadian constitution would, under those conditions, seriously affect the basic rights of Quebec.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the Quebec government is somehow seeking to trade its agreement as to the repatriation of the constitution for a constitutional review, which would inevitably lead to an increase in its constitutional powers. Therefore I hope that Quebec will

renounce what sounds very much like blackmail and give its assent to the repatriation of the constitution. Thus it would help create a more serene and favourable climate in view of a future federal provincial conference which would consider the matter of sharing constitutional powers, which is obviously most important for the province of Quebec. However, it is imperative that the federal government show unequivocally in the next months its strong intention to pursue more vigorously than ever its objective by strengthening slightly the role of French-speaking officials in the management of the business of this country to promote the full development of French culture and the use of French in Canada, particularly in Quebec. If not, the people of Quebec will be right in turning to the government of their province and the latter will be justified in taking all available means to get a new sharing of the constitutional jurisdictions which will satisfy it.

We must say, Mr. Speaker, that if the present sharing of powers does not seem satisfactory, because of the extraordinary behaviour and the untiring devotion of Quebecers in the government who make sure that Quebec gets its share and that it is not affected in its vital interests, it is not impossible than an electoral accident could deeply change the Canadian political checkerboard and lessen the role of Quebecers on the federal scene. I think it is normal that such a possibility is the main concern of several Quebecers and that they are anxious to give to the Quebec government the necessary means enabling it to modify even more the destiny of Quebec in case the voice of French-speaking people would disappear from the federal scene.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think that all these negotiations to review the system of the sharing of powers must be undertaken in a real cooperative spirit and must at least take care that the quality of the services offered to all Canadians will be maintained. We must also see to it that they will not generate an irreversible process of gradual erosion of the powers of the federal government leading to some kind of disappearance of the presence of Quebec on the federal level. If French-speaking people could expect to be equitably represented in the senior positions of the federal public service, the possibillity of a setback of Quebecers on the political level would not be so serious. Unfortunately, it is clear that, in spite of the important progress that has been made in almost ten years, the efforts made to promote French-speaking people to the senior positions of the public service have not been as fruitful as expected. If the number of French-speaking persons in the senior posiions of the Public Service Commission, the Privy Council, the Secretary of State and in some other departments is adequate, the situaton is far from satisfactory in some others, and I would like my friends of the opposition to listen carefully to some figures I would like to give. For example, in the Department of National Defence, only one senior officer out of 28 is French-speaking; in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, three French-speaking persons have been promoted to senior positions out of a total of 67; in the Department of Finance, 2 out of 32, in the Department of Agriculture, 5 out of 79, and in the Department of the Environment, 10 out of 127—

• (2030)

[*English*]

Mr. Paproski: Whose fault is that?

Mr. Duclos: I just want you to listen please. You take action.

Mr. Paproski: Do not blame it on the Tories.

Mr. Duclos: I did not say a word about you—

[*Translation*]

—does the hat fit you? And what is done to correct this situation? We could believe him as far as the hiring of university graduates is concerned. We could try to catch up by hiring a percentage of French-speaking persons slightly over the 28 per cent rate that must be reached as fast as possible. However, in 1974, French-speaking graduates who left the universities and who were hired by the Canadian public service made up hardly 29 per cent of the total. At least 35 per cent of French-speaking persons should be hired if we really want to make up for time lost.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that many French-speaking youths, especially in Quebec, are not very enthusiastic at the idea of moving to Ottawa, which they consider wrongly, to my mind, as an inhospitable city for French-speaking Canadians. I am sorry that they are prejudiced in this way, but this is an attitude that we must consider and which should in fact urge the federal government to be more enthusiastic when French-speaking people show an interest in a career in the federal government.

How can we ask French Canadians to play a role in federal administration if, in spite of their university degrees and their experience on the labour market, they are not sure that their offer of service will be well received. The government says that there are not enough French Canadians in the public service. It is supposed to be very difficult to find competent French Canadians, but if one shows some interest, he is treated with indifference.

I know that the government can count on the suppport of our Social Credit colleagues and on the open-mindedness of the NDP members on this matter, but I would like especially the official opposition to make a positive and determined stand on this matter instead of being satisfied with supporting the government half-heartedly.

I am sometimes surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear certain members of the official opposition. From what they say, it seems that it is the French Canadians who have taken over everything in the federal public service. I hope that the few figures that I have submitted to the House will make them reflect on this and that they will take the trouble to read the last annual report of the Public Service Commission which contains very significant statistics in this matter.

Mr. Paproski: Do not blame the opposition. It is your government.

Mr. Duclos: I will provide the hon. member with a copy.

Mr. Speaker, when speaking on this same subject in the House in October 1974, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) very rightly said, and I quote:

Therein lies an obligation that we all have, a kind of political contract with French-speaking Canadians under which they would reject separatism and the federal parliament would guarantee the right to French Canadians to communicate with and work in the federal administration in the French language. I solemnly believe that if we do not or cannot make that right a reality during the life of this parliament with its commitment to bilingualism, with the very emphatic words of the Leader of the Opposition in his speech an hour ago, with the strong French-speaking representation in government, then it will never be done and separatism will have proved its point and Canadian unity will cease to have meaning for the majority of Quebecers.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of a lucid man who, more than anyone else, wishes all Canadians to feel at home in Canada and to feel that they are making a useful contribution to the progress of their country without having to suffer cultural alienation.

● (2040)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Perhaps before the Chair recognizes the next speaker it can have the indulgence of the House for a moment. It seems to me that the Chair can accommodate one member from each party in the time available between the present and 9.45 or 10 o'clock, if each speaker agrees to limit his time. I know that several members still wish to be heard.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think, after the next speaker has spoken, we will be glad to limit the time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understood that the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek) was to be recognized after the hon. member who has just spoken, and that, after he spoke, there would be some agreement for allowing two or three members on the Liberal side to speak for the balance of the evening. That is my understanding. I could be wrong. However, I believe the Chair did say that the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley would be recognized next.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): This always happens when the Chair tries to divide time, or suggests that it should be divided. The names I have before me include those of the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Miss Campbell), the hon. member for Greenwood, and the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne). The Chair, trying to be fair, has obviously got itself up to its neck in trouble. I suggest that if hon. members speak for 20 minutes that would carry us through until 10 o'clock.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley will endeavour to fulfill that obligation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Greenwood. Is it agreed that each member will speak for 20 minutes?

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we will try to stick to that suggestion.

[Mr. Duclos.]

I feel that this debate is about to end and that probably nearly everything which needs to be said about the budget has been said. But I wish to make a few comments on what, after all, is an important central event in the life of parliament.

In my view the budget introduced few significant changes. It lacked any sense of social justice and failed to move in the direction of equity. The view which I and, I think, my party hold is that the budget should be the instrument for bringing about social justice and promoting equity. I share the view expressed by Lord Keynes, the famous British economist, who recommended redistribution of income in the direction of equality, partly on the ethical ground that extremes of wealth and poverty were disgraceful but also because the poor spent more of their income than the rich.

I was going to quote the words of other famous men, the words of Tawney and Matthew Arnold, but will not do so now. Both said that a system founded on inequality is against nature and breaks down. I think we are seeing the breakdown of our system which is based on inequality. My quarrel with the budget is that it fails to reverse this trend. For example, let us consider unemployment.

Over 700,000 Canadians are out of work. I strongly suspect that when students seek to enter the labour force, the figures will get worse. What has the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) done about this? He has done nothing, as far as I can make out. He rests his case on shallow optimism about the American economy. He anticipates it will continue to expand and that this will have the direct effect of promoting in the neighbourhood of 250,000 new jobs in Canada. One is assuming a great deal when one assumes the American economy will continue to expand. In any event, there is little link between American expansion and the Canadian economy. I remind the House that we will have 300,000 people entering the labour market next year; therefore, even on the basis of the Minister of Finance's assumptions, we will have a larger number of unemployed than before. What should be done about this question?

In my view the Minister of Finance should substantially cut the personal income tax for those whose incomes are below $15,000. This would have a dual effect. It would not only be a way of equalizing wealth between rich and poor but would stimulate the economy. People on lower incomes spend a greater proportion of their incomes than the rich do. As Lord Keynes pointed out, an excellent way to stimulate aggregate demand is to tax the rich to employ the poor. The budget does not touch on this.

It is suggested by some, including the Minister of Finance—I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said much the same this afternoon—that such a tax cut would be inflationary. This argument ignores that our economy is only working at 80 per cent of capacity, and if we were to use the now unused 20 per cent capacity the effect might well be a reduction of inflation. The minister ignored the fact that in an economy working at close to capacity there will be less unemployment, less money going out in unemployment insurance payments, an increased supply of goods and services, and a reduction in welfare costs.

The next thing on which I wish to comment in the budget is the proposal to increase the number of weeks of employment required to qualify for UIC and the decline in

the duration of benefits. Here again the so-called remedy of the Minister of Finance strikes at those who can least afford it. I refer to the people in the maritime provinces and Quebec where there is little opportunity to qualify for the present eight-week requirement. There will be even less opportunity to qualify if the period is extended to 12 weeks. The effects of these proposals will drive those people on to welfare rolls and increase the burdens of municipalities and provinces which can least afford them. Surely we in this House have learned that the welfare of all regions of Canada is of vital interest to all Canadians.

The question may be asked, if we are to seek full employment, for what types of employment must we plan? I maintain the view that where private industry cannot provide the necessary jobs it is up to public enterprise to step in. There are very great needs in our country; I will not list them all. We need public housing at rents and prices people can afford. There is an urgent need in metro areas, such as my own, for the extension of rapid transit. So far the government has completely failed to live up to its promises to assist the development of public transit, promises made in the last election campaign.

There are one or two things in the budget of which I approve. The first is the higher taxes on large cars. This measure is designed to conserve energy. I wonder if enough has been done. I am inclined to think that a reduction in the tax on small cars would have been a better incentive to conserve energy over the years.

● (2050)

I heartily agree with the increased tax exemption for small businessmen. The limit to which businessmen are eligible to pay the small business rate of 25 per cent tax is doubled. Small businessmen are a group in the community who have been particularly damaged by inflation and urgently need the assistance provided for them by the budget change.

I also approve of the increase in the child care deduction. I wish the government would proceed vigorously to carry out the recommendations of the Status of Women Committee which recommended a major federal investment in day care centres. On the other hand I do not agree that the government was wise in allowing tax exemptions for an increased range of registered personal pension plans. This is a change to assist the well-to-do and not the people who need it most.

I have tried to study the proposed changes in the prices and incomes policy. The objection which we have in this party to the government's anti-inflation measures is that the prices and incomes policy was effective to some extent in stabilizing wages and salaries but it left profits virtually intact. The Prime Minister this afternoon almost seemed to acknowledge this fact. I suspect that after the changes it will remain ineffective in respect to prices and profits. One obvious reason is that a large number of prices are exempt, such as energy, most food, and the price of imports. The price of housing has not been effectively controlled. These are major items.

I suppose that the object of the proposed changes is to give at least the impression of more effective control of prices and profits. I am afraid that the effort will be ineffective. One reason for this is the extraordinary complications of the system. These invite evasion by those who can afford a skilled accountant and other expert advice. The mysteries of transfer payments give rise to serious doubts whether these technical changes will be an effective instrument of control. The Department of National Revenue has been unable to control large multinational corporations, and without an army of investigators far exceeding the present staff of 853 the Anti-Inflation Board has no way to assess the figures found in financial statements of these large corporations engaged in intra-corporate trade.

I now want to turn to the external aspects of the budget. The Minister of Finance in his budget speech did indeed make reference to the new economic order, but I think Canadians still have a long way to go before they appreciate the importance of the revolutionary changes affecting the world trade system. Canada depends upon trade; trade in the ultimate analysis depends on world stability and prosperity. There is an increasing recognition all over the world of the need for change in the way in which international trade is conducted. This has given rise to a series of international meetings. The main actors and promoters of the new economic order have been the victims of under development who have suffered on an immense scale from ever-worsening destitution and malnutrition. The Prime Minister himself observed in his famous address at the Mansion House, London, and I quote:

> These nations seek no piecemeal adjustments but a comprehensive restructuring of all the components. The response of the industrialized countries can be no less well prepared or no less comprehensive in scope.

What is sought from us now is not aid, although in the least developed countries that remains a major factor. What is needed is to promote agriculture in the Third World, and to improve trade opportunities so that the Third World can earn for itself the means of developing itself. What we are talking about then are not fringe benefits but the basic necessities of life such as food, shelter, and clothing. What is required is to meet the basic needs of mankind in the foreseeable future on a global scale.

To this end a number of conferences under the auspices of the United Nations have met. The latest one we discussed today, the UNCTAD IV conference at Nairobi. It is notable that in all of these conferences the participants recognized the inter-dependence of nations in solving the basic problems of mankind, and the urgent need for the political will in both developed and developing countries to make the necessary changes.

Another thing which seemed to be common to all of these conferences was the conviction expressed by knowledgeable men and women from all over the world that the problems of the world could, in fact, be met by international co-operation and the necessary political will.

The Canadian government has clearly indicated its acceptance of the basic notions behind the new economic order. In his address to UNCTAD IV, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) spoke of the need for action "with an unprecedented sense of urgency". He went on to say:

I believe we have passed the stage of analysis and assessment of issue. We must now get together to devise workable and dynamic solutions, and solutions mean action.

Some observers at the conference felt that, at Nairobi, Canada did not take an effective lead and offered no solution but only more talk. I will not discuss UNCTAD further because it was discussed today. However, there is a long course ahead of us where important structural changes are required to be made. We must organize new machinery, such as the common fund to stabilize the price of commodities.

I am aware of course that programs in this field will be sought during the coming year, and no doubt for many years to come. It is of course wrong to assume that commodities are the only subject that is the concern of the new economic order. It is concerned with trade liberalization policies. It is concerned with the transfer of technology, and is still concerned with adequate aid transfers.

It is sometimes asked what is the real basis for Canada's concern about these matters. The real basis is a dual one. On one side is enlightened self interest. This requires that the strong, positive demands of two thirds of the world's people be heard and acted on. This is essential to stability. The other is the basic notion of human compassion and brotherhood. It is perhaps old fashioned to mention this, but it remains that some such moral imperative is an essential ingredient if we are to have effective action.

I had intended to mention the subject of justice to our native peoples, but I do not have enough time to do that. I will conclude by repeating that I have found the budget uninspiring and inadequate. It fails to move in the direction of social justice. It deals inadequately with the major problem of external trade whose urgency was expressed the other day by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson). I can only hope that if the minister has another chance to bring in a budget, it will be a much better one.

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to rise tonight to speak in the budget debate. I would first like to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) on what I consider a very good budget for the times. One might have the great desire to get into all sorts of expansionary ideas and projects, and certainly as a member of parliament it would be very nice to have more federal money circulating in my constituency. However, it seems to me that it is very important to allow existing programs to take hold fully. I refer to the anti-inflation program established last October.

At that time all Canadians were asked to abide by the guidelines for prices and incomes, and we made provisions for mandatory controls over the larger economic units in our economy. The essential purpose was to change expectations, and to bring about a quicker response to the program as a whole so that the fiscal, monetary, and other general policies would in fact bring about real growth and declining inflation. We have seen the program become operational in the last few months and we have actually seen it taking effect. It would not do at this time to introduce programs which might disturb the full operation of the government's attack on inflation. The importance of all

[Mr. Brewin.]

Canadians co-operating in this program was reiterated in the Prime Minister's speech on the budget today.

● (2100)

Nevertheless there are some areas in the budget which I should like to discuss and with respect to which I may, hopefully, introduce some new thoughts. The one-parent family or the working mother will welcome the changes set forth under the day care provisions which allow a deduction for child care of $1,000 per child up to a total of $4,000 per family. Many people will not be directly affected by this concession, but for those concerned about the cost of child care this will be a welcome measure.

I also welcome the new tax provisions concerning oil and gas exploration. Such a means of equalizing power costs will be particularly attractive should oil be discovered and the Maritimes become an exporter of energy. I understand that a similar concession is given to the coal industry. Let me remind hon. members that we have a source of energy in coal. Not only could this provide energy but it would also provide work for people in Cape Breton and other areas in Nova Scotia. Let us take a look at it. The challenge is there. My sources tell me we still have a great amount to use up.

The budget provides that a taxpayer will henceforth be able to write off exploration costs at a rate of 100 per cent—up from 30 per cent as it presently stands. This concession became operative as of budget night and will remain in force until July 1, 1979. Until now, only the principal business taxpayers could claim a 100 per cent write-off of exploration costs. The new provision will also apply to funds received under provincial incentive programs in connection with drilling and exploration. As one who comes from a province where, at present, we are right in the difficult situation of relying on an oil-based power system due to the low cost of oil less than three years ago, I welcome these tax advantages and look forward to the use of coal and to the discovery of commercially viable oil resources off the Atlantic sea coast.

However, let us not think the discovery of oil will ease our problems over the long term. The Atlantic provinces and Quebec must make arrangements between themselves to provide a mutually beneficial and fully operational grid power system.

The federal government has offered financial support for the development of alternative power sources and it is up to the provinces to take advantage of this program. The provinces wish to continue jurisdiction over energy and thus they should come forward with new proposals. In this regard I am particularly anxious to see action taken to harness Fundy tidal power if this is possible.

Canada has always been a country which seemed to be able to get around its difficulties. In 1867 the areas came together and, as provinces, dedicated themselves to working together for the good of all. This has occurred over many years; it happened with respect to the rail and air transport industries; in connection with the oil and gas pipeline in the West; in equalization grants to the provinces; in support for the arts, humanities, and sciences; in education; with the CBC; with our social insurance programs, and in all principal areas of our national life.

The federal government provides services of unique importance to the unity of this country; this is what Confederation is largely about. Surely at this point it is not up to the federal government to say to one province, "Find your own solution." This is particularly the case should the solution lie in co-operation not only with the federal government but perhaps with four or five other provinces, all of which must get together if a particular difficulty is to be solved. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the sooner this is done the better it will be for Canada.

I should like to turn now to the subject of employment and the labour force. We often hear of the high unemployment rate in the Atlantic provinces. We also know that the figures mentioned are true and we look forward to the amendments which are to be introduced to the Unemployment Insurance Act. However, one does not solve this problem by increasing the number of weeks a person must work in order to qualify. Surely what we need to solve the problem are incentives which would help get all those people back to work.

We know that approximately 50 per cent of those presently receiving benefit can find those four extra weeks quite easily and will do so as soon as they are forced to take such action. But what of the others? As I say, I look forward to the amendments to the UIC Act in the fall. We welcome the assurances from the government that there will be programs of retraining and job creation—that the money which has circulated in the area will continue to be there. We are looking to see incentives which will enable existing operations to find new jobs for these people, along with the incentive already provided by the federal government.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that there are abuses of the present system and that it is not only the working people who are responsible for them. There are employers who will not take a person who comes knocking at the door because they are scared that if they refused to say that the applicant is not suitable he will, when engaged, fail to provide efficient service. Employers therefore prefer to state that the applicant is not fit for the job rather than engage the services of a possibly unwilling worker. The system certainly has its faults and the one I have mentioned is probably the greatest—an employer is afraid to say openly to an applicant for a job that the job is available when he knows that the applicant is really not anxious to stop receiving UIC benefits.

On the other hand in some areas it is very hard for employers to compete in the employee market bearing in mind the amount of UIC benefits possible applicants for work are receiving. Usually it is persons from outside the community who receive these high amounts of unemployment insurance benefit.

I do not want to give the impression that we should jeopardize an unemployed person's UIC benefits if he has earned them at a particular level and would receive the same amount if he returned to the work force, when there is no job available for him. However, over an extended period of time perhaps it would encourage people to get back into the work force if the rates were reduced to the minimum wage thereby enabling an applicant to compete for jobs which are available in the area. I therefore welcome the indication of the Minister of Finance that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) will introduce a further change relating to unemployment insurance benefits, that is to say, the number of weeks during which benefits may be drawn will be more directly related to the number of weeks worked and that, in addition, regional extended benefits will be related in a more sensitive manner to the level of regional unemployment. I look forward to taking part in the discussion of these proposals.

The budget has been criticized by the opposition as failing to bring forth new housing programs or incentives to business. I have been a member of parliament for not quite two years but I know the government has brought in a number of housing programs. Consider, for example, the Assisted Home Ownership Program. Under this program, a couple, regardless of income, who are buying or building a new house under the qualifying limit, which is $31,000 in my area, are eligible for loan assistance to reduce their mortgage interest rate to 8 per cent. Those with children and needing additional help to keep monthly payments below 25 per cent of their income may qualify for outright subsidies of up to $750 annually.

We have programs such as the Neighbourhood Improvement Program available to a great many municipalities. There are 16 municipalities in Nova Scotia which have taken part in this scheme. One of them is in Yarmouth, in my constituency. I should like to see more use being made by Nova Scotians of these programs, and I look forward to seeing residential rehabilitation assistance programs in full use.

● (2110)

I also realize that an agreement has been signed by the province of Nova Scotia with the federal government designating the rest of the province—that is, the rural areas including municipalities of less than 2,500 population—as eligible for residential rehabilitation assistance programs. It is up to the municipalities to take advantage of these programs. Included in this designation in Nova Scotia are a number of areas selected for priority assistance. I am under the impression that some problems still remain to be worked out before commitments can be made, particularly program delivery arrangements for provincial assistance. However, negotiations on these matters are proceeding and I hope it will not be too long before the full impact of these housing programs is felt.

These programs, Mr. Speaker, show progress in the housing industry, and I hope that anyone with housing problems will go after their municipality, their provincial and federal representatives, to ensure that the full benefit of these housing programs are taken advantage of, not only in Nova Scotia but in Canada in general.

In so far as business incentives are concerned, Mr. Speaker, opposition members claim we have not provided measures to stimulate capital investment. This government provided in the last budget manufacturing incentives, investment tax credits. Other programs provide financing directly, such as to small business. In the province of Nova Scotia in the first three months of 1975 there were eight loans to small businesses, whereas in the same period this year there were 30. The amount last year was $66,240, compared with the amount this year of $487,146.

With regard to farm improvement loans, in the same period last year, namely the first three months, there were 48 loans made in Nova Scotia, and 48 in the first three months of this year. However, the amount lent last year was $191,537 compared with $262,435 this year. As far as the fishing industry is concerned, there were 208 loans granted in Nova Scotia during the period April, 1974, to March, 1975, totalling $1,505,251. Between April, 1975, and March, 1976, there were 197 loans—this was a poor year for expansion, particularly in the groundfish industry—for a total of $1,300,773. However, loans in the first quarter of this year ending March, 1976, totalled 50, amounting to $282,021.

These measures have been provided to sustain high levels of business investment in Canada. We are looking at productivity as a government, Mr. Speaker. People, business, and Canada as a whole must get into these programs. We have reached a maturity; let us take it from there and make a success of what we have.

This budget also increases the amount of corporate profits allowed for the small business tax reductions. Canadian controlled private corporations are entitled to pay tax at a reduced rate, subject to an annual limit on their profits. For 1972-73 the limits were $50,000 to $400,000 per annum in total. In 1974 they were raised to $100,000 to $500,000; and effective for 1976 the Minister of Finance in his recent budget announced the limits will be further increased, ranging from $150,000 to a total of $750,000. This can only create incentives for small business in the Atlantic area and will help these small businesses to continue and expand.

Another welcome announcement has been the increase in the maximum annual deduction for registered pension retirement plans from $2,500 to $3,500. This measure will be welcomed by all those who are saving for their retirement.

A new step was taken by the government last Friday when it announced that it would be proclaiming jurisdiction over fishing rights extending out to 200 miles from our coast. This is to take effect as of January 1, 1977. We have had bilateral negotiations and have tied up some 88 per cent of the operations of foreign fleets within this 200 mile limit.

What will this do for the Atlantic provinces? It can only provide new industry and ideas. It is also time that the government regarded fish as a natural resource. We do not have to look elsewhere if we have a 200 mile limit. Businesses will grow and the fishery will develop. We have allowed foreigners to fish off our shore, but a lot of these fishermen have been fishing these grounds for some time alongside our own fishermen.

With regard to tariffs, we have a tariff on finished fish products that leave Canada but no tariff on unfinished products. When we are negotiating tariffs with other countries, perhaps we should consider imposing a tariff on unfinished products as an incentive to finish our products in Canada.

I realize we have agreed to take only 20 minutes and perhaps I have overstepped my time.

Mr. Grafftey: Keep going.

Miss Campbell: Thank you. This budget has been critized by the opposition as not being expansionary. I suggest that this is a time when we ought to examine the programs we already have in existence in an attempt to make our economy work. At a time when we are trying to make our anti-inflation program work we should not try new, expansionary ideas; the programs we have, I suggest, will probably work if given the opportunity.

I was very pleased to be given this opportunity this evening to speak in this debate, Mr. Speaker. Since my 20 minutes have expired I will say thank you, and resume my seat.

[Miss Campbell (South Western Nova).]

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again to take part in a budget debate, especially since I seem to have the distinction of closing this memorable debate on this memorable budget, which will be remembered forever for its nothingness. However, if I stick strictly to the contents of the budget itself, I will probably be finished before I have hardly begun. I say that because the budget is as shallow and as celluloid a budget as we have ever seen, and as a result it has very quickly become known as the "no budget budget".

This budget is what we get at a time when sweeping new proposals and policies are required, in fact are vital, if the downward economic trend that we are facing is to be reversed. But all this and more has been said by my colleagues who have spoken before me, none better than by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) in his very forceful yet eloquent address just a couple of days ago.

Instead of expounding on the obvious deficiencies in the budget itself, I would like to take this opportunity to express my thoughts about a part of our economic process, a part that must surely form the backbone of our economic way of life. I am, of course, referring to small business, which many believe is slowly but surely disappearing under this government.

This small firm sector which generally seems to be ignored and bypassed by governments is responsible for employing over 50 per cent of our labour force. This high figure was substantiated several years ago by the minister of energy who was then the minister of industry, trade and commerce, when he stated in this House:

> Almost 60 per cent of our entire labour force—two thirds of Canadians work for businesses employing 15 persons or less. Most of these businesses are owned and managed by Canadians and provide a means of developing greater Canadian participation in our country's growth.

● (2120)

Although it is admitted that by far the largest and possibly the most important sector of our economy is in fact the small firm sector, the government continues to expound on philosophies it established some 20 years ago by concentrating most if not all its efforts on bigness, bigger and costlier governments, bigger and stronger units, and larger and fewer multinational corporations as well as merger oriented enterprises, while small business as we know it is possibly heading toward extinction.

The government has gone so far in its centralization of power that it has nearly reached the stage of allowing a few to monopolize our over-all economy. The Canadian Labour Congress, for example, has been allowed to become so powerful that just recently it reached the height of impertinence when it threatened the government, and

therefore the public at large, by suggesting that unless it were given a key role to play in running the nation it would call a national strike. This is the way things operate in most communist countries, obviously not to the advantage of their people. In any event, they hold all this concentrated power, and yet the CLC controls only approximately 20 per cent of the labour force compared to over 50 per cent in the small firms sector.

Mr. Rodriguez: Nonsense.

Mr. Jelinek: I notice that my socialist, if not communist, friends are getting upset because they would like nothing better than state ownership and control. If that is so, they can go back to Cuba or Russia.

Mr. Rodriguez: Absolute tripe.

Mr. Jelinek: Yet the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) did not even mention small business in his speech on the budget earlier this week. He does, however, from time to time outside the House indicate the seriousness of problems relating to the small businessman, as he did in a recent speech to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. But I believe this is only a means of pacifying the hungry. If the minister were sincere in his casual concern for the small business community, then he would back his statements by appropriate legislation in order to show his sincerity. Promises alone mean nothing unless they are backed by action, and action is nowhere to be seen as far as the government is concerned.

As for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) I do not think he even knows small business exists. The only mention in his budget which was in any way connected to even medium sized firms was an increase in the amount of net profits eligible for a lower tax rate. Not only will this affect less than 1 per cent of the business community but the truly small businessman whose net profits are below $100,000 a year remains on the list of the ignored so far as the government is concerned.

I would like to point out some of the problems or deficiencies that exist between governments and small business, but before doing so let me say that I hope I will not be labelled a pessimist or a cynic, as I was by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) a few weeks ago during my objective questioning on Olympic financing because I will now, as I did them then, base my points on facts and precedents, and therefore if I am to be labelled anything by anyone I suggest that the word realist would be far more appropriate.

First, however, let us clarify by means of a definition who we are talking about when we mention the small firms sector. The government's definition of small business, an active business income, has created considerable room for dispute which involves the usual cost of accountants and lawyers for the businessman and of civil servants for the government.

I believe that a far better working definition, perhaps oversimplified to some extent, would be that a small firm is one that is owner-managed. There are always exceptions, of course, for specific programs where arbitrary size limits would have to be decided upon. However, at this time for the sake of simplicity let us assume that the so called small business sector would fall into the owner-managed category. Even without the exceptions, by using this definition we can be sure that we are including 99 per cent of all small firms in that category.

Let me begin with high interest rates and the over-all banking system as it relates to this "owner-managed" segment of our business community. It is a well known fact that a small independent firm is at a great disadvantage against conglomerates and multi-national corporations when it comes to money supply. Although there are thousands of chartered bank branches across this country and the government has the Federal Business Development Bank, which is a carry over from the Industrial Development Bank, established supposedly for the purpose of assisting Canadian firms in their expansion programs; our banking system still remains one of the least competitive organizations in the world, afraid to take the least amount of risk when compared to the banking system in the United States, for example. A sort of a monopoly by the big "10" seems to be in existence within the money institutions, supported and protected by the government. The branches and their managers virtually have their hands tied when it comes to credit decisions, as their credit levels are limited by head office at uniform levels, thus eliminating any possible fluctuation for the sake of a healthy competitive atmosphere.

What is even worse is that American and other foreign subsidiaries can come into Canada and purchase Canadian firms and businesses which may have remained in the hands of Canadians, without ever using their own capital. The foreign company, by simply using its parent company in the United States or elsewhere as collateral, is able to generate a loan from a Canadian bank with no real problems. In many cases it is able to obtain the loan from the same Canadian bank that more often than not had refused the same Canadian plant further credit for necessary expansion. I know this as a fact as I have gone through this whole cycle myself.

In short, as it now stands, a U.S. or foreign enterprise can in fact buy out a Canadian firm without ever having to bring a red cent into Canada. From time to time we cry foul, or independence, and rightly so, but we as Canadians cry foul often without doing anything about it. The best comparison I can make is the way we cry and complain every four years when, as a nation, we do not bring back enough or any medals from the Olympic Games. Unfortunately this year will not be any different, so we complain, but during the subsequent four years we as Canadian citizens, as media, as governments, do next to nothing to assist, morally or otherwise, those few athletes who continue to give all their energies as well as their souls to specific goals for this country, and that is just one typical comparison with the small independent businessman in Canada and the government's attitude to him.

Yet still on the money end, while governments continue to turn their backs on small business and from time to time throw a bone in their direction just to keep them pacified, Canada has lent almost $1.5 billion to 57 foreign countries in the last ten years alone, for little or no interest. These are not figures I am making up, Mr. Speaker, they are figures that the government itself has confirmed. Some of

these loans are even made to communist countries with no termination dates set, and they continue to be made while thousands of small businesses survive in this type of political atmosphere. How is it that Cuba, for example, can borrow millions of dollars at a rate of 3% while many small Canadian firms have to fight and beg, and collateral their gold fillings, in an attempt to obtain reasonable financing—say around 12%—many to no avail? No wonder the unemployment situation is a disaster, with three quarters of a million Canadians unemployed. Mr. Speaker, there is no better, no cheaper, and no quicker potential employment opportunity than by way of the small firm sector of our economy. The government must take appropriate steps to utilize this sector for economical make-work programs, by initiating and imposing comprehensive and realistic incentives for this very important industrial and economic community for the benefit of all Canadians.

● (2130)

Now let us move to a more specific problem, the problem dealing with the swamp of bureaucratic paperwork which governments continue to impose on all business establishments. There are the conventional tax papers, refund forms, application papers, questionnaires, licence forms, and on and on goes the list. There is general agreement that some of these forms have no justification for existing, and in fact many have become obsolete, sometimes tied to legislative bills which are no longer in effect. However, the forms continue to circulate, causing unnecessary demands at great expense to governments and business establishments. Meanwhile the filing cabinets of the nation bulge, often with incorrect and incomplete information. The only consolation is that most files gather dust, rarely to be used again.

The answer to this problem is simple: all we have to do is follow the example of the United States and initiate an immediate reduction of 10 per cent of government forms every few years or so. The result would be an unbelievable saving in dollars to the taxpayer and would certainly reduce considerably the nuisance, even harassment, that the small firm is expected to bear.

Surely if the government is prepared to wait for the United States economic upswing to bring us out of our doldrums, the least we could do would be to borrow some of their effective methods, which are obviously working for them, and could just as well work for Canada.

With regard to labels and packaging our labelling legislation is yet another horrendous bureaucratic and complicated mess. It is of little, if any advantage to anyone and unquestionably a big hindrance to the small manufacturer. To point out a very quick example, a manufacturer in northern British Columbia distributing goods from, say, the United States within the borders of the province of B.C. alone must go through the expense of relabelling and repackaging his product at a very great expense. The same can be said for manufacturing in central Quebec, or in any other area of this regionally complex nation. The act should and must be simplified.

One of the more intricate problems for some businesses—and I suppose every individual has this problem to a certain extent—is one which relates to the existing tax complexities. It is bad enough for individuals, but for small businesses it is a nightmare and a real deterrent to expansion. The entire Income Tax Act should be rewritten so that it would be comprehendable to the taxpayer. This may seem like a large and burdensome order, but from the viewpoint of a small business the administration of the tax laws has become as critical as the laws themselves. It is a double cost to the taxpayer who must indirectly pay for bureaucratic administration and then pay again for advisers to deal with the problems directly affecting him.

If the small businessman had unlimited funds, as most multinational corporations do, there would be fewer tax problems for him to worry about. He could set days aside to confer with tax advisers, supervisors, and evaluators from Revenue Canada, but only to find that simple solutions are no longer available in this respect. Of course the small businessman has other things on his mind, for example, mere survival, let alone keeping up with product development, research, employment, cash flow, expansion and so on.

I could produce a long list of specific tax examples which apply to the small firms sector in a harmful way, but because of my time limitation I will just give one sample. It relates to the small businessman who in many cases must depend on his spouse to take part in his business endeavours. It so happens that because of the weird tax laws which are in existence it is cheaper for the business proprietor to live with a woman working for him rather than to marry her. I can vouch for the fact that wives can be just as expensive as girlfriends, but that is no reason for this specific tax law to continue. The point of the matter is that if they marry his business income is all taxable, and if they do not, he can deduct her salary. Then if they do decide to marry after all, they will need to incorporate so that she can be employed by the business. In other words, it is more economical to live with a mistress than it is to marry her. Strange as this example may seem, it is a true fact, and it affects tens of thousands of Canadians struggling to carry on their business ventures under existing tax complications.

The fact that the budget is a no budget naturally came as a surprise to many, but the fact that the budget in no way deals with Canada's current number one problem surely must have shocked all. I am of course referring to the housing situation as it now stands and the fact that the average young family can no longer purchase a home. This lack of positive action by the government in the field of housing does not only affect the small firms sector, but indeed all Canadians. Surely if the government was not prepared to reduce the tax on building materials, at least further concessions should have been introduced in respect to insulating materials, just to name one example.

We talk and preach about the serious need for energy conservation, and rightly so, yet modern homes are built without the least bit of thought about conserving energy. It is a known fact that properly designed and insulated homes will use less energy, as far as heating and air conditioning are concerned, than the types of homes which are now being constructed in various developments across Canada.

I had the privilege of attending a recent NATO conference at which it was established that those nations which impose stricter controls on building construction in respect

of energy conservation are the same nations which are ahead in the energy conservation field, and Canada unfortunately is not among them. It seems to me that the government has its priorities mixed up when it comes to controls.

Having just mentioned air conditioning, I am prompted to reflect on why the Minister of Finance saw fit to include in his budget a surtax on automobile air conditioners when the amount of energy consumed by air conditioning is less than one half of 1 per cent. The only answer must be that once again this is simply another example of pacification, this time for the benefit of energy conservationists who have a right to be concerned.

If I may, I would now like to take this opportunity to make some suggestions and recommendations which I hope will be considered in a serious manner.

It is no secret that government, whether in a restraint period or not, is by far the largest purchaser of goods and talent, but the bulk of the contracts go to a concentrated group of elite corporations and individuals, usually in the multinational range. In this regard it is time that the government followed the examples set by Japan and others by initiating set-aside programs in its purchasing for the purpose of contracting them to the competitive small firms sector. It is time the government took immediate steps to reduce the costly bureaucratic paperwork onslaught I mentioned earlier. It is time to simplify our legislation with regard to labelling and packaging, and it is time to rewrite the Income Tax Act for the sake of simplification and saving.

It is time the government took away the right to strike from those individuals and groups working in essential services. It is no secret that one of the major factors behind the low productivity figures in Canada is the fact that millions of working man-days are lost as a result of strikes, many of them illegal, and many of them within essential or government services.

Two recent polls indicate strong support for such a proposal. Of roughly 5,000 business establishments polled on a national basis 91 per cent favoured the idea of taking away the right to strike within essential services. On a more local level, of those constituents from my riding of High Park-Humber Valley who answered a recent questionnaire, 94 per cent supported such a move. Many of them work in essential services themselves.

It is also time the government followed its anti-inflation guidelines and reduced its spending in accordance with those guidelines. Our finance critic, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), outlined in his budget remarks how we could realistically reduce government spending by at least $1 billion.

It is time for the government to encourage, by way of co-operation in research and development, the formation of a small firms consortium. This system of business co-ops in West Germany, Japan, and elsewhere is a tremendous advantage to the small firms taking part with respect to buying, selling, financing, sharing facilities, and so on.

It is also time for the government to initiate cautious but realistic and meaningful incentives for the primary purpose of increasing productivity. It is time the government encouraged, through tax incentives, a far greater amount of secondary manufacturing within Canada rather than selling our national resources abroad for the sake of improving our international trade balance.

In short, the time has come for the government to change its attitude toward centralization of business, unions, and governments as well, and to take the necessary steps, some of which I have outlined, for the purpose of preserving a competitive business community which forms the basis of the free market system.

● (2140)

I have tried to outline some of the problems, along with some remedies, that relate to the small firms sector of our economy and, believe me, I have only scratched the surface. If we want this sector to survive within our society, as indeed we do, then immediate action by the federal government must be taken, for the small business community is what the free enterprise system is all about. It is what this country was built on and what this country can prosper by. Other countries which presently are more fortunate than Canada in regard to unemployment, inflation, productivity, and other areas by which the standard of success and happiness is judged, have all concentrated their economic energies toward their small firms sectors within their industrial way of life.

Japan, Belgium, West Germany, not to mention the United States and others, are all in far better shape economically speaking than Canada, and one of the primary reasons is because in those countries their governments are dedicated toward the betterment and continual growth of the small firms sector, thereby assuring the survival and success of the free market system in particular, and free enterprise as a whole. We cannot allow the Prime Minister to change the free market system in this country. If the Prime Minister believes that the free market system does not work, as he so clearly stated late last year, then may I remind him that if indeed free enterprise is having its problems in this country it certainly has nothing to do with the system itself but rather with the stranglehold that he and his government have had on that system for the past decade or so.

I see I still have about five minutes left, Mr. Speaker, so in order to close on a not too serious note I should like to read to you a very simple but significant story put out by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. It simplifies the realities of our economic society to a children's fairy tale, but the reason I decided to end my address today by reading this story is because, more than anything that has been printed lately regarding the problems within our economy, this story signifies reality and comes right to the point in a way that even members and supporters of the New Democratic Party will understand—I hope.

Before I read it, however, let me set the stage by introducing the characters in the story and equating them to the real life segments of our society. First, there is the Little Red Rooster who should be equated to a typical small businessman in a free society. The cow will play the part of the union leaders, the duck will be the NDP oriented working man, and the goose is a socialist Liberal—is there any other? And lastly the farmer represents the cabinet. Allow me to read from this pamphlet put out by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, which

is a non-profit organization of over 32,000 independent business owners dedicated to the preservation of free competitive enterprise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May we clarify one point? It being 9.45 p.m. I should at this time put all questions necessary to dispose of the motion, but I believe there is some understanding so perhaps I could recognize the parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Trudel: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find there is general agreement among the parties that we do not see the clock until ten o'clock?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is correct.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed by unanimous consent that we do not see the clock until ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, it was also agreed that the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek) would finish his speech and then we will go to the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne), and finish up by ten o'clock.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, does that include listening to fairy stories about red roosters?

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Lefebvre: You guys deserve each other.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is adding to the situation. I should ask consent not to see the clock until ten o'clock but the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) suggests that the next speaker will be the hon. member for Kamouraska. I know that some other members might want to make representation and wish to speak, so it is difficult for the Chair to include that in the agreement. We could go beyond 9.45 p.m. and see what happens afterwards.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Jelinek: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by reading this story although it is simplified for the primary purpose that even those socialists on my left will be able to understand some of the problems of industry. It does lower itself somewhat to the level of a fairy tale. There is a very strong and important point in this. Allow me to read the story from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You could have read it by now.

Mr. Jelinek: If you guys had been quiet over there I might have been finished. Here is the story. Once upon a time there was a Little Red Rooster who scratched about and uncovered some grains of wheat. He called his barnyard neighbours and said, "If we work together and plant this wheat, we will have some fine bread to eat. Who will help me plant the wheat?" "Not I," said the Cow. You remember who the cow was. "Not I," said the Duck. "Not I," said the Goose. "Then I will," said the Little Red Rooster and he did.

After the wheat started growing, the ground turned dry and there was no rain in sight. "Who will help me water the wheat?", said the Little Red Rooster. "Not I," said the Goose. "I'd lose my workman's compensation," said the Cow. "Equal rights," said the Duck. "Then I will," said the Little Red Rooster and he did.

The wheat grew tall and ripened into golden grain. "Who will help me reap the wheat?" asked the Little Red Rooster. "I'm waiting for a guaranteed annual wage," said the goose. "Not I," said the Duck. "Out of my classification," said the Cow. "Then I will," said the Little Red Rooster and he did.

When it came time to grind the flour, "Not I," said the Cow. "I'd lose my unemployment insurance," said the Duck.

When it came time to bake the bread, "That's overtime for me," said the Cow. "I'm a dropout and never learned how," said the Duck. "If I'm the only one helping, that's discrimination," said the Goose.

"Then I will," said the Little Red Rooster and he did. He baked five loaves of fine bread and held them up for his neighbours to see.

"I want some," said the Cow. "I want some," said the Duck. "I demand my share," said the Goose. That is the NDP.

"No," said the Little Red Rooster. "I can rest for a while and eat five loaves myself."

"Excess profits," cried the Cow. "Capitalist leech," screamed the Duck. "Equal rights," screamed the Goose. And they hurriedly painted picket signs and marched around the Little Red Rooster, singing, "We shall overcome." And they did.

For when the Farmer—that is the cabinet—came to investigate the commotion, he said, "You must not be greedy, Little Red Rooster. Look at the oppressed Cow. Look at the disadvantaged Duck. Look at the underprivileged Goose. You are guilty of making second-class citizens of them."

"But I earned the bread," protested the Little Red Rooster.

"Exactly," the wise Farmer said. "That is the wonderful free enterprise system; anybody in the barnyard can earn as much as he wants. You should be happy to have all this freedom. In other barnyards, you would have to give all your loaves to the Farmer. Here you give four loaves to your suffering neighbours."

And they lived happily ever after. Including the Little Red Rooster, who smiled and crowed, "I am grateful. I am grateful."

But his neighbours wondered why he never baked any more bread.

The point of this story is that it is time to wake up to the fact that unemployment insurance has increased five times since 1971 and government spending has increased five times in the past ten years. The unemployment deficit has reached a staggering $4 billion, not to mention the unacceptably high unemployment figures and the highest infla-

tion rate in history. So wake up Canada—there is no free lunch.

● (2150)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Loiselle (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I wish to emphasize some aspects of the budget proposed by the present government and that seem very logical, wise and adapted to the general situation of the Canadian economy a well as to the needs of the area that I represent, the south shore of Montreal.

Without coming back in detail on every point contained in the precise statement of the minister (Mr. Macdonald), I wish to comment briefly on the general context of that budget which is as follows: it is made up of a delicate web of contradictory situations. It represents the middle phase of an economic cycle. We are not entirely out of the depressive phase of the last economic cycle and we are not yet at the apex of the recovery which follows automatically any recession in each four or five year cycle. This is why the opposition can only make general criticisms which consequently are irresponsible. Those criticisms are general and out of context. As we all know the years 1974 and 1975 were the worst years of the recession in our economy since the 30's. In unprecedented and extremely concrete fashion, they reflected for every citizen what happened internationally, events which cannot possibly be underestimated in the restrictive context of a national electoral quarrel—a new planetary awareness both distressing and beneficial at the same time.

The last years have lit up new alarm signals on the controls panel of our planet. We realized as never before the limit of our resources. We noted, even us, the privileged citizens of a wealthy country, a large country new and rich, the fragility of the economic and environmental balance of the world.

We also understood the message of Carl Sagan, the American astronomer and physicist responsible for the message sent to the stars by Mariner 8. Our planet is small and limited and while we are broadening our conscience at the universal level we must look for new forms of organization on this earth and evaluate immediately its resources in the spirit of interdependency so favoured by the economists Galbraith and Myrdal. This is the meaning of the two years of recession which we have just experienced. They mean deep realignments on a world-wide basis between developed and underdeveloped countries, rich and poor ones, young and old ones, heavily populated and almost empty ones such as ours.

In spite of its privileged position in the world, Canada has known the consequences of an economic crisis which has affected every one of its partners. Due to some persistent behaviours of its citizens, especially the rapidly growing significance of wage increases as a deflation factor of the yearly inflation rate, Canada has been prompted to react, to strengthen some controls and to impose others enabling it to anticipate the future and maintain a real stability. By the way, while all or almost all industrialized countries reported a real reduction of their national production, Canada maintained during the past years an average growth of 1 per cent on a two-year basis.

While the unemployment rates were reaching 10 per cent in the United States, including incredible rates of 16 per cent in Connecticut and 23 per cent in the States of New England, Canada for its part was always maintaining unemployment rates lower than 8 per cent. At the same time, the unemployed of our country enjoyed services and benefits whose realism and efficiency drew the admiration of all industrialized countries. For me, the general criticism expressed by the opposition in its motions of non-confidence are shabby and show an alarming chauvinism. They form, I think, an incredible condemnation of the policy carried out by the majority of our major commercial partners in the free world that were unable to match the stability of Canada in the recent crisis.

Indeed, if the opposition is not satisfied with an actual increase in the purchasing power of Canadian citizens, a real employment growth, a gradual increase in oil prices and a sustained national productivity, I wonder what strong criticisms they would make as regards the American government which enables the United States to undergo a real slowdown in productivity, the Japanese government which had to face inflation rates ranging from 10 to 20 per cent and the British government which must constantly appeal to the International Monetary Fund to keep afloat what is left of the strong pound sterling. I wonder what else the opposition want and to what model they were referring when they restlessly attacked the behaviour of the government of Canada during the recent events.

They were probably referring to a hypothetical country located in a solar system with which they are the only ones to maintain a constant relationship. I humbly suggest that Canada got out of the recent crisis with distinction and that the Canadian government was largely responsible for the relatively good performance of our economy through its strong and responsible approaches which were constantly adjusted to reality rather than to the requirements of a restrictive theory. And this year, it continues to act according to its principles.

We might have, between two alternatives, either applied brakes and more severely restricted our expenditures by relying on the economy recovery to ensure as best as we could a fair distribution of wealth. As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) said, this would have amounted to clearly ignoring the most disadvantaged segments of society whose improving status necessarily depends on suppletive government action. Or we might have brought forward a largely expansionist budget, ignoring the fact that we can expect a better recovery than was forecast in Canada, under the pretence of stimulating our weakened economy.

But we had to respect the traditional balance of the economy. We decided not to feed inflation thanks to expansionist measures and important tax reductions, but at the same time not to demand further sacrifices from the citizens, under the pretence that consumption has remained at a high level and that it is impossible to cut expenditures that are attributed to it in our society.

This budget strikes a difficult balance between expansion and belt-tightening. It is an intermediate budget, with significant amounts still allocated to items that will require less funds starting from next year because the effort is done now. It also takes into account the real and

significant results obtained mainly through the Anti-Inflation Board. It is now projected the inflation rate for 1976 will be below 8 per cent, certainly a more acceptable figure than the 11 or 9 per cent figures of preceeding years. This budget takes into account the key action by the Anti-Inflation Board since its inception. It also introduces a delicate transition before the termination and change of certain programs, and finally it undertakes major structural changes originating from important policy statements such as those made by the Economic Council of Canada.

I would like to stress at this point why this budget seems to me both acceptable and in line with certain major aspects of the situation in Quebec, namely economic development—more especially that of small and medium businesses—the improvement of manpower programs and progressive changes in the employment insurance, and finally the energy issue. On the matter of economic development, I note firstly that this budget does not affect the regional development incentives programs.

Despite the significant progress experienced during the 1970-74 economic cycle, and the bulk of favourable trends now experienced by the Quebec economy, that province is still faced with important structural problems that were keenly emphasized in the last DREE report in March 1976. Although Quebec has caught up in real terms on most aspects, its economy is still plagued by traditional industrial traits that must be rapidly changed to bring the province to the level of Ontario or the Canadian average.

We may therefore hope in that context that all this year and all along the 1976-1977 fiscal year the DREE programs take into account that basic requirement, by allocating significant funds to industrial reconstruction efforts that are complemented at the provincial level by a determined and specific action policy. However, I see in this budget a special emphasis on the growth of small and medium businesses, clearly the ones that denote the highest level of local and regional enterprise.

• (2200)

The provisions designed to increase deductible benefits for tax purposes to $150,000, and set their total amount at $750,000, are first of all a type of realist indexing to the cost of living. But by allowing a business to save up to $10,500 on its tax account for the previous year, the government exceeds indexing and ensures—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It being ten o'clock, I must interrupt the hon. member and, as agreed earlier, it is my duty to put forthwith the question to dispose of the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

The question is on the motion standing in the name of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On division.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion (Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)) agreed to on division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being ten o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning, pursuant to Standing Order 2.

At 10.01 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 11, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

POSSIBILITY OF MEETING WITH QUEBEC TO REDEFINE ITS OBJECTIVES WITH CONFEDERATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion.

Yesterday, the Quebec Minister of Communications stated that if this government continues to centralize everything, it could, if it remains in power a few years, bring about the split-up of Canadian federalism and Quebec separation.

Since the statement made by an official representative of the Quebec government shows a growing concern among Quebec authorities and consequently among Quebecers generally, and recognizing also the centralizing position of this government which daily threatens the objectives aimed at by the BNA Act, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey):

That the House unanimously instruct the Prime Minister to call a meeting between the Quebec government and the federal government to reassess the legitimate objectives of the Quebec government within Confederation.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

PROPOSAL THAT COMPANY GRANT PENSIONERS AN INCREASE EQUAL TO THAT GRANTED BY CANADIAN NATIONAL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to present a motion to which I hope the House will agree. It is of urgent and pressing necessity so far as many persons are concerned. The delay in the submitting of the report by Dr. Noel Hall on railway pensions ought not to delay action with respect to the pensions of those who are now retired. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin):

That this House calls on the government to urge the CPR to grant to its pensioners an increase at least equal to the increase granted recently by the CNR to its retired employees and their survivors.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1110)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR MORATORIUM ON GARRISON DIVERSION PROJECT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to propose a motion of urgent and pressing necessity concerning the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota. As the International Joint Commission will not complete its report until October 31, 1976 on the effects the Garrison diversion project will have on polluting Manitoba waters and on Tuesday, June 15, additional moneys will be requested from the House of Representatives in Washington for further construction of the project, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta):

That the Secretary of State for External Affairs contact President Ford and request a moratorium and that no further funds be allotted to the project until IJC files its report.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

RECOMMENDATION THAT NO APPOINTMENT BE MADE TO REPLACE MRS. PLUMPTRE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to seek the unanimous consent of the House on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that Mrs. Beryl Plumptre has resigned as vice-chairman of the government's Anti-Inflation Board, and in view of the fact that

her reasons, apart from personal ones, included an obvious disenchantment with the growing bureaucracy of the anti-inflation program and the obvious ineffectiveness of the program in controlling prices, and in view of the fact that recently the Minister of Agriculture chided members of this House for not making recommendations to the government for the appointment of a top official of the Farm Credit Corporation, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn):

That this House recommends to the government that no appointment be made to replace Mrs. Beryl Plumptre on the Anti-Inflation Board.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

RESIGNATION OF MRS. PLUMPTRE—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO RESTORE CREDIBILITY OF BOARD

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. Yesterday the co-chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board resigned on the very day that we saw almost a record increase in the consumer price index. Since one of the original reasons for her nomination as co-chairman of the board was her great credibility with Canadians, especially the consumer, may I ask the Minister of Finance what immediate action, after this serious resignation, is the government prepared to take to restore the credibility of the Anti-Inflation Board with Canadians in general and consumers in particular?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there are two questions of fact: in the first place, Mrs. Plumptre was not the co-chairman, but the vice-chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board and in the second place the resignation did not occur yesterday. It occurred, I think I am correct in saying, on June 1 or some seven to ten days ago when she indicated in a letter to the Prime Minister that the six month period that had been discussed with her at the time she took on the role, had been reached and for personal reasons she proposed to stand down. With regard to her replacement, there have indeed been some considerations and discussions in this regard and we hope to be able to make an announcement at a very early date.

DATE ON WHICH WAGE CONTRACTS WILL BE REVIEWED—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT ON PRICE MONITORING

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): A supplementary question. Since the very credibility of the government is at stake here,—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

Mr. Grafftey: —is the minister prepared today to give the House a firm date on which the wage contracts before the board will be reviewed, and because this government has been given specific statutory authority to protect the Canadian consumer, will the minister table a thorough report of price monitoring in order to explain the price increases reported yesterday?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, virtually all of those questions were answered yesterday. The price increases were described very fully by Statistics Canada in the release issued which indicated it was the price of beef and the impact of certain provincial budgetary decisions such as the pricing of tobacco and alcohol which had an effect on the consumer price index in the month of May. With regard to the other details of pricing decisions by the Anti-Inflation Board, from time to time the board issues releases. I would be prepared to make a collection for the hon. gentleman and make certain that they get into his hands so that he can review them.

As to the question of the backlog, as I mentioned to his colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton West, of course the Board has not proceeded as quickly as it would have liked to in dealing with cases generally, one of the principal reasons being that a number of occasions they have paused to consider fully cases that have raised a lot of public comment, such as the Thompson case. The board has been prepared to go back and talk again to the parties rather than make a final and summary decision. The board will be trying to make its decisions as quickly and effectively as it can. I think the chairman is concerned about seeing that each party who feels he has not been fairly treated will have full opportunity to state his case before the final decision is made.

GOVERNMENT ACTION ON MRS. PLUMPTRE'S RECOMMENDATION FOR NATIONAL FOOD POLICY

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since Mrs. Plumptre, who resigned yesterday, has on a number of occasions advocated that the government should adopt a national food policy and since in yesterday's price rise, the rise in price of food was a serious consideration especially affecting low income Canadians, will the government now accept Mrs. Plumptre's recommendation to formulate as quickly as possible a national food policy, so that we will not have any other announcements like yesterday's concerning the rise in prices?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the government has accepted the importance and priority of formulating a food policy. I will not say that this, necessarily, was Mrs. Plumptre's suggestion, but we are glad to have her support in this regard. As the Minister of Agriculture has indicated many times, it will be valuable and useful both to consumers and producers in Canada if they can have that kind of statement. That is an occupation on which he is now engaged and has been for some time.

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE STUDY OF BOARD'S OPERATIONS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. As both labour and consumers have little confidence in the board because at present their interests are not vigorously represented within the board, would the minister, in view of the necessity of fully disclosing the operations of the board to the public, arrange the immediate referral of the administration of the board to a committee of the House, which would call witnesses and hear evidence in order to assess the board's performance and the resources it enjoys for doing its job? I ask this in view of existing circumstances.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would have to correct the hon. gentleman with regard to the membership of the board. There are two labour representatives; one is Mr. Ladyman of Winnipeg, whose lifelong career has been in the labour movement; the other is Mr. Chapman, from Vancouver, whose metier as well has been in the labour area. We will be seeking appointees to the board who have Mrs. Plumptre's specific experience in the consumer area; although I would have to say that the membership of the board generally has been sensitive to consumer concerns, as evidenced by the decisions which have been made.

Finally, with regard to the proposal that the members of the board and its staff should be involved in hearings before a parliamentary committee, it seems to me that, following the line taken by several members opposite, it would be much more valuable if their time was spent dealing with the problem of inflation in Canada rather than in conducting another set of hearings.

REQUEST FOR OUTLINE OF PROGRAM FOR POST-CONTROL PERIOD

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the minister's attitude to full disclosure, which I think is surprising, particularly as the board has a mandate to advise on general and structural policy changes necessary to contain inflation after the controls come off. Mrs. Plumptre's resignation having further narrowed the coterie of post-control advisers available to the government, is the government prepared to open up this process and advise the House what options are now being considered and who in the government is doing this important work? Perhaps it will disclose, as it ought to—this is the hallmark of a free democratic society—what is to happen in the post-control period. Or, is the post-control period so far down the road that there is no point in doing it now? Is that the position of the government?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of full disclosure, the chairman of the board and other representatives have appeared before the standing committee, to discuss their work in detail and in more general terms. If the hon. member feels that was not adequate, then that, of course, is a reflection on his own colleagues rather than on the government's willingness to make these people available.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The situation now is different.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of the discussions concerning the post-controls period, we will, of course, be meeting many groups in the community and it will be the government's intention in the coming session to set before parliament and the country the kinds of options and considerations we will have to take into account in the period after the controls come off. We have set ourselves a specific period for the controls program. That period should give parliament and the country time in which to reflect on some of the important changes which may be necessary in the post-controls period.

POSSIBILITY MRS. PLUMPTRE MADE RECOMMENDATIONS ON LEADERSHIP OF BOARD AND ITS PRICE CONTROL POLICY

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Since the minister said that Mrs. Plumptre told the government six months ago she would only take the job for six months, it is strange that she would call a press conference to say exactly what she had told the government six months ago. Surely this press conference is bound up with the fact that she is not pleased with the manner in which this anti-inflation program has been put into place. Can the minister or the Prime Minister tell this House whether Mrs. Plumptre made recommendations to the government, the Prime Minister or the minister with regard to the leadership of the Anti-Inflation Board, its consumer policy or the control of prices? Did she make any such recommendations during the past six months?

● (1120)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I can say quite categorically there were none with regard to the leadership of the Anti-Inflation Board. My observation would be that there has been a very close, cordial and effective collaboration between the chairman and the vice-chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board. As to what she may say about her reasons for resigning, it would probably be a better idea to let her speak for herself rather than put words in her mouth. I suspect she may have concluded that the personal reasons for her leaving might have been misconstrued by the malicious in some way and she would like to dispel that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): It is obvious that Mrs. Plumptre intends to go out with a bang rather than a whimper. She has chosen a time when food prices are escalating as well as the bureaucracy of the government's anti-inflation program. Does the government intend to implement any of the recommendations of the final report of the Food Prices Review Board which Mrs. Plumptre has fought for since becoming involved in the Food Prices Review Board and the Anti-Inflation Program?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I say again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is seeking to put words in her mouth. Why not let her speak for herself? With regard to the recommendations under her leadership as chairman of the Food Prices Review Board, these indeed are an important part of the government's consideration in relation to food policy.

SUGGESTION REPLACEMENT FOR MRS. PLUMPTRE BE OFFERED LOWER SALARY

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): We are not trying to put words into Mrs. Plumptre's mouth. We are trying to get the government to tell us whether the program is indeed foundering. I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether in seeking a replacement for Mrs. Plumptre he will honour the attempt to tighten up the belt in this country and offer a reduced wage in order to attract someone who can better reflect the consumer interests of this country, a wage that is more in line with his attempts to fight inflation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I find this line of questioning absolutely preposterous. The Minister of Finance has repeatedly said, let the lady speak for herself, which she is obviously able to do. If the hon. member is intimating in some way that the wage is the cause of her resignation, that it is related to our ability to entice other people to the board and that the lady has been overpaid, I wish the hon. member would put that to her directly and see what her answer would be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

RESIGNATION OF MRS. PLUMPTRE—ACTION ON RECOMMENDATION FOR MONITORING SYSTEM FOR MARKETING BOARDS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Since it now appears obvious to everybody but the minister that Mrs. Plumptre's timing exemplifies in a very dramatic way her frustration over her inability to get this government to act on the prices issue, will the minister advise what action the Anti-Inflation Board and the government are taking on one of the recommendations made by Mrs. Plumptre with respect to a monitoring system of marketing boards in Canada and some agreement with the provinces in this regard?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, having been the person who first spoke to Mrs. Plumptre about taking on this assignment, I feel I must at least dispel the suggestion put in the first part of the question. When I first approached Mrs. Plumptre in October, her first answer was negative. I would rather not put these matters before the House because they are of a confidential nature. But in face of two opposition parties which really are fabricating a whole series of interpretations which are completely opposed to the truth, I feel I must say that at first Mrs. Plumptre refused, because of family and personal reasons, to accept the assignment. Finally, she took it on but made it quite clear she would resign within a period of a few months—that she was only taking the job to help in the transition. Wait to hear the results of the press conference, Mr. Speaker, but I am stating the facts as they happened. She made it clear at the outset that she would resign in a few months. If her resignation now comes as a surprise to the opposition, it certainly has not come as a surprise to the government. The timing, if anything, was favourable to the government because Mrs. Plumptre stayed on longer than she said at first she would. Her letter of resignation was dated June 1, before the figures of the last consumer price index were known, and I therefore repeat that this whole line of questioning, if not malicious, is extremely ignorant.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE STUDY ON FOOD POLICY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): My supplementary question is to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps had the Prime Minister shown a little less ignorance of this subject he would still have Mrs. Plumptre. I would remind the right hon. gentleman that yesterday I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister regarding the activities of the interdepartmental committee on food policy, and the Minister of Agriculture and the Prime Minister expressed complete ignorance. Yet, as reported at page 7482 of *Hansard* for July 11, 1975, in reply to a similar question, the Minister of Agriculture said this:

> Mr. Speaker, the committee is active. I can say this: if the hon. member has any constructive suggestions, we would like to hear them.

Can the Prime Minister now inform the House whether there is an interdepartmental study going on with regard to a comprehensive food policy and if so is he prepared to tell us what proposals this committee has made to the government?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): If the hon. member would refer to the white paper published on October 13 he would see that one of the four lines of attack on inflation concerned the need for structural changes in the area of food, housing and energy. Announcements concerning policies in these three areas have been made and more will continue to be made.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MANPOWER

THE ALLEGED WRONGFUL USE OF FUNDS FOR MANPOWER TRAINING

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Is the minister aware that in some provinces manpower training courses are used to denigrate free enterprise, to promote divorce, abortion, the abolition of capital punishment and homosexuality? Although I realize that the minister may not be aware of this, will he order an investigation and recommend that provinces take action so that the federal funds for manpower training serve the purpose of

the emancipation of workers and not destruction and negativism?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am really at a loss for words. But I will take note of the hon. member's vehement representation and try to trace this suggestion to its source.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF FEDERAL POSITION PAPERS

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question, of which I have given notice, is directed to the Prime Minister and relates to the crucial Conference of First Ministers which is to begin on Monday. I know that members of the press are to be briefed on Monday morning with respect to the federal position papers, prior to the next sitting of the House. Will the Prime Minister undertake to table these papers today so that Members of Parliament may have an opportunity to study the federal position?

● (1130)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to table the federal position papers on Monday at two o'clock. The custom, a long established one, has been that position papers of either the provincial or federal governments for federal-provincial conferences should not be released in advance, and would not be released in advance unless there were agreement from the parties that that could and should be done. Obviously, the federal government acting alone would have no objection to tabling this paper now, but I feel that this would be somewhat of a breach of faith with the custom established with the provinces.

In fact, my office has received representations from at least four provinces following a partial leak which I understand occurred a few days ago, from we do not know what source. These representations are to the effect that we should not release these position papers. The premiers wanted to be in a position on Monday to react to them and not be forced to react to them before that time because of the release of the federal position papers. This has been the custom in the past.

Miss MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While I appreciate the Prime Minister's reply and understand that position, given that copies of these proposals are already in public circulation and the further fact that the press will be briefed and made aware of them at nine o'clock on Monday morning prior to the tabling in the House of Commons, would the Prime Minister undertake to canvass the provinces again on this matter to see whether or not their agreement to tabling these documents later today could be achieved?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether between now and four o'clock it would be likely that we would reach every premier and get his consent to do this. I do not see what great advantage the opposition would get from having them at four rather than on Monday. What was leaked to the press—and I have not seen it—certainly could not be the final document, which was worked on until very recently. So, therefore, let us assume that the premiers will have first look, at I believe 9.30 on Monday morning, at what is to be the final version of the federal document. I would certainly agree at that stage to give copies to the hon. lady and to any other members of the opposition who would want to take cognizance of it before the document was actually tabled in Parliament at two, presuming that the House would not object to our releasing it to some members before it was tabled in the House as a whole.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REASON FOR DELAY IN LAYING OF UNDERWATER POWER CABLE TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—PAYMENT OF EXTRA COSTS

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, may I address my question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Can the minister state whether the installation of the underwater power cable to Prince Edward Island has run into unforeseen delay and, if so, what is the cause of the delay; and can the minister also say whether there is still any possibility of this cable coming into service on schedule?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, indeed we are having a small problem which I trust will only be temporary and will not cause too much delay in the installations of the cable. Some time in the last few days, a small incident occurred when the manufacturer of the cable was getting ready to load it in Sweden for shipment to Canada. The cable was damaged but technical teams are now evaluating those damages and how long it will take to repair it before shipping it to Canada. It may be that this will cause some delay and, for the time being, we are not sure how long that delay may be and whether it will affect the laying down of the cable which was to go into operation in the fall. Within a week or two I should be in a position to say more specifically what effect the incident in question will have on the installation of the cable.

[*English*]

Mr. MacLean: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say whether any additional cost involved will fall on the Swedish contractor or on Canadian taxpayers?

Mr. Lessard: Mr. Speaker, if any costs are involved at the production level so far as fixing the cable and keeping the cable in good shape is concerned, no doubt such costs will be borne by the producer of the cable.

Oral Questions

CONNAUGHT LABORATORIES

ALLEGEDLY INFERIOR QUALITY OF VACCINES—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO MAINTAIN STANDARDS

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In light of continuing concern expressed about Connaught Laboratories by a former employee, Dr. Andrew Moriarty, regarding the quality of vaccines and other biologicals produced by that firm, and recognizing that Connaught is owned by the Canadian government through the Canada Development Corporation, can the minister assure the House that the government, through the health protection branch, holds Connaught Laboratories to the same high standards, regulations and controls as other pharmaceutical manufacturing companies?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister would indicate to the House what action is being taken to verify or deny the validity of Dr. Moriarty's reports, and with particular regard to the effectiveness of various viral vaccines produced by Connaught, is anything specifically being done to test them in view of the charge that perhaps the polio vaccine which we have is not as effective as we all thought it might be?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, Connaught Laboratories are in exactly the same situation as any other firm in Canada, subject to examination and control by the health protection branch of my department.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

USE OF MERCURY CONTAMINATED FISH BY NATIVES IN AREA OF ENGLISH AND WABIGOON RIVERS—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROVIDE OTHER SOURCES OF PROTEIN

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I presume that the minister has seen and probably read a report prepared by officials of his department and the Department of National Health and Welfare recommending that subsidies be paid to Indians on the English-Wabigoon river system to provide protein substitutes for mercury polluted fish which is still being eaten for lack of any substitute in the area. Would the minister either make a statement now, or if he has not had time to look into the matter fully would he make a statement at an early date in the House, stating what the federal government proposes to do about this suggestion, either in consultation with the provincial government or on its own, so as to deal with this serious threat to the health of those affected?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the report contains several recommendations; for example the program to provide alternate fish by fishing for them in the lakes themselves rather than having them flown in from other centres; the institution of subsidies; and programs for economic development. However, the first point that the report made was to strongly recommend that none of these programs be instituted without full and complete consultation with the two Indian bands directly involved and with the provincial government. That is the step we are now taking; we are discussing the contents of the report with the Indian people and the provincial government.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister is going through this process of consultation would he report to this House what this government proposes to do?

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to make that information available.

* * *

TRANSPORT

POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN SUBSIDY FOR CLARKE STEAMSHIPS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is posed to the Minister of Transport, and in doing so may I express to him my sincere thanks for taking time out of a very busy schedule to visit the port of North Sydney to meet with union reps and others.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muir: I am sure he now has a much greater appreciation of the facilities that we have there. Can the minister advise the House whether Clarke Steamships Limited have applied for an increase in subsidy beyond the over $7 million that they have now received to carry freight to St. John's, Newfoundland through the ports of Halifax and Montreal, to the detriment of the port of North Sydney?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would want to check to see whether this could be classed as an application. I am sure there were explorations of possible increases; however, there has been no decision to grant any such increase.

Mr. Muir: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that by providing government subsidies from taxpayers' money to private shipping corporations that apparently cannot operate on a profit basis on their own merit, when at the same time East Coast Marine Ferry Services, a CN subsidiary, has ships lying idle, the government is contributing to an already unbearable unemployment rate on Cape Breton Island, where our stevedores are walking the streets and our work force has been reduced?

● (1140)

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the situation. Of course, the hon. member ought not to ignore the very significant sums of money by way of subsidy covering losses which are paid on the North Sydney-Port-aux-Basques line.

An hon. Member: That's why you should run your own ship.

Mr. Lang: The question of alternate subsidies really came up as part of the effort in the battle of matching one subsidy with another, a general policy which I have stood against, but which is not necessarily easy to reverse when it involves a matter of a constitutional arrangement.

* * *

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT OF CLOTHING AND TEXTILE BOARD ON POLYESTER YARN

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and in his absence I trust his parliamentary secretary will handle it. The question is urgent and pertains to the Canadian textile industry which is now in a severely depressed state because of the damaging importation of offshore low-costs imports. A major recommendation has been made to the minister by the Clothing and Textile Board with regard to polyester yarn and filament. This recommendation has been in his hands now for five weeks. The minister promised to table it in the House and give his answer within 15 days of the time of its receipt by him. Can we be assured that this will be tabled soon?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that the situation in the textile industry is now undergoing a complete review at the hands of an ad hoc committee which was set up five weeks ago at the request of textile industries. A report will be tabled on the matter by the end of June.

* * *

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Jean-R. Roy (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance try to determine from the Vice-Chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board how she has managed to seduce to her support the very opposition parties and members who were violently opposing her appointment last October?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

TRANSPORT

RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE—POSSIBILITY OF HEARINGS TO CONSIDER REVIVAL OF ABANDONED SERVICES

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, now that the rabble has quietened down I would address my question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that hearings on existing passenger rail services in Canada are being held, will the minister tell the House whether the ministry has any intention of examining presently abandoned passenger rail services in areas of Canada which could possibly sustain passenger rail services, in order to determine whether they should be revived?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it will be our intention to look at potential rail passenger services as well as going through the present exercise, which is examining passenger services in place. They are separate exercises, of course, but certainly it is our view that as passenger rail services demonstrate themselves in various locations there will be new possibilities of renewed services in areas where they no longer exist.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that statements made thus far would indicate that hearings are being held only on existing rail services, and in view of the fact that the minister has received representations from unions, from this member and others that the Kettle Valley line be reviewed, how does this particular decision that rail services in Kettle Valley not be examined at this time square with the minister's statement that they are proposing a total examination of Canadian rail passenger services? In fact, will the minister assure the House that the Kettle Valley line and the people concerned will have an opportunity to provide the Ministry of Transport through the transport committee with input?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must have missed my earlier answer in which I indicated that these two things will be done but they are separate exercises. The current exercise is one of looking at existing services to determine which of them should, indeed, be retained. I am, indeed, pleased to receive representations from many sources about various services which are now being studied, and also those which are not in existence and where a case might be made for them.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSAL TO STIFFEN PENALTIES FOR THOSE WHO POLLUTE RIVERS AND LAKES—REQUEST FOR DETAILS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Last week the minister's parliamentary secretary, after continual prodding on my part—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jelinek: —stated that the government is considering the introduction and implementation of stiffer penalties to industries and municipalities which continue to dump excessive pollutants into our rivers and lakes, and I was specifically referring to the Great Lakes. In view of the fact that the very costly cleanup of these lakes has fallen sadly behind schedule, and because of a continuing and alarming increase of large quantities of dangerous chemicals, such as PCB, which incidentally is known to cause cancer, can the minister now advise this House what these stiffer penalties will be, who they will affect and when will they be implemented?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): In general terms, Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member,

who gave me verbal notice of his question, for which I thank him, is aware of the press release issued a couple of days ago concerning PCB. PCB will be prohibited in Canada everywhere, except in respect of some electrical materials. There was an exception made for electrical materials for obvious reasons; because a technological substitute for this product has not been found. On the other hand, most of the products which contain PCB for electrical materials come from the United States, and we have to work with the United States in order to eliminate this very noxious material, and that is what we are doing now.

ACTION TO REDUCE AMOUNT OF PCB IN GREAT LAKES

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware that four times the amount of PCB from electrical uses gets into the Great Lakes from the air. Therefore, I wonder whether his department has given any consideration or thought to further research on the matter, and where does the department stand on this situation as far as the United States is concerned? In other words, when can we expect some steps to be taken on the electrical question, which is primarily the reason for PCB pollutants in the Great Lakes?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Of course, Mr. Speaker, the question is not limited to PCB, but all other pollutants in the atmosphere and in the water. This was discussed with Mr. Train when he visited with me about two or three weeks ago. In July we are supposed to meet with the Great Lakes committee and with the Minister of the Environment for Ontario to see what other steps we can take to reduce PCB, mercury and phosphates, and generally clean up the Great Lakes as much as possible.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

AUTHORITY OF MR. GALLACHER TO SERVE EVICTION NOTICES TO PROPERTY OWNERS IN PICKERING AREA

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, on June 8, as recorded at page 14269 of *Hansard*, I directed a question to the Minister of Public Works, asking whether there was governor in council authority for the activities of Mr. Gallacher in the Pickering area. I am wondering whether he can now advise that this authority exists?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the action taken was under the Expropriation Act which authorizes the minister to issue notices and documents of this character in connection with expropriation proceedings, and does not require an order in council.

[Mr. Marchand (Langelier).]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

SUGGESTION COMPANY GRANT SAME INCREASE TO PENSIONERS AS CANADIAN NATIONAL HAS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that the delay in the submitting by Dr. Noel Hall of his report on railway pensions is disturbing to many pensioners who had hoped that by now something would have been done for them, and in view of the fact that the CNR has granted a small increase in the pensions of its retired employees and their survivors, will the minister have a serious talk with the CPR to try to persuade that organization that it should at least match what the CNR has done?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to carry the hon. member's representation forward, and I am always willing to draw to the attention of the CPR the example of the CNR and ask them to do as well.

* * *

● (1150)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TRIBUTE TO MR. FERNAND ARCHAMBAULT UPON RETIREMENT

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before continuing with the remainder of the question period I wonder if I might borrow a minute from the schedule, which I will repay to hon. members at 12 o'clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): With interest.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps hon. members will allow me to take some time to indicate to them that today marks the last day in the House of Commons of one of our distinguished and devoted official stenographers, Mr. Fernand Archambault.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: After 15 years of loyal and valuable services, Mr. Archambault will enjoy a well deserved retirement. I am confident that all hon. members in the House join me in expressing our gratitude and wishing him a very pleasant retirement.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF TIME NECESSARY TO REDUCE PCB IN GREAT LAKES TO ACCEPTABLE LEVEL

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of the Environment and it relates to the PCB discharge into the

Great Lakes. As the minister knows, this chemical, like mercury, is toxic and cumulative as the discharge is released gradually into the water. What is the estimate of his department of the length of time when PCB would be reduced to an acceptable level, presuming the immediate cessation of the PCB influx into the Great Lakes? In other words, how long would it take for the Great Lake PCB content to reach an acceptable level if we could stop dumping this chemical immediately into that body of water?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think only one thing is sure so far as PCB is concerned, and that is to control the sources of PCB. So far as the presence of PCB in the environment is concerned, I think it will be a matter of years before it is reduced to an accepable level.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

PROPOSED MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER WITH MR. BOURASSA TO SOLVE PROBLEM OF CENTRALIZATION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to disturb the right hon. Prime Minister, but I have an important question to ask him. I know he will give me a good answer.

Considering that the president of the Quebec Liberal Party was startled Tuesday by a statement from the Minister of Health, and that the Quebec Minister of Communications stated yesterday that in the current regime there is no doubt that this government could trigger separation, I think it is important in such circumstances to put a question to the Prime Minister. Recent polls prove, considering the circumstances—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member proceed immediately to ask his question?

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, in view of those statements from both sides which cause profound concern to Quebecers, I ask whether the Prime Minister would agree to meet his Quebec counterpart to find solutions which might better correspond to the aspirations of Quebec. I do know it is an objective which the Prime Minister would like to achieve as much as I do.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not without knowing that I will meet my Quebec counterpart Monday and probably Tuesday. If he has suggestions to make or discussions to open, of course, they would be welcome.

I cannot comment on the statements which the hon. member claims to quote because I do not know whether they are correct. I know the premier of Quebec never expressed such opinions and in all likelihood the hon. member is unknowingly quoting comments by a Quebec minister. Ah, he is showing a page of a newspaper, Mr. Speaker; that is always the ultimate response of those who spread unsound rumours and gossip. However, let me add that I am encouraged by the fact that the hon. member of the opposition is so concerned about communications between the provincial Liberal party and the federal Liberal party. If that interests him so much, he should come over and join us and we can discuss it.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

I do not know if the Prime Minister understands my concern for Quebecers, since on one hand the two political parties are contradicting themselves, and on the other hand the Minister of Communications, who still is an official of the Quebec Liberal Party, said yesterday he wished this government would be defeated as soon as possible in view of its centralizing attitude. Would the Prime Minister like to comment on a similar statement reported in the press—and I think it is accurate—for the benefit of the Quebecers who are also concerned? I believe the Prime Minister should make such a statement.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement. Someone in authority should make a statement, but the point is who it should be. If a minister of the Bourassa government did state that he wished this government would be defeated, I am convinced Mr. Bourassa will disown him very quickly.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Are you sure?

* * *

ENVIRONMENT AFFAIRS

GARRISON DIVERSION—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON DISCUSSIONS WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. Certain aspects of it were raised as a motion under Standing Order 43 by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. It has to do with the Garrison Dam project in North Dakota and the possible effects on the Manitoba waters. I am wondering whether or not the Minister of the Environment has communicated to the United State government or to North Dakota officials the uneasiness and apprehension that Manitobans feel with respect to the continuing progress on the Garrison Dam, regardless of the stand and the effect which the International Joint Commission may have on the final outcome. If there had been discussions, could he inform the House of the nature of the discussions and what reply was given by the U.S. government?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to give a clear cut answer because, as the hon. member knows, this problem is before the IJC. I expect a report very soon. I discussed the matter with Mr. Train. They are well aware of the fact that we will resent any action on the part of the U.S. which will have a negative effect in Manitoba. This is all I have to say today while I await the report of the IJC.

GARRISON DIVERSION—SUGGESTION UNITED STATES BE REQUESTED TO DELAY FURTHER CONSTRUCTION AND FUNDING

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of the Environment in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. As IJC will not complete its report on the Garrison Diversion project until October 31 and it is my understanding that moneys for further construction are to be appropriated before October 31, will the minister request that the U.S. delay further construction or funding until alternatives to the project not resulting in a treaty violation are found? It is my understanding that requests for further funding will be made on Tuesday, June 15, in Washington.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, as I recall, Mr. Train told me they would not do anything before the report is presented. I will make sure that this is the position of the United States. I will be seeing Mr. Train early in July. I do not think they will do anything in the meantime.

* * *

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF TESTS OF ELECTRONIC PAYMENT SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR REPORT OF STUDY GROUPS ON LEGAL AND CONSUMER ISSUES

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. On May 21 I brought to the attention of the Minister of Communications that Master Charge and Bank America of the U.S. were test marketing a primitive precursor of an electronic payment system. I tried, somewhat unsuccessfully to determine whether or not the minister was following the introduction of the system in the United States and whether the government was aware of any plans to test market a similar system in Canada. Since that time I learned of the responsibility of the Minister of Finance for government policy in this respect, and I wonder if he can indicate whether he is following the developments in the U.S. and, if so, could he also tell the House whether or not there are similar plans for test marketing even a primitive form of an electronic payment system in Canada?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): The hon. gentleman is quite correct. The government now has underway a careful study of a payments system that will be an historic change in many respects from using negotiable paper instruments to operating, in effect, by a kind of credit card system, and electronic transfer of funds. For this purpose the government has established a number of working groups made up of federal and provincial representatives and representatives of the private sector to define the necessary changes which will be required in our law of negotiable instruments and banking for this purpose and also to define the circumstances under which it will come into effect. I anticipate that it would be a

number of years before we would do this, but the preparation is now under way. I think it is not unlikely that for the purposes of experimenting with the system, once it has been determined for Canada, we might want to do a trial run marketing.

● (1200)

Mr. Beatty: Perhaps I could address my supplementary question either to the Minister of Finance or perhaps the Acting Minister of Justice. One year ago on June 25, 1975 the then minister of justice was asked if a special study was being set up on legal and consumer issues arising out of the increasing use of electronic technology in the payment system. I wonder whether the minister could indicate whether a preliminary report has been received from that study group as yet and also whether he can tell the House when a final report is expected from that study group?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): A final report has not been received. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has had the opportunity of examining the document—I think the title is "Towards an electronic payment system"—which is the principal document available at this point. A general summary of work of the various committees is that they have the work in process, but they have not as yet produced any documents for publication.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

INQUIRY AS TO LIAISON OF BOARD WITH DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance, and it deals with the expertise now possessed by the Anti-Inflation Board as opposed to the tribunal activities of the Anti-Inflation Board. Does the AIB have an input into the Department of Finance and the government regarding the problems it faces, apart from making its decisions public, and if so, what kind of liaison is there, and what results are obtained?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there has been a close liaison, particularly between the staff of the board and officials of the Department of Finance and other government departments. The most extensive liaison at the moment is for the purpose of producing the new regulations with respect to the profit and pricing rules. I understand that the board will be in a position to publish draft regulations early next week dealing with these areas.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

TABLING OF REFERENCE TO ADMINISTRATOR ON COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT RESPECTING INTERNATIONAL NICKEL COMPANY OF CANADA

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, in both official languages, a copy of the reference from the Anti-Inflation Board to the Administrator, under the act, of the collective agreement with respect to the International Nickel Company of Canada, in Thompson, Manitoba.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,126, 5,269, 5,404 and 5,449.

[*Text*]

MOTOR VEHICLE ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS OF CABINET

Question No. 4,126—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Do members of the Cabinet receive a yearly car allowance and, if so, in each case, what was the amount for each year 1965 to date?

2. For the same years (a) what provision was made for the use of an automobile by members of the Cabinet (b) who purchases the automobiles (c) in each case, how many have been purchased (d) what is the cost of operation of the automobiles including chauffeurs, etc.?

3. Is such allowance in addition to the use of a car supplied by the government?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): 1. Provision was made by statute in fiscal year 1930-31 for $2,000 per annum motor vehicle allowance to each minister of the Crown and the Leader of the Opposition (see Senate and House of Commons Act).

2 and 3. See replies to questions 321, Sessional Paper 255, dated December 9, 1968, and 1,037, *Hansard* 99, page 5839, dated February 24, 1969. Also see the Minutes of Proceedings Issue No. 52 of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates for April 5, 1976 pages 52.8 and 52.9.

Order Paper Questions

INFORMATION TO PARLIAMENT CONCERNING CBC

Question No. 5,269—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Is the government prepared to review the periodic refusals of the Secretary of State to furnish information to Parliament concerning the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with words contained in answers to various questions: "It has not been customary to require the CBC to supply such details of its internal management and administration" and (a) if so, will the government consider making requests for legitimate information concerning the CBC available to Parliament (b) if not, what are the reasons justifying such continued secrecy being applied to a publicly owned corporation?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): No. See reply to question 2,530 (Debates No. 200, dated November 6, 1975, page 8913).

NATIONAL WELFARE GRANTS

Question No. 5,404—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since the implementation of the National Welfare Grants Programme, how many grants have been allocated to each province?

2. For each year, what amounts have been allocated to each province?

3. What was the number of projects approved in the Constituencies of (a) Témiscamingue (b) Abitibi (c) Villeneuve and, in each case, what was (i) the aggregate amount allocated in grants to each Constituency (ii) the name and purpose of each project?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Newfoundland, 14; Nova Scotia, 45; Prince Edward Island, 23; New Brunswick, 28; Quebec, 87*; Ontario, 161; Manitoba, 34; Saskatchewan, 29; Alberta, 47; British Columbia, 65; Northwest Territories, 13; Yukon Territory, 6; National Organizations, 108.

---

*It should be noted that Quebec did not fully enter into the program until 1968-69.

2. See table below.

3. Two projects (a) Témiscamingue (Rouyn) (i) and (ii) Projet de Développement Social du Nord-Ouest Québecois, 2554-1-11, 1970-1974. ($244,263.87) To encourage the residents of northwestern Quebec to become aware of their community and to establish the machinery that would give them a growing influence on the decisions that affected them through popular participation in local and regional activites. (b) Abitibi—None (c) Villeneuve (Val-d'or) (i) and (ii) Projet: Centre de Référence et d'information, 1972-1974 ($20,423.36) To aid persons with various types of financial problems, to furnish information on types of social assistance available and on welfare rights, and to provide help through advocacy of individual claims.

$ '000

Province	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	1966/67	1967/68	1968/69
Newfoundland	11	9	21	43	8	4	—
Nova Scotia	8	20	61	91	93	115	108
Prince Edward Island	—	—	1	11	36	23	35
New Brunswick	12	10	15	32	12	16	37
Quebec	—	6	22	30	36	47	66
Ontario	57	154	242	463	549	302	359
Manitoba	23	33	77	112	110	184	197
Saskatchewan	18	22	43	61	39	107	131
Alberta	9	21	40	81	48	56	118
British Columbia	19	66	113	196	239	283	299
Northwest Territories	—	—	—	—	28	39	31
Yukon	—	1	—	12	19	20	20
CANADA	—	—	—	—	62	345	300

Order Paper Questions

$ '000

Province	1969/70	1970/71	1971/72	1972/73	1973/74	1974/75	1975/76
Newfoundland	16	15	10	27	29	101	27
Nova Scotia	107	191	173	291	290	553	320
Prince Edward Island	22	27	27	80	70	67	218
New Brunswick	27	31	86	126	88	68	77
Quebec	233	504	489	567	607	999	1,021
Ontario	310	267	309	704	643	548	528
Manitoba	179	213	180	134	78	48	—
Saskatchewan	59	100	127	213	248	139	137
Alberta	139	122	96	187	239	367	199
British Columbia	232	243	238	264	268	318	333
Northwest Territories	60	45	19	—	11	6	5
Yukon	15	—	—	—	—	—	—
CANADA	263	343	268	110	109	285	546

ERECTION OF FENCE AT VICTORIA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 5,449—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. Is a fence being erected at Victoria International Airport and, if so (a) what is the amount spent to date (b) what is its purpose (c) is the project completed and, if not (i) how much fencing remains to be built (ii) when will it be completed (d) what is the total estimated cost?

2. Is the purpose originally intended for this fence being served as matters now stand?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes. (a) $161,664.85. (b) To meet the requirements of the National Airports Policing and Security Program to separate aircraft operating area from public access at developed areas near terminal building. (c) (i) The project is complete, but should a deterioration in the (ii) security climate occur, consideration to completely fence the airport would involve a further 9,000 feet of security fencing, at an additional estimated cost of $72,000. (d) Total estimated cost is $161,664.85 to date.

2. Yes.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,346 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AIRPORTS—ABANDONED VEHICLES

Question No. 5,346—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. What is the name and location of each Department of Transport operated airport?

2. What is the official DOT policy on abandoned vehicles at such airports?

3. For each such airport, how many abandoned motor vehicles have been reported since January 1, 1975?

[Mr. Lalonde.]

4. Do such vehicles fall to the Crown and, if so, in what manner are they disposed of?

5. Has the government received any revenues from the disposal of such vehicles and, if so, in what amount?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—TRANSPORTATION—"USER PAY" CONCEPT AS DEFINED BY DEPARTMENT

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot) moved:

That this House questions the application of the Department of Transport's "user pay" concept as it applies to "mature and immature" regions of Canada and to different modes of transportation, and urges the minister to clarify the guidelines for implementation of the policy and to explain any alterations contemplated in it.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion I really welcome the opportunity to discuss one of the main obligations of the government, such as governing the country of Canada. Transportation has historically played a very important role in the development of this country. In the last two or three years this government indicated to us that it was going to do something about transportation. Over and over again the government stated that it had a concept which would greatly assist Canada in its development, namely rationalization of our transportation policy. Some years ago, a former minister of transport said that the transportation policy of Canada was in a mess. We all agreed with him, acknowledged his frankness in admitting that, praised him for admitting it and hoped that he would come up with a solution. During the election campaign in June, 1974, the Liberal party pranced across the country suggesting that it had some solutions, and the Prime Min-

ister (Mr. Trudeau) said they were not idle election promises but they were promises to do something about Canada's transportation problems.

In the Speech from the Throne in 1974, the government indicated its desire to see transportation used as an instrument of policy designed to achieve broad national, social and economic objectives. Well, we are still wondering. In fact, on the question of transportation policy today we could ask where we are going. In western Canada, the Stavely commission is studying the cost of moving grain. Also, in western Canada the Hall commission is studying the question of rail line abandonment and the rationalization of trackage. The CTC is travelling across the country hearing briefs with regard to passenger traffic. We wonder where all this is leading us.

As late as June, 1975, the government announced a new transportation policy. The government and the then minister said the principal advice on transportation policy would be in the hands of the government and they were really going to take over much of the role played by the CTC until that time. Now we are in June, 1976, and what have we seen this government actually do? We have a new Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang). He has bought the line handed down by, I suppose, the civil service which said that we must work on a "user pay" concept. I have always felt that transportation could serve the people of Canada a great deal better if users had a little more say before they were asked to pay.

● (1210)

Members of the transport committee travelled to Vancouver. One of the things they learned was that the federal government's policy had held back the development of that port. Nearly everybody concerned with the question of transportation into and around Vancouver harbour seemed to admit that. The committee then travelled down to Seattle and saw Canadian produce moving in and out of that port both to and from Canada when much of the goods should have been coming in through Vancouver. Our port facilities and transportation policy on the movement of goods into the port from the centre of the country and the prairies have not kept pace with the need which has been demonstrated in our trading policy with the Pacific rim countries.

What are this government and the Minister of Transport going to do about it? There are numerous commissions studying conditions, of course. We have a country concerned with transportation and productivity, because transportation plays a great part in our economy. It can keep inflation down and increase productivity, or increase costs; so it is important to know which direction the minister is taking. The only conclusion I can come to is that the minister seems bent on increasing freight rates, increasing the cost of air passenger travel, increasing the cost of rail passenger travel and, recently, increasing the cost of shipping.

An article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* reported that Nova Scotia was complaining about this government's actions in regard to Bill C-61 which will increase the cost of shipping in Canada. Shipping costs went up on the Great Lakes last year, and we have seen rail costs and freight costs go up. All this makes it more difficult for our produce to get to world markets because of a poor and ailing transportation system. We want to know what the government is going to do about it. How are they going to apply the "user pay" concept?

In June, 1975, a policy was announced which spoke of "mature and immature" areas. What does that mean? What are "immature" areas? At various times in committee the minister stated that subsidies would have to paid in immature areas, but in areas where competition had matured, competition would take care of the cost and no subsidy would be necessary. The government did away with some of the subsidies for the maritimes with regard to the movement of freight, so I suppose they consider it a mature area. I am sure it is not considered that way by many of the people living in the maritimes and attempting to do business there. This government has failed to clearly enunciate what they mean by "user pay" and what they mean by "mature and immature" areas. I hope the minister takes the opportunity to explain to the House and to the country what he means by the use of those terms in the national transportation policy.

It is not good enough for the government to suggest that they are going to do something about rail passenger service, or to think that giving $30 million to the CPR is going to bring about any great improvement. We know that 3.4 million people travel in what is commonly referred to as the Quebec-Windsor corridor. In 1974 the government had a grandiose scheme to set up a transportation authority for passenger traffic, something like Amtrak in the United States. But they have not done it. Instead, they proclaimed loudly that the $167 million subsidy for rail passenger traffic was too high.

They say they are going to adopt the "user pay" concept and that people who use a certain mode of transportation will have to pay for it. They do not mention that the government operates something like 86 airports and loses $243 million in maintaining them. Some time ago the minister suggested that under the "user pay" concept landing fees would have to be increased. If fees were increased for all the smaller planes using airports, that would in no way pay for the cost of maintaining those airports.

When he announced the new transportation policy, the minister also stated that the government was going to increase competition with Air Canada. In November, 1975, I asked him if this meant that the 25 per cent formula that controls CP Air would be done away with. Earlier this spring I asked the same question in the transport committee, and the minister replied that they were trying to find a way of removing the 25 per cent formula and allowing CP Air to grow. But we still have no clearcut explanation of how this will come about.

In 1965 we had a regional air policy that was designed to promote the growth of clearly established regional airlines. We have five regional airlines in Canada and have built up a huge number of primary air carriers, sometimes referred to as third-level carriers, but as yet the government has not announced any policy with regard to them. All this uncertainty with regard to freight rates, air passenger traffic and costs is cause for a great deal of apprehension to the users of our modes of transportation. Is the "user pay" concept going to apply fairly to all modes of transportation?

Transportation Policy

When the new transportation policy was announced in June, 1975, the Department of Transport stated that buses were the only mode of transportation not subsidized. One could argue that buses receive a tremendous subsidy through the maintenance of our highways. In fact, figures released recently suggest that all users of highways only pay for about 67 per cent of the cost of maintaining them. Buses make good use of the highways and they perform efficiently. In the "user pay" concept, will the government step in and ensure it is applied fairly to bus, rail and air traffic?

Ottawa has been the centre of a very recent experiment in the movement of passengers, Mr. Speaker. The government set up an experimental STOL service between Ottawa and Montreal which lost a great deal of money. Although the service is discontinued, we do not know if the government intends to reintroduce it. We have not been told. This leads to uncertainty.

● (1220)

The government wants to set up a new kind of rail passenger service between Ottawa and Montreal, Montreal and Windsor, and Montreal and Toronto, but has not specified clearly what it intends to do. We are entering an era of high energy costs, but the government has not spelled out clearly which mode of travel it prefers or how that mode will be developed or even financed. We do not know the government's direction. If we bound into one volume all the press releases the Department of Transport has put out in the past ten years, we would have an encyclopaedia of the government's good intentions. But the government has done few of the things set out in glowing terms in those news releases.

The minister said quite clearly that Air Canada may lose some of its shorter routes. Apparently, regional airlines, including CP Air, will be allowed to bid on some shorter routes. If it is found that regional carriers need less subsidy to operate such routes, Air Canada will lose them. To me, that will be a step in the wrong direction. As it is, too many airlines are operating in the United States. There has been some attempt to trim the fat off airline operations in that country. Here, in Canada, the government's move may encourage the proliferation of airlines. Instead of dealing with one airline in trouble, some day we may have to deal with six or seven all in trouble.

What is the government's policy on freight movement? The Minister of Transport has created much apprehension on the prairies and in western Canada generally. Many people in western Canada suspect him of being in bed with the CPR and of being in favour of getting rid of the Crowsnest pass rates. Some time ago he said in Edmonton that the Crowsnest pass rates had to go; it was only a matter of time.

Mr. Paproski: Shame!

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: The hon. lady is pounding her desk. Apparently she supports the minister.

Mr. Paproski: The next minister is clapping her hands.

[Mr. Horner.]

Mrs. Campagnolo: Someone has to do something for the north.

Mr. Horner: I do not mind seeing Liberal members clap their hands when it is suggested that the minister suggested the Crowsnest pass rates have to go. At least that clears the air. We on the prairies, particularly those in the minister's province, want to know the Liberal party's intentions with regard to the Crowsnest pass rates. If we know the government's position, the uncertainty will disappear.

In 1974 the government convened the western economic opportunities conference in Calgary. Western Canadian representatives presented their ideas concerning railway tracks. The government has not acted. We have seen no answers and few results. The government said it would devise a system for grouping commodities with a view to bringing about more favourable freight rates. There was much talk, but that is all. So far as we know the conference brought few results and answered few western Canadian complaints about the movement of goods.

Mr. Paproski: The government does not care.

Mr. Horner: The minister has said in the past that freight rates governing the movement of goods west should not be greater than those governing the movement of goods from central Canada to Vancouver. But this policy has not been implemented. It still costs more to ship from Hamilton to Calgary than from Hamilton to Vancouver. We have heard much talk but we have seen little action in this regard.

Some time ago the Canadian Transport Commission studied the movement of rapeseed, but its findings were not released. The minister said he would make a decision on the matter. He did, but that decision is not clear. He said certain discrepancies must be eliminated and the rate gap narrowed. But he wanted to move up the bottom rates rather than bring down the top. That did not suit the people of western Canada, who still wonder what the minister's policy is with regard to freight movement. In North America the natural flow of traffic has been from north to south, and vice versa, rather than from east to west. Perhaps that accounts for some of our difficulties.

As we see it, transportation in this country must play a vital role in making our economy sound—and developing the various regions of Canada economically so that, in competition with one another, they will be able to grow and better serve central Canadian—indeed, all Canadian consumer markets. As we see it, also, this government's policies have created much apprehension and solved few of our difficulties. Supposedly, it enunciated a new policy one year ago. It talks a great deal about the concept of users paying for service. I say that users should have more say in these matters.

It talks of certain mature and immature regions, but does not define what those terms mean. At present, shippers and manufacturers do not always know if they are entitled to a subsidy. In this country we have traditional subsidies coming under the Maritime Freight Rates Act in the maritimes and the Crowsnest pass rates in western Canada. But the minister has already said that the Crowsnest pass rates in western Canada are to be reviewed. That

has created much apprehension. I suggest that the minister should explain in greater detail exactly what he intends.

Two years ago the government talked of introducing a new transportation act, because the original act passed in 1967 can no longer serve Canada adequately. We are still awaiting that new transportation act, which I suppose would incorporate policies the government announced over one year ago. Perhaps if this session continues another year the government may introduce the bill.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to put before the House some answers to questions asked throughout the country concerning the transportation policy of the government as now being developed. Transportation in Canada is most important. For that reason, what we do in transportation is most important as well. Because transportation is costly, it is a large item affecting the over-all cost of living of Canadians. Therefore, if we manage our transport system badly we shall lose a great deal of money.

I want to talk today particularly about the cost of transportation and where our policy with regard thereto has taken us so far. When my predecessor, the now Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), said several years ago that transportation in this country was a mess, he did not mean that people involved in transportation in Canada were doing their job badly. He did not mean that about the people involved in the various modes of transportation. He did not even mean that about the people inside government departments who work on various aspects of transportation policy and issues. What he meant to say was that the policy was a mess, that the conglomeration of approaches to transportation in Canada which had developed over the years was full of inconsistencies and contradictions, that it had built into Canada tremendous costs in the way of non-productive expenditure that was in fact counterproductive.

● (1230)

He pointed the finger, in the bold way he has, directly at government as having the responsibility, at least today, to put the situation right, even though, clearly, the problem he was speaking about was the conglomeration of problems of governments year after year and over many decades in Canada. In his bold way, as well, my predecessor began the work of putting right the mess in transportation. Last summer he put before the House and the people of Canada the broad outline of the analysis of our transportation difficulties and the broad direction in which we ought to go in order to find solutions. I want to make it very clear that in pursuing this work I feel a complete consonance, a complete "in-tuneness" with my predecessor in the work he has done. I express my gratitude to him for the way in which he began it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: I have been saying all across this country that we have to be realistic about our transportation costs. This has been translated into the expression that the user pay. I want to put that expression clearly before the House in the proper context. The proper context is that transportation costs are real and someone must pay them. Those who do not think the user should pay have to appreciate that they are pointing the finger and saying that someone else should pay. If you do not like the expression "user pay", you have to defend the proposition that the non-user ought to pay for transportation costs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: That term "non-user" can, of course, be put in other ways. He can be called the taxpayer. It can be the taxpayer who is supposed to pay part of the cost. However, those politicians who like to make it appear that by fighting "user pay" they are fighting against and eliminating high costs to the great advantage of the country, are deluding themselves and the country. It leads to the continuance of the very kind of patchwork policies, suitable to particular political demands, which created the mess in the first place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: Those patchwork policies were frequently devised, and subsidies piled one on top of another, in answer to particular political demands which by themselves were popular in meeting a particular cause of a particular individual. It did not change the cost to the country. It had the impact over the years of unnecessarily increasing the total cost to the taxpayer, building a transportation system more costly than it otherwise would have been. It is to put this right that we are now launched upon the reform of transportation policy.

I want hon. members, particularly on this side of the House, to appreciate that this exercise will not be easy. These particular band-aids went on as political offerings to meet a particular demand for a particular area. There is a good deal of attachment to those band-aids and a good deal of fear about the pain that will be involved, as it will, every time you remove a band-aid.

We will only be able to succeed in improving our transportation policy in Canada, and thereby our transportation system with our dollars, if we are prepared to be strong enough to stand up politically and draw the picture of what we are trying to accomplish in terms of removing the band-aids, not individually but one by one, in order to remove them in total so that the body politic of transportation in the end can be healthier as a result of removing the band-aids rather than covering them over with more political band-aids.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: I want to make it clear that there are very good reasons in this country for direct policy action to accomplish particular ends. Direct policy action to improve regional development is clearly an objective that this government asserts. Redistribution of wealth is another objective which this government asserts. However, generally speaking we will be better off if we try to accomplish those objectives directly instead of hiding an apparent accomplishment of those objectives behind a transportation distortion and subsidy program. That is the point I am trying to make.

The point is that these distortions in transportation costs in fact lead to distortions in production and a higher total cost in Canada. For example, it may be effective to the

producer of grain on the prairies to have a low freight rate. There is, simultaneously, a more normal cost-reflecting rate on meat which might be produced from that grain. That is a serious disadvantage to the prairie region, in terms of the encouragement of the shipment to Japan and Italy of grain instead of the shipment to those markets and the creation in those markets of a demand for our beef, pork and similar products. The substitution of meat for grain might create jobs in processing and development, the very things that the prairie region wants. Does it, therefore, prefer the shipment of grain because the cost to the shipper is lower by shipping it in that form than shipping it as beef? The important point here is that the cost to the country is significantly greater to move eight pounds of barley from the middle of Saskatchewan to Vancouver than it is to move one pound of beef. The rates may be lower, but the cost to the country is higher. Therefore, there may be an inducement to that kind of movement. Indeed, if they are much lower than the real cost reflected rate, they tend to that artificial result.

Not only do we defeat our broad purpose of being productive by producing where it is best, ideally, by economics to produce, especially when that is an area where we want to develop population, jobs and secondary industry in processing, but we end up spending more money on transportation than we would have to spend if we went about the system correctly and in a balanced way.

An hon. Member: You have not created any markets for beef.

Mr. Lang: The hon. member says we have not created markets for beef. We have not. That is because of this very kind of disincentive which has stood in the way of real encouragement to production.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: I wish to make another very complicated point as clear as I can. I am referring to the value of the Crowsnest pass rates which I have been, obviously, discussing with regard to the low rates on grain. I want to say something about that and some very special arrangements in this country, such as the arrangement entered into with Newfoundland at the time it joined confederation when a particular and special treatment was accorded that province with regard to the movement of goods between North Sydney and Port aux Basques. That may indeed, in that sense, be rather sacred. The sacredness of the constitutional agreement with Newfoundland obviously stands. The sacredness of the tradition with regard to the Crowsnest pass is well known. But the point I am making—and I have made it in the west—is that if we have to do these things in accordance with our obligation to a region, it should be open to us to consider whether we can do them more directly rather than indirectly in the area of transportation. I have, therefore, said with regard to the Crowsnest pass rates that if this benefit were conferred more directly, and if we did not pin it on the rates, we would not only benefit the region as much in terms of dollars, but a lower-cost over-all transportation system would be brought about because we would be shipping the goods which it makes more sense to ship, instead of goods which are shipped because of the artificially lower rate upon those goods.

● (1240)

In the west this is understood—only they refer to other matters. They say the low rates on ores and the higher rates on finished products are disincentives to the refining of those products in the west. Obviously, that is true, and it is exactly the kind of case I am making. It is exactly the approach which leads us to say that by and large in this country, we would be better off if the rate to which a person is exposed when facing a business decision is as close as possible to real cost. He then has to take into consideration the real cost of moving the product he wishes to move.

I do not see the advantage of taking coal out of our ground and shipping it at a certain cost to the shipper when, if we weighed all the costs to the country, including the real cost of the freight which is not being charged, it might not be a benefit to move that coal into some other market, or abroad. Why should we move it if the costs, when taken into account, are not adequately met by the gains we get from the product which is moved?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: That is the realism I ask to be brought to the transportation system. When we talk about bringing this approach to mature transportation systems, we are, of course, talking about transportation systems in which the loading factor, the use of the system, is sufficient to make an approach which balances costs an appropriate one. I say this because I will always accept the need on occasion to take a transportation system into a remote area or to go in well in advance, for national purposes, of development which will eventually sustain that transportation system, or to connect remote areas so as to provide for the movement of people by some mode to the more settled centres of the country. When only a few people are there, it may not be possible to charge enough to meet the total cost. What we really mean when we say the user should pay is that there should be a logical cost transportation system, a low-cost transportation system, and this will most likely result if the user knows the real cost and makes his decisions accordingly.

The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) says that if there is "user pay", there should be "user say". To that, I say "bravo". Increasingly as we move toward the implementation of costs which are real and reflect the investment required, more and more of the people involved in the marketing of that service will have a say in the kind of service provided. I have told the airlines, for example, that I welcome input from their customers on the question of the style of facilities which are legitimate in our airports from a marketing point of view.

In the passenger area one finds one of the best examples of the problems which arise when we are prepared to distort the real cost. The papers published in connection with the 1975 study of our transportation system have been before the House and the people for a very long time, essentially unchallenged by those who have read them. It is true they have been challenged by some who have not

read them. Some of those figures are out of date now, but in my view they are still instructive.

Based on those studies, it is said that the person who travels by bus essentially pays his own way. The analysis even concluded that a fair share of the total road cost was defrayed through the gas taxes and licensing system to which buses are subject. The automobile was seen as receiving a subsidy equivalent to half a cent per passenger mile. The air passenger was seen as receiving a subsidy equal to 2 cents per passenger mile. In the case of the railroads it is higher, at 6 cents per passenger mile.

I ask hon. members: What kind of particular public purpose is there which would lead us to say that a person who travels by bus should first of all pay his own way and then, through sharing in the tax system, pay part of the costs of those who travel by car or by airplane? I ask what justification there is for that. I ask whether it is not better, if we have income distribution in mind, to face this situation straightforwardly. I do not think we would then end up taxing the bus rider to pay for the airplane traveller. If we have something else in mind, I would like to know what it is. I can see no justification for it.

Mr. Nowlan: What about the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. Lang: To every example hon. members would like to raise, I say the same logic should apply. As far as I am concerned, we should move with that logic in any particular mode, and as time goes on we should move as close as possible to recognizing real costs except where there is justification in terms of development, remoteness or some other clear reason which we can state. What we ought not to do is pretend in one area that a particular subsidy is kept for good political reasons, and then try to get people in other parts of the country to ignore the fact that there is an adverse impact upon them by virtue of the subsidy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: If you followed that, I would agree. But you don't follow it.

Mr. Lang: With respect to air, bus, rail and automobile, I ask about the need for the subsidies which have been in place, and of course we have unveiled a progressive move toward a policy of reflecting those costs. Serious discussions with the key users involved are under way. There may be some good arguments about how much, in fact, the cost amounts to and how much ought to be debited to the particular mode. We have taken some steps—for example, in the air business—to collect more from those who travel, because I do not see why we should put a subsidy of a particular amount on the table and say, "You can only benefit from that if you fly between Ottawa and Montreal. If you go by bus or in some other way, you cannot have any part of that subsidy." I do not see any justification for that.

All we do by inducing people to fly when it is not in Canada's economic interests or in their own economic interests, is end up having to build more airports to service the additional facilities. We will still need a lot of airports, let there be no doubt about that; but we have already adopted the principle for our major airports, those at Toronto, Montreal, including both Mirabel and Dorval—the key international airports—that those airports will be paid for by the users. Those who land at or leave those airports will be paying over the years ahead.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the Atl-East rate is another example of an occasion on which we embarked upon an artificiality. I say again: unless one is really embracing a principle of using a teaspoon to dig ditches by way of maintaining employment in this country, we ought not to preserve systems which lead to absurdities in terms of total cost.

● (1250)

The Wheat Board told us yesterday in committee that even at the Atl-East rates it costs seven cents a bushel more to move grain from the prairies to Halifax and Saint John than if it were moved by the water mode. That seven cents was worth their while to pay in order to have grain in position over the winter months for delivery when the lake and seaway system was closed. Of course, the cost to the country was much greater. This led to the result that we took grain from a farm by truck, put it in an elevator, then it was taken out again and put on a train to Thunder Bay, unloaded there, put in an elevator, cleaned, loaded into a vessel, taken to a port along the bay or lake, unloaded there, put into a terminal, then in due course loaded on a train, taken to Halifax or Saint John, and then unloaded into the final terminal.

Because of the subsidy, no one in that period of time had any incentive to look at a reasonable alternative, such as taking it from an elevator which can clean grain on the prairies, putting it on a train and taking it by unit train movement direct to Halifax, Saint John or Montreal, which can be done at very little more cost than by the water route, if all the truth be known—if we can get the truth, in terms of a real rate, from the railways, and we are trying to do that exactly these days. Those costs, unnecessary for that purpose, were thrown away. The examples go on and on, Mr. Speaker. That is the theme that we would want to develop as we examine all aspects of our transportation system.

I must say this to the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan), that when we are looking at the seaway, rail and a road running side by side, it makes no sense at all to be paying a specific subsidy or part payment of the cost if the grain go by water, making a different payment if it goes by rail, or some other payment if it goes by road. There is no justification for that at all. All that does is distort economics and it leads in the end to the construction of more facilities that are subsidized, even though that may be the more costly way of moving the product. This is what we are going to try to put right.

I want to say a few words, since the hon. member for Crowfoot did, about a couple of other issues rather than this broad, philosophic one. For instance, we are moving forward with our passenger rail examination in Canada, and we intend, as we have said, to put under one management and operation passenger rail service in this country so that it can be marketed effectively and run in a cohesive way to make maximum use of joint facilities and the interchange of track wherever it makes sense to do so. This is our firm intention. We have asked the companies to

move in that direction and we are prepared to take whatever action is needed to make sure that this result is accomplished.

Mr. Horner: That is just one more band-aid.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting at this stage that we can necessarily approach cost recovery in all our passenger service routes which are retained, but that is consistent with what I have just said. Our problem is that we start with a transportation system that was built on certain patchwork principles, and therefore there is a certain amount of preference for some modes over others. In particular, we have without any doubt favoured, in terms of subsidy, the automobile mode over other public modes of transportation.

I am prepared to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this country there is a real chance that passenger service can be made more attractive, that with new equipment and upgrading of lines it can be made attractive to passengers. The only way we are going to demonstrate this is by having faith in this thesis, going out and building the system and proving that it can work. We therefore propose to maintain some rail passenger services where it will not be obvious that it will be possible in the early phases to accomplish full cost recovery. We believe, of course, that we ought to discontinue those services where perhaps lack of demand is so great that the losses will be inordinate, and where alternative modes of transportation, such as a bus running alongside an unused rail passenger service, is available to the people. In those cases we ought not to spend the money; we ought, indeed, try to save it.

We also propose to continue to attempt to support public transportation in the cities of this country. When we implement the commuter policy of making some money available for commuter services, we recognize that we will only be doing part of the job that we have to do for urban transportation. We believe that it is right at this stage to support urban transportation with federal capital assistance, for much the same reason as I have described in relation to rail service. These have been in large part underused and undersupported because of the quite unnecessary and unjustified subsidies, although politically band-aid subsidies, which have been given by governments all over this country in support of the automobile, particular in regard to urban transportation.

That is a patchwork problem that has been created in large part by governments other than ours. Nevertheless, I believe we will have to try to take the lead in trying to get a change, a revolution in thinking, in favour of public transportation and away from the subsidized automobile which is so common in our cities.

It happens, of course, that both in the case of rail across the country and in the case of urban transportation system within our cities these may be modes that look particularly to the future, as we face a Canada that is becoming more and more concerned about pollution of the atmosphere, noise, and the cost of energy. Therefore, we may want in many different ways to encourage the use of these systems and certainly to avoid the use of the costly systems employed in each of these modes.

I have, Mr. Speaker, touched on some of the issues with which we will be dealing. We have, indeed, laid before the House and the country the blueprint of a philosophy that we will be adopting, and we will continue to do this. This helps individuals to know where they may be going and to calculate what the costs to them may be in the future of various options for a transportation system. What I should like from most users, therefore, is the general conclusion on their part that if they make a mistake in examining a future course of action, looking at rates on an artificial basis instead of costs that are real, they will be looking at the wrong thing.

As far as this government is concerned, productivity in this country will be improved by this rational approach to transportation and the lowest cost alternatives being selected. Productivity will also be improved as users of transportation, both businessmen and entrepreneurs looking at business possibilities, face the real cost to this country of what they are trying to do and of what is being done, and not at artificial rates based on some band-aid, political opportunity subsidy. Those subsidies we will want to remove, and that will be our task.

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

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, before lunch the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) used an analogy and likened the transportation system of our country to a band-aid policy or band-aid program. He said that now he is taking these bold steps in removing the band-aids, it is going to hurt. I am glad he used that analogy because I always think of a band-aid in terms of it being used to cover a sore or a wound, the purpose of which, of course, is to protect that wound or sore from infection and to allow whatever it is you are covering to heal. The premature removal of a band-aid would, in fact, result in further harm, especially if you have not done anything to heal the wound or sore.

In fact, that is what we have here in terms of transportation in Canada. We have the minister removing these band-aids without having put anything in their place to correct the problem. Indeed, the very things he is doing—and we have analysed what he is doing in respect of giving the CPR $30 million for railway passenger services between Quebec City and Montreal—constitute another band-aid program; he is starting a new brand of band-aid program.

We in this party have always held the view that at the beginning of Canada, transportation was used as a binder; it was used to bind this country together, bringing its peoples closer. The railway system was specifically built for that purpose. It was to repel what was feared to be an American invasion from the south, and really to connect the country from coast to coast. Of course, with the improvement in telecommunications, that original purpose has been lost. There is a new role we in this party have always felt, and still feel, that transportation ought to be

playing. We feel it ought to be used as a tool by the government to eliminate regional disparity. In other words, it ought not to be considered in terms of profit for the railway companies or in terms of the phrase "let the user pay" which the minister uses so often, but, rather, to eliminate regional disparity.

I congratulate the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) for having chosen this particular motion to put before the House, giving us an opportunity to debate it. A few years ago the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) who was minister of transport at the time, had some interesting ideas about transportation. We heard that transportation in this country should serve the country, and that our transportation policy should be used in conjunction with other policies to improve the lives of Canadians. Specifically, the minister said:

> What we are proposing states that the transportation system should be accessible, equitable and efficient, rather than economic, efficient and adequate. The notion of efficiency is not lost, but the emphasis is on service to Canadians.

That is a far cry from what we hear today. Today we hear the Minister of Transport trying to throw the country back 100 years with his concept of "let the user pay." Mind you, this "let the user pay" concept is pretty selective. It is pretty clear that some users will be paying a much higher percentage of the cost than others. It is also clear that some parts of this country are going to pay a lot more for transportation than others. I am not just talking about the dollar cost of taking a train, nor am I talking just about the dollar cost of shipping material from one place to another; I am talking about the cost of unemployment in parts of Canada, both in social and economic terms, and the destruction of the potential for job-producing secondary industry.

If this government was really concerned about these problems, it would present this House with a comprehensive transportation policy. The government would present us with a policy which we could debate, analyse and legislate on. It would show the people of Canada exactly how parliament intended to use transportation over the coming years and what could be expected across this country because of it. Instead, the government is surreptitiously making changes in a "half-fast" way which masquerades as a transportation policy.

For example, the government announces a cutback in transcontinental rail service by sending the matter to a committee of the Canadian Transport Commission, giving the committee instructions that can only result in the choice of alternative cutbacks. For example, this government chooses to change freight rate arrangements at a time when commissions are already studying the subject. While this goes on, low-income Canadians and the poor regions of Canada continue to suffer from policies aimed at keeping them in their place.

In northern Ontario particularly, where I come from, freight rates for years have played a major role in preventing the growth of secondary industry. Relative to Ontario as a whole, northern Ontario suffers from stagnant population growth, a lack of growth in employment, a high rate of emigration and low levels of per capita income. As a result of that emigration, northern Ontario will lose one federal seat in this House, dropping from 12 to 11.

The fact is that the economics of transportation are such that they tend to favour the transportation of materials in their unprocessed state to their final destination. This has pretty obvious implications for areas based on the production of prime products, such as northern Ontario. We do not have a great deal of information on this subject, for the very reason the minister gave in the House earlier today: he said the railway companies have never provided us with their freight rate structures and the costing of their rates.

Why can the government not act on behalf of Canadians and demand from the railway companies their freight rate structures? This is a veritable jungle, and if the government cannot get that information from the railway companies, how can it plan any kind of program? How can it put into place any kind of transportation policy, when it does not have the facts? It seems to me the government should obtain these facts before it takes all the little band-aids off all the little sores across the country.

Over the years we have gained some information. Here are some examples I was able to get my hands on in 1974. These examples amply illustrate the discriminatory manner in which present freight rate structures discriminate against northern Ontario and areas like ours. It costs about $9 to ship a ton of iron ore pellets from Copper Cliff, which is in my riding, to Pittsburgh, a distance of 800 miles. But it costs about $90 to ship a ton of fertilizer, a manufactured product, from Toronto to Sudbury, a distance of 242 miles. A 500-pound shipment from Kirkland Lake to Toronto costs $95.20 a ton for a distance of 398 miles. The same sized shipment from Winnipeg to Udora, Saskatchewan, a distance of 394 miles, would cost only $55.20 a ton. Using another example, shipments of plywood from Hearst, northern Ontario, to Eugene, Oregon, cost $74.80 a ton. But similar plywood can be shipped by rail from Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, to Eugene, Oregon, for only $60 a ton—despite the fact that Dartmouth is 1,000 miles farther from Eugene than Hearst is.

● (1410)

Here is another example. A shipment of forest products from Kapuskasing to Green Bay, Wisconsin, must travel a circuitous route via Detroit, travelling a total distance of 1,449 miles. A shorter route via Sault Ste. Marie to Michigan would mean a journey of only 625 miles, but the railways will not authorize this. It is pretty clear from information like this that those rates and routes unreasonably discourage the growth of primary and secondary industry in the north. This is discrimination which the present national transportation policy is supposed to eliminate. Yet the discrimination exists because this government will not institute a rational transportation policy for this country based on service to our citizens rather than based on corporate benefits.

If anyone doubts the effect this has on the north, all one has to do is to study the latest census data comparing northern Ontario with Ontario as a whole. In Ontario 22.3 per cent of the work force is involved in managerial, administrative and clerical work. In the north, the figure is 15.1 per cent. But a better example is in the area of machining, product fabricating, assembling and repairing: 12.1 per cent of the Ontario work force is involved in those jobs, but for northern Ontario the figure is only 8.3 per cent.

In Sudbury, for example, when the world price for nickel is buoyant and the two levels of governement, federal and provincial, are threatened into bribing INCO and Falconbridge to produce there rather than at their branch plants abroad, there is a boom in employment in the north. But in the bust, when the lay-offs come, my area faces severe unemployment. When this happens, the community begins to disintegrate as families drift away to other locations in search of work. The economic base of the community fails as taxes decline and the community as a whole suffers. And do not think the companies do not know the power they hold in that part of Ontario.

Secondary industry in the north would break the strangle-hold of those companies by providing alternative employment and by broadening the economic base of the community, thus minimizing adverse effects in any slowdown in the resource sector for whatever reason. But this situation is not peculiar to northern Ontario alone. The people of western Canada have for years experienced development problems directly related to the lack of any national and comprehensive transportation system. The people of western Canada have traditionally opposed the railway monopolies which sought to make enormous profits off their backs, and over the years they have won some fights. The result of one of these fights was the creation of the Crowsnest rate arrangement which guaranteed fair prices for the shipping of their products.

It was MP Reynold Rapp who in the early sixties introduced a bill in this House whereby rapeseed would be included under those rate arrangements. This allowed rapeseed to be delivered in the east or the west at the lowest possible rates. These rate arrangements meant that western farmers could move their grain to market at reasonable costs, and in return the railway companies got other considerations.

But now the minister wants to give the companies more than the healthy profits they already enjoy on freight. In fact, commissions have been set up to study this whole problem. But the transport ministry has prejudged the outcome of the Hall commission and the Snavely commission, presently examining this problem, by his recent actions on rapeseed products freight rates and his proposal for increased seaway tolls. The Minister of Transport talks about consultation, but it appears he has already made up his mind without consulting the provinces. The order in council of April 13 removing rapeseed oil and meal was made only five days after mailing the latest cost information to the provinces, which they view to be inadequate and inaccurate.

The federal government is reneging on its promise at the western economic opportunities conference in 1973 to support further processing of raw materials in the west. Compensatory rates for movement of rapeseed products places the total western rapeseed crushing and processing industry in jeopardy. It will increase the anomaly in favour of crushing rapeseed in eastern Canada over crushing it in western Canada.

The minister's "the user shall pay" policy will wipe out any hope of transportation being used to achieve broad national, social and economic goals. People will be discriminated against because of where they live. The freight rate structure which discourages processing in western Canada will only worsen regional disparities.

According to successive Liberal and Tory governments, westerners are not supposed to be able to process their own products in western Canada. They are supposed to grow the raw product and send it to central Canada for manufacturing, then buy it back. This latest freight rate controversy on rapeseed products has caused a great deal of disappointment among western Canadians. It is quite clear that the federal government has abandoned its promise to eliminate the freight rate discrimination on processed western products in favour of having the processing done in eastern Canada. The further suggestion to solve this problem by increasing the freight rate on unprocessed rapeseed is another attack on the Crowsnest rates before the results of the Hall and Snavely commissions are completed. The work of these commissions and of the people who appeared at formal hearings is being ignored by the minister who has already made up his mind.

The minister has been playing around for two years with feed grains on the open market. The producers have shown a distinct preference for dealing through the Canadian Wheat Board rather than the open market. Now the Wheat Board will be required to offer feed grains at prices competitive with those of U.S. corn. Reducing the feed freight assistance will mean lower feed grain prices to western producers. This feed grains policy will also put the western livestock producer at a disadvantage with respect to the eastern livestock producer. In western Canada, as in northern Ontario, Canadians are being treated as hewers of wood and drawers of water. The Minister of Transport is perpetuating and intensifying this problem through policies which discriminate against the establishment of secondary industry in the prairies and northern Ontario. Recent attempts to raise costs for the use of the St. Lawrence Seaway is another example of a change in our transportation policy that will cost our western farmers plenty, without any thought for the social and economic costs beyond the crass concept of "let the user pay".

Now let us turn to Atlantic Canada. The Atlantic provinces are in the same boat as the west and northern Ontario. The specific example I have chosen to exemplify the transportation mess in Atlantic Canada is Bill C-61. The theory behind Bill C-61 is that it will give Canadian shipping a boost, and to a lesser extent the Canadian shipbuilding industry. The bill makes it mandatory that ships sailing from one Canadian port to another Canadian port must be of Canadian registry.

● (1420)

Canadian shippers and the SIU strongly agree with this bill, for their own reasons. The SIU is hoping for expanded membership, and the Canadian shippers, a relative handful of companies, would have no foreign competitors. There is an exemption clause in Bill C-61 which is very germane to this particular transportation problem, and which will allow firms to ship with foreign flags if there are no Canadian vessels available. This clause is vague and subjective. The government could veto shipping contracts if a Canadian shipper offered a vessel, no matter what the cost difference. Companies are not going to expose themselves to such a hazardous proposition. Already one firm has claimed that it will not build in Cape Breton because of the

proposed changes. This was in regard to iron ore. It will be cheaper to send the iron ore to Rotterdam, in Europe, than from Ungava to Cape Breton for processing.

Canadian shippers, perhaps in anticipation of the bill, have drastically raised their fees, forcing marginally profitable firms like SYSCO to switch to commonwealth ships. If this measure passes, the maritimes will be at the mercy of these shippers. For this law to work, this government must build a Crown-owned merchant marine, but unfortunately the government makes no such guarantee. Hence, we may inherit the worst of both worlds.

Presently, shipping rates are having the effect of keeping down rail and trucking rates in coastal areas, because if there is a significant difference firms will shift business to the cheapest of the three means of transport. If this bill is passed it is sure to cause a rise in shipping costs. Transport minister Jack Davis of British Columbia, for example, estimates that this measure could mean increases of 30 per cent for rail and marine shipping. Salt from Nova Scotia mines will be put at a comparative disadvantage, for example, with Rumanian salt. Worst of all—and this could be disastrous for Cape Breton—it could mean a cancellation of the steel complex for Cape Breton because of increased shipping costs and the fact that it will be cheaper to process Canadian ore abroad rather than in the Atlantic area.

What about rail passenger transportation? If the government was really interested in presenting this country with a useful transportation policy, now is the time to call for hearings to find out what the people of Canada want and need. However, instead of having people involved in planning a new transportation strategy for Canada, we have them reacting to a three-page outline by the Canadian Transport Commission on alternative cutbacks in passenger service from Montreal to points west. We are offered no supporting papers which deal with the social or over-all economic costs of these measures. There is nothing at all. These are hearings held in a vacuum.

In the meantime, the railway companies are allowed to cut back services. The CNR is dropping one of its transcontinental trains this summer, when the Olympics will be on and when people will need to be moved across this country. While waiting for the government to develop a policy, the Minister of Transport has ordered the companies not to purchase any more rail passenger equipment. The CNR is retiring 50 passenger rail cars, which will amount to 15 per cent of its passenger capacity. When it comes to improving Canadian rail passenger service, all this seems to come under Professor Parkinson's third law which states that delay is the deadliest form of denial.

In my opinion, policy formation is the responsibility of the people's elected representatives, not the role of appointed individuals in the CTC, and even when the government does decide to improve rail service it does so in the most absurd way. For example, let us look at the recent government decision to give the CPR $30 million to upgrade its service between Montreal and Quebec City. Canadian Pacific has never indicated any interest in rail passenger service in the corridor between Quebec City and Montreal. It is the CNR which has shown the people of Canada that it is interested in passenger service. The CNR has shown an interest in improving rail passenger service, but the CNR did not get the $30 million.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), but his 20-minute time allotment has expired. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I just say that you adorn the chair very well, and you appear to be a person with the impartiality we in this House would like. Of course, we have received that from Mr. Speaker, but you seem to fit into that chair very well and I am glad to see you sitting in that place.

In view of the fact that our time is limited, I would like to start off my remarks by complimenting the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) on the very important motion he has brought to the attention of the House. This motion is of great concern to a good number of people in our country, dealing as it does with matters relating to transportation, a most important topic in a country the size of Canada.

I am sorry that the minister is not able to be here this afternoon for this very important debate, but I see that his parliamentary secretary is here. I am sure that in his usual way he will take notes and relate all the information which comes from this side of the House to the minister in the hope that it will have some effect upon him. I am sorry to say that during the time the minister has been in his portfolio he has not taken advice or had the consultation which I think is expected of a minister of transport in an area which has been referred to—and was referred to again today—by the minister's predecessor, as being a mess.

I listened with great interest to the minister's comments today relating to his theory and his concept of transportation in Canada. Much of what he said is quite true. I say that in the spirit of attempting to have a dialogue with the minister relating to transportation matters in Canada. I think it is most important that this matter be dealt within a non-partisan debate. It should be dealt with in a debate without partisan consideration, in which there could be consensus throughout the land. I commend that attitude to the minister.

I hope the minister will change his present attitude with respect to developing transportation policies in Canada, because the evidence we have before us is that he is making, not only piecemeal decisions before coming to any firm conclusion with respect to transportation policy for Canada, but he is doing so without the benefit of full consultation with those involved in transportation. I think the example of transcontinental rail passenger service, mentioned by the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), is a good one. That is an area in which the minister has not carried out discussions across Canada. Rather, he has given a directive to the CTC with respect to a policy to be implemented, an irreversible policy, and he has sent the CTC out under the guise of consultation when everyone knows that the die is cast in that regard.

I am not alone in suggesting that the minister is instituting a transportation policy of his own which is on a piecemeal basis. A very respected spokesman for western agriculture, in the person of E. K. Turner, president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, saw fit to put out a press

release recently in which he pointed out that the minister has in fact been instituting his own transportation policy. He has not done so in any co-ordinated way but, rather, on a piecemeal basis and no one knows for sure whether one part will fit with the others. Mr. Turner condemns the government for operating in that fashion. Therefore, I hope the minister will heed some of the criticism from very responsible people across Canada and give a little more thought to getting some advice from people who have knowledge and expertise in the area of transportation, as well as from people who are affected by changes in transportation policy.

In concluding this part of my remarks, I want also to remind the minister that, as I understand it, he made a commitment to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications that the committee would have the full responsibility of investigating national transportation policy. As I understood the minister, he would not be introducing any policies with respect to transportation until the committee had had a full opportunity to investigate the subject. I am sorry to say that what we have had in committee has been, almost exclusively, representations and submissions by officials of the department. On a limited basis we had a number of opportunities to deal with certain aspects of transportation, notably through a trip to the west coast recently.

● (1430)

Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary seems to indicate another position, but I am sure he will have an opportunity to make a speech this afternoon. I have to make a confession, Mr. Speaker. It is an awful thing to have to say, but I must bare my soul. The parliamentary secretary is a former student of mine. To paraphrase the Prime Minister's remark: Where have I gone wrong?

I want to address my remarks primarily to the area of rail passenger service. Here is an example of the kind of ill-considered policy that has been rammed down our throats without full consultation and an opportunity to consider its implications for the people of Canada. I find that policy incredible for any minister of transport, but particularly incredible for a minister from western Canada. I have referred to the fact that the former minister of transport, now the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), referred to transportation in Canada as being in a mess. He was not kidding, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the extent of this mess was revealed to us in the statement made by the present minister about the federal government's new rail passenger policy at the end of last January.

In introducing the policy, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) said that although Canada has extensive rail passenger services, they have been allowed to deteriorate so that Canadians no longer have a fair incentive to use them. He added that this was in no way due to any fault on the part of those who operate the trains, but to a combination of management and government policies which could only produce losses and worsening service. Losses, according to the minister, amounted to $167 million in 1974 and are increasing. He went on to say that losses may amount to $400 million by 1980 if changes are not made.

This sounds like a very ominous forecast. But what are the facts? The Department of Transport, in my estimation,

seems to have a bias against passenger rail. Like bees to honey, they swarm around glamour projects such as STOL, the short take-off and landing aircraft. The government has spent over $150 million on STOL, the heavily subsidized "new baby", only to have Mr. Kirkwood, the senior assistant deputy minister, inform me and my colleagues on the transport committee in February that they have no idea what to do about STOL now that the demonstration project is over. What we are witnessing is another hydrofoil case which involved a loss to our taxpayers of $52 million spent on a vessel designed to carry passengers over water at fast speeds, the Bras d'Or which now sits propped up and dejected on the shore at Halifax as a very expensive wallflower.

The Minister of Transport states that rail passenger service does not pay its way, therefore rationalization is needed. In the department's terms, "rationalization" is defined as "reductions". Why is it that a government which sinks $400 million into the Pickering airport and then suspends its construction, gags over a $160 million loss on rail passenger services? There are many examples of areas where the federal government picks up losses and deficits with respect to essential services. For example, the government picks up the $26 million annual deficit incurred by the Canadian National cargo and ferry service on the coast of Newfoundland.

A research study shows that Canada lags five years behind the United States, ten years behind the United Kingdom, and 20 years behind France in new rail passenger service concepts. The same study shows that passenger trains in Canada are "almost always late" and that rail operations in Canada are "more dangerous than other systems", recording, in 1972, 12 times more derailments and three times more collisions per train mile, twice as many passenger deaths and 17 times the number of rail employee deaths and injuries than France, for example.

Although the federal government is just beginning to admit it, the Canadian public has been aware for years that our railway passenger transportation system is in a state of deterioration. Certainly, during my time in parliament we in the opposition have been pressing the government to develop a national transportation policy, including rail passenger service—a policy that would be integrated, less costly, workable and fair to all parts of the country. In June, 1975, the former minister of transport stated in his overview of policy proposals that transportation should be an instrument of economic and social development.

With special reference to rail transportation, section 18(1) of the Canadian National Railways Act states that the railways of the Canadian National Railways "are hereby declared to do works for the general advantage of Canada". The Minister of Transport, in a letter dated April 5, 1976, to His Worship Mayor T. J. Cavanagh of Edmonton, Alberta, stated that the rail passenger policy was put forward in explicit recognition of the key role that railway passenger services play, not only in the direct provision of transportation services but also in terms of employment, tourism and many other facets of the economies of all regions of Canada.

But the government's response to this date has been to submit the country to policy reversals dazzling in their frequency and continued ineptitude. Premier Alex Camp-

bell of Prince Edward Island has stated that the new policy statement on rail passenger service left him cold and confused. He found that the notion that the transportation system can serve as a development tool contradicted the idea that it could also be self-sufficient.

The government's entire transportation policy seems to be devoted to, and the Minister of Transport seems obsessed with, the "user pay" concept. This, I suggest, is one of the problems we face with this government: they only see things in black and white and have no flexibility in their approach to a transportation policy. There is absolutely no room for any deviation. Once the minister has in his mind that it is going to be a "user pay" concept, that means it will be a "user pay" concept whether it hurts or not.

The minister has referred to band-aid measures. He was trying to make us believe that the government is a brand new one and is going to cure all the woes of past years which got us into this mess by applying band-aids. Once you take them off, of course, it causes pain and suffering. Once the sores are exposed, they are susceptible to a kind of gangrene. That is what could happen to the transportation policy. It is the government's responsibility to act in a responsible manner, and not impose black and white concepts on us as these will have serious economic consequences.

I do not disagree with the "user pay" concept in the right circumstances, but what bothers me about the minister's approach is its inflexibility. The principle of "user pay" must be weighed against what I consider the more important policy principle—the principle that transportation is an instrument of national policy and a tool of regional development. In my view, the geographical distance of Canada makes residents of the different parts of this country remote from each other and an exception to the objective of commercial viability is necessary to allow rail passenger services to fulfil the role of linking this country. The previous minister of transport agreed to let the standing Committee on Transport and Communications review recent government studies.

I hear thunder outside, Mr. Speaker, and I know He is with us as well, bringing lightning down on the heads of the government.

An hon. Member: You mean "she".

● (1440)

An hon. Member: Hitler said the same, with a thick German accent.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I know some hon. members opposite are more expert than I am about what happened in other countries. I am merely pointing out the inadequate policies introduced by the government. The promise of the previous minister has not materialized. There has not been a full review on the part of the committee. It was my impression that the new policy was to be instituted only after the committee had been given the opportunity to conduct a full investigation. Then, before the committee was able to complete its consideration of a national transport policy, the present minister, on January 29, made a statement about passenger rail service. The minister's statement was a dramatic reversal of the government's rail passenger policy as enunciated by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on June 18, 1974, at Cornwall. I see the hon. member from Cornwall present in the House. He may remember the Prime Minister's glowing remarks which were instrumental, no doubt, in the hon. member's being elected to sit on the government side.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Now the Prime Minister's words are a millstone around his neck.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: On that occasion the Prime Minister did not mention any form of physical removal of passenger rail service: he promised, instead, as the hon. member no doubt remembers, additional services. A Canadian passenger corporation would be established by the government to operate all intercity passenger train services and to set up transcontinental excursion trains to supplement the existing cross-country services. That was quite a speech. I see the hon. member smiling, no doubt as he fondly remembers the Prime Minister's promises. The Prime Minister said that there would be increased provision on the transcontinental services of piggyback carriage of private automobiles so that persons taking the excursion runs could use their own cars at their destination.

The backtracking came quickly. To the Speech from the Throne of 1974, and the tabled statements on rail passenger policy, was added the sneaky proviso that transportation policy would be implemented within the means of the financial resources of the federal government. During the last federal election campaign the Liberal party did not mention in any way that transportation policies would be subject to financial restrictions.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that transportation is a top priority which should not be hindered by financial restraints or rationalization. I will not dwell on the discrepancy between government promises in the last election campaign and the reality of government transportation policy, but will add that the Prime Minister himself said during the last election campaign that Liberal promises would not be "pie in the sky." Now, on the minister's instructions, the Canadian Transport Commission is holding public hearings with a view to reorganizing the rail passenger system by 1980, dropping some duplicate services and improving operation in the heavily populated Quebec City-Windsor corridor. I contend that the government's true intention is not so much to reorganize our rail passenger service as to reduce substantially the service in some parts of the country or wipe it out completely.

The Minister of Transport's new rail passenger policy has created great apprehension throughout the land. To cite just one example, in his own city, Saskatoon, the city council passed an emergency resolution expressing disapproval of any proposal to reduce transcontinental rail passenger service. It expressed particular opposition to the reduction or discontinuance of any such service passing through Saskatoon.

The new, so-called self-sufficent policy announced by the Minister of Transport has run into considerable opposition, particularly in the maritimes and the west which will apparently feel the brunt of the new policy. I hope it is only a coincidence that the only area of Canada promised new initiatives and expenditures in rail passenger travel, the area between Quebec City and Windsor, is an area

largely represented by members of parliament supporting the government.

The minister says he must phase out non-profitable rail passenger service because too few people use trains and they are not paying their way. I disagree with the statement presented to the Canadian Transport Commission earlier this year that passengers have deserted the railways. I believe passengers were driven away by government policies.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. Unfortunately, the time allotted to him under the Standing Order has expired.

Mr. A. C. Abbott (Mississauga): Mr. Speaker, I join other hon. members in appreciating your presence in the chair this afternoon. This day's debate is particularly interesting as it deals with the difficulties parliament and the government can encounter in bringing about needed changes and in changing old ideas. Of course, change runs counter to Tory philosophy, perhaps best expressed by a Tory in Great Britain, whose name escapes me, who said, "Any change at any time, for any reason, is to be deprecated."

The minister has taken on a massive job in looking into the history of his department. He is examining a mass of regulatory sacred cows and is determined to change at least basic principles, even if some things are not to be changed overnight. He has suggested that the cost of this enormous transportation apparatus should be borne fundamentally by users unless a good case can be made to the contrary. This does not mean that there are not instances throughout the country, possibly in every constituency, calling for subsidy and assistance. But the basic argument proposed by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) is unassailable, I suggest.

The minister asks, "Why should someone be given a free or a subsidized rate, at the expense of someone else, if that situation can be corrected without endangering the fundamental economic viability of the area in question? He suggests, also, that it is more sensible to subsidize directly an area in which the assistance will do the most good. These policies show the minister to be tough but farsighted. If Canadian transport policy is in a mess, as has been alleged, or in difficulty, the surest way to create order is by applying the kinds of solutions he has recommended.

Numerous examples respecting the transportation question have been cited. I think the most graphic one drawn by the minister showed that bus travellers pay for their service entirely; automobile passengers are subsidized at the rate of .5 cent per mile; air travellers at 2 cents per mile, and rail travellers at 6 cents per mile. The minister asks, "Is it fair to ask the bus traveller to pay his fare and a portion of the train traveller's fare as well?"

Let me say a word about airports. There is a major airport in my constituency. Airports are extremely costly facilities. The government has been criticized for allowing airports in the past to be built without considering, first, efficient use and convenience of passengers who must use them. Too often, airports have been built as large entertainment centres, where people see travellers off or greet them. This has created enormous parking problems.

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

The "user pay" principle, as far as it relates to federal government airports and related aviation facilities, is aimed at placing a fairer share of the cost of the burden on the shoulders of that section of the Canadian public which benefits most from the use of any particular transport facility. For instance, it is well known that only between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of our population actually use our aviation facilities. The cost of building and maintaining these facilities has increased at an incredible steadily growing rate in recent years. At the same time, the government is keeping well in mind that the cost of certain aviation facilities, such as those in the Arctic, should continue to be borne by the public, or the taxpayer. In that category also come such things as government support for airport development and improvements which may be part of a regional economic development program, the provision of airport facilities and services for remote regions and other, similar regional and national undertakings.

The framework for user charges was provided for in the National Transportation Act of 1967 in which it was stipulated that each mode of transport in Canada, as far as was practicable, should bear a fair proportion of the real costs involved in providing that mode of transport. It can be shown that in 1976 or 1977 the Department of Transport's air transportation administration will be seeking parliamentary approval of a non-budgetary appropriation totalling some $385 million, as well as approximately $75 million in increased loan authority to support the international airports at Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. Therefore, the total air program will be around $460.7 million.

● (1450)

The deficit in the next fiscal year has been estimated at $225.3 million. Because of the burgeoning costs of operating our aviation facilities, a number of user fee charges have been introduced this year. These include a 30 per cent increase in national fees and an increase from $33 to $50 per flight in respect of using North Atlantic facilities. I will not go into further detail. I do not think this is of particular interest beyond stating that it is a specific major example where, notwithstanding an increase in user fees, the Canadian taxpayers, 85 per cent of whom do not have anything to do with flying, are paying a very large proportion of this cost. Those of us who travel regularly by air are the beneficiaries. What the Minister of Transport is saying is that as a basic, underlying principle of policy, the user should pay in full for the product he is using unless it can be demonstrated that a wider public interest dictates otherwise.

In the United States, many major airports have been built, with the airlines being obliged to subscribe to the bond issues that finance the construction. The price that they pay is high, but this is compensated by the fact that they can dictate to a large extent how the airports will be laid out and how they will be most efficiently utilized. In this country we have a different procedure. I am gratified to find that in this area and in others citizens who use the facilities, or those companies who ship the products, must be prepared to pay.

We see throughout government that one of the problems is that history may have baked our cake, as someone once said. We in this parliament must be prepared, not in this area of government alone but in many others, to consider

that while the programs as formulated were adequate and proper at the time, they may require change. We should not build up sacred cows, unchangeable objectives, and rebel when positive reform is offered. If we run up large annual deficits in this country, a good proportion of them are borne by projects which have served their purpose and are now in need of reform and scaling down. This is true right across the board, whether it be unemployment insurance, health costs or transportation. If we are wedded to programs, we will not make the reforms or changes which would deprive the people for whom they were designed, but will make them more efficient and reduce the cost to the taxpayers.

I fail to see why every time a policy is proposed to parliament which has as its objective saving the taxpayers money without impairing the program, the Tories in particular turn on the minister who brings them forward, even though they would reduce the impact and burden of government financing, freeing moneys for other purposes.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Wrong.

Mr. Abbott: It is true, and it is not true on only one side of the House. I think all of us resist change. We are all tempted to say that if it was good enough for grandfather, it is good enough for me. I do not think it brands one, despite the comment of one of my colleagues, that as a Conservative there is a need to change something. There are many programs which have been designed, all of them by Liberal governments which this country—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Your modesty is overwhelming.

Mr. Abbott: It is the truth. There has not been a social program provided in this country, on a national basis, that has not been provided by Liberals, over the opposition of Conservatives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Abbott: Liberals are equal to the challenge of saying that we do not regard these programs as written in stone. We are prepared to make changes because we want to allocate the resources of this country in the best possible manner. In transportation, as in many other areas, there are only so many dollars to spend. Now that we have tough, capable ministers who are ready to face the music and reform the programs under their administration, all of us can have confidence in the future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) reminds me of a secretary who once wrote speeches for a politician.

Mr. Goodale: Now he is Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark).

Mr. McCain: He took quite a promotion. Wait until the next election. That is the one we are waiting for.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: When that politician was stuck for a source of fact, he always had a phrase in his speech which was, "Grisdale says". That was his source of reference. Grisdale was a man who had a great capacity for knowledge and was famous for many sayings. The hon. member for Mississauga, in his reference to the Tories, was using a "Grisdale". He was not using a Tory, nor was he quoting directly from anybody; he was merely attacking—and that is his prerogative.

Every member of this House recognizes that there must be change. It is not simply the characteristic of the government, the Conservatives or the NDP. Every person, regardless of his political philosophy, recognizes that our transportation system, which literally built this country, must now be adapted to fit what it built. Change we must support, but change must make for the better. It must not add to the confusion. This is what a multitude of Canadians fear as change is proposed at this moment in time in the transportation structure.

The policy as outlined this morning by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) is purely theoretical. Scientists may sit down and rely on the law of gravity. They may rely on the laws of mathematics and may be accurate in the conclusions as they calculate solutions to the problems that face them, because those laws are inflexible and continuous; they are dependable. However, when one starts to deal with something such as the laws of economics and modes of transportation, one finds oneself in an entirely different situation where a single, simple formula does not fit the needs of the people to be served. Such in the case in the field of transportation: it is theoretical; it is not realistic.

Let me cite an example. The minister stated this morning that we should not be moving grain by rail in Canada; we should, instead, be exporting beef. Theoretically, this is a perfectly good statement; but in fact we are not competitive, in world markets, in beef. Most of the time we are not quite self-sufficient in beef products. It is therefore ridiculous to discuss the idea of turning corn into beef to sell, for example, to Italy, a country which could not afford to pay for it anyway.

● (1500)

Our farmers could not possibly live on the return for beef which the world market would bring us. I can envisage, too, that if we entered this trade our competitors would cut the price under us. On the markets of this continent, yes, our producers could survive although they have gone through hard times, but on the markets of the world we are really not competitive.

If we were to follow the pattern the minister suggests we would certainly dislocate a number of the economic structures which exist in this country, not only in the West and in the Atlantic area. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), the economy of certain areas depends to a very large extent on the system of railway rates presently in existence. The existence of these arrangements allows those sectors of the economy to remain in business, whether it be the apple growers of Nova Scotia, the wheat farmers of the prairies, or those who grow vegetables in central Canada; they depend upon their ability to get their goods to market at reasonable cost of transportation related to the weight and value of the produce.

The minister's theory breaks down because he fails to take into account the aspect of competition and the abnormalities which exist in the rate structure. I could give a number of examples, but again I will refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Nickel Belt. He pointed out that far too many rates are now based on what the traffic will bear; they are in no way related to compensation for the service rendered.

The mess which was described by a former minister of transport is one which was created by the party which has been in power in Canada virtually uninterrupted for 50 years, so when the present minister referred to band-aid solutions he was referring to the band-aid solutions applied by his predecessors. When he referred to decisions taken for political reasons he was referring to decisions taken by his predecessors—and in somewhat uncomplimentary terms. The policy which is in operation today is not a Conservative policy nor is it an NDP policy. It is a Liberal policy, and it has been for 50 years.

There is a fourth reason why the minister's suggestion that transport be placed on a user pay basis will not work out. I defy him to say to the urbanites of Montreal, Ottawa or Winnipeg, "You will pay the full cost of transportation in your city." It simply would not work. And just as it would not work in the urban areas, it would not work in the rural areas and all points between. No government anywhere has been able to make an airport pay for itself. There will be subsidies.

Let me turn to the Seaway. The minister spoke in deprecatory terms with respect to subsidies and those who rely upon them—it was the phrase "those who rely upon them" which some of us found offensive, and I might add that the objections did not all come from the Atlantic area. There is, by legislation, a subsidy paid to the maritime region under a measure known as the Maritime Freight Rates Act. Relate this to the Seaway.

The Seaway was opened in 1959. The fee structure was established in such a way, we were told, that not only would it pay for maintenance costs but it would amortize the cost of construction and, in the end, not cost Canadian taxpayers a nickel. Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the total investment in the Seaway were added up today one would find that this undertaking owes the Canadian people a billion dollars, and if this were to be financed in today's terms the amount of money paid to the Atlantic area would be less than 25 per cent of the interest charges alone on the amount of money the Seaway owes Canadians. Is the minister prepared to say to the City of Montreal, for example, "You will pay the actual cost of operations on the Seaway?" Try that one on for political size.

An hon. Member: What about Saint John?

Mr. McCain: We will come to that, all in good time. Here are at least three instances in which the user pay concept could not possibly be applied to the nth degree, even politically.

There are other instances which might be mentioned. Sacred cows? Political realities? They may be more than that. There may be economic realities, and they may in the end be in the interest of the nation. I do not really agree with the idea that the federal government should be paying subsidies to any part of Canada. But if there are not to be subsidies, let me point out right away that the anomalies in freight rates which we were supposed to get rid of long ago, according to the former minister of transport, still exist. For instance, there is the $90 rate to Nickel Belt referred to a little while ago, as compared with the $45 rate for iron pellets to Pittsburgh. These are anomalies we cannot afford. Cannot we obtain rational rates which relate to the ton-mile cost, or the cost the shipper or the consumer can bear? Let us change the system by all means, but change it in a way which will bring about a better transportation structure, one which will be of benefit to the total economy.

Criticism has frequently been expressed about what is happening to passenger service. In the past 50 years or so the government never paid serious attention to the service which was being rendered by the railroads as passenger service was being phased out. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, have had the same experience as I had when I waited three hours in the bowels of the station in Windsor in trying to get a connection between the passenger service of the CPR and the CNR in Nova Scotia. I have waited overnight in the City of Saint John to get from train to boat although both are operated by the same company. I have driven my car—something the minister deplores—because I knew I would not be able to get to Saint John by the passenger service provided and complete my business without having to stay in that city overnight. With that timetable, Mr. Speaker, the operation had to fail.

One of the factors which contributed to the disappearance of express and passenger service was the removal of mail contracts. This has proven to be a sorry decision as far as the effect upon mail delivery is concerned. In former times mail to the east was often delivered over night. It is a rare occasion now, under the present airmail system, for a piece of mail to be delivered over night to my constituency. And so it has been during that period of 50 years under the Liberal administration that this system has gone downhill in every aspect, whether it be freight, passenger or express. It is the only system, Mr. Speaker, in which government has permitted excessive charges for deteriorating services. And the government opposite sat back and watched it happen.

Not too long ago the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) moved a motion in the House with respect to the conditions of the railways in Prince Edward Island. There are no other means of transportation services leaving that island other than rail services. Yet the railroad is in a condition which is unacceptable, deplorable, and incapable of giving proper service to the area. That has happened under 50 years of Liberalism, with a little interruption under the guidance of a Crown corporation. It is no use government trying to avoid the responsibility.

● (1510)

Let me come back to another user pay concept. Bill C-61 has been proposed by the Government of Canada. It is a notable bill and I for one support the principle that Canada should have a merchant marine. No matter what I may say in criticism of that bill, Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that this is my principle and my objective just as much as that of any person inside or outside the House. However, we come back to a theoretical position on the bill presented to the

House; we have ignored the practical situation that exists in the economic world in which the act would take effect.

Let me remind the House of some of the comments that have been made but whose authors have not been given the opportunity of presenting their case before the committee or the House. I have before me a telegram from the Atlantic premiers conference, signed by Mr. A. B. Campbell. I wonder who he could be? I think he is the Liberal premier of the province of Prince Edward Island. I will not quote this telegram in full because I do not have time, but it says this in part:

> Existing industry and future industrial development in the Atlantic provinces will be seriously affected if this bill, and those regulations of which we have been made aware to date, come into effect.

That telex was dated May 26 last and was directed to the Minister of Transport. Has the telegram been acknowledged, Mr. Speaker? There are those who do not know whether it has. In any event that is the position of the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. MacFarlane: How do you know this telegram was received?

Mr. McCain: There are none so blind as those who will not see. Let us just see, Mr. Speaker, how all this began. We are all fully aware of the Darling report. A multitude of people in the Atlantic area made representations to the group that made the report. Their objections did not appear in the report, nor were they given consideration in the economic conclusions that the report reached.

A meeting was held in camera in Halifax between federal and provincial officials and industry and labour representatives in regard to the Darling report on July 18, 1973. Here is a list of the people who appeared. First of all the provinces made an appearance and their representative said it had been agreed with the then minister, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), that no action would be taken until the regulations were approved by the provinces.

The Sydney Steel Corporation said the Darling report would hurt them. The Canadian Salt Co. did not favour it because it would hurt them. Dover Flour Mills suggested that they might have to close. Gulf Oil Company were going to have problems. Labrador Linerboard said they were threatened with loss of business. The Maritime Co-operative Services spoke on behalf of the farmers and said that the increased cost of farm requirements would be severe, and they objected. The Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission presented a brief rejecting the principles as outlined. Smith Brokerage, which deals in grain, said the cost of the proposals would affect the Atlantic area, and they objected.

The pertinent part of the minutes of this meeting is as follows. Labour union opinion—I understand this came from the SIU—was this:

> The two representatives expressed their agreement with the recommendations of the Darling report. Noting: the lack of a real national transportation policy; that the government should provide the vessels that are required to move the cargoes—

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when the corporations complained about the costs that they feared and anticipated, the union recognized, as well as the corporations, that such an act without subsidy would be nothing but detrimental to the manufacturing and shipping industries of the Atlantic area. I repeat that I favour the formation of a Canadian merchant marine, but it must not be a theoretical thing of the sort the minister talked of this morning; it must be practical in every sense of our economic world. One shipper suggested to the transportation committee in Vancouver that if the government would offer tax incentives or other incentives comparable with those given to ships of foreign registry, it might be possible to have in Canada a merchant marine that could operate and have a chance to profit; but the government has said it would not care to do this. I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the union representatives recognized fully that this could only happen with government assistance or through incentive of one form or another, even if it supplied the ships to the shippers.

The Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* for May 19 said that financial incentives are required to encourage a Canadian flag fleet. The *Gazette* for Tuesday, May 25, carried the headline, "Atlantic Provinces Concerned Over New shipping Act Changes". I could go on to read these editorials, Mr. Speaker, but there just is not time.

Let me come back to the user pay concept. Again the *Chronicle-Herald* has an editorial from which I wish to quote briefly:

> With major markets in the centre of the country, producers in the east and west are placed at a competitive disadvantage . . .
>
> Government simply is determined that there are two classes of users and that one class is to have preferential treatment.
>
> The currently popular policy favours the heart of the country and greatly strengthens the Ontario economy. The price is paid by the west and the east.

That is where the political clout is which the minister was talking about this morning. I should also like to refer to the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* for Monday, May 3, 1976. I want to quote a name familiar to the government of the day, Premier Regan, who in this article criticized the program. Then I want to refer to another chap who is familiar to the government of the day, Mr. Jack Davis from B.C. According to the article:

> Mr. Davis said last week that the amendments would force shippers to wait for a Canadian flagship to carry his goods if one were available immediately. Premier Regan said if Mr. Davis ran the B.C. transport department the way he ran the federal fisheries department "it's quite possible he could be mistaken."

I like that little comment.

The *Gazette* for Tuesday, May 25, carried this headline: "Merchant Marine Policy—Cost-Benefit Focus of Study". I want to refer to an article dealing with what members of the committee and those opposed to the act asked for consistently, and to which no one would respond until after the committee had risen and this little snippet appeared in the *Gazette*:

> A key element in forming the recommendations will be a series of cost-benefit studies now under way—

This has neither been acknowledged nor denied by the government in regard to Bill C-61.

> —Roland Murray, a senior adviser to the federal transport ministry, told a meeting of the Naval Officers' Association of Canada Montreal branch.
>
> . . . Murray, who heads the board's working committee, said there can be no policy recommendations to the transport minister until the board sees the conclusions of 20 studies it has commissioned covering such

areas as international agreements, labour, shipping rates, and shipping in the Arctic.

Despite this statement by a high ranking official in the government, only as recently as last Wednesday the government was trying to rush this bill through by June 30. I suggest that we need the kind of change called for by the hon. member for Mississauga. Above all, one of the things we need is a change in the way policy decisions are reached, as well as a change in the way legislation is framed so that people may be guided in what they do. This Marine Code Act, including its most recently suggested amendment, is enabling legislation. It has "mays" and "mights" and permissions throughout both the act and the regulation. For this reason it leaves the people at the mercy of government policy at the moment in time at which a decision affecting industry is to be made. If that policy at that moment is unfavourable then industry will suffer the consequences.

● (1520)

I want to give one assurance to the minister while I am in the process of these remarks.

An hon. Member: Where is the minister?

Mr. McCain: I do not know, but he is not in Halifax. They had a transportation week down in the Halifax area and the minister was to be the guest speaker. He advised certain people in the Atlantic area that he was sorry he could not be there because there was an important vote in the House of Commons. I want to assure the minister that anytime he has an important transportation meeting anywhere in the Atlantic area which is to the benefit of that area, he can count on me or any other maritime member on this side of the House to be his pair. He will not be hurt as long as it is beneficial to the Atlantic area.

An hon. Member: You better talk with your party whip.

Mr. McCain: I do not have to talk to my whip. I do not worry about getting his permission in circumstances like that because he, Sir, is a generous and trustworthy individual. I just want the minister to know that when he wants to make an announcement we will protect his vote, even though I do not believe in pairing.

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have some rather specific points to make with regard to the subject of this opposition day.

One of the major transportation problems of our country is the establishment of a rational, efficient, and flexible system for the shipment of grain from the prairie provinces to Canada's ports and then overseas to our export markets. While this is an issue of interest to all Canadians, it is of particular concern to those of us in the western part of this country, whether in the prairie provinces where the grain is produced, or in British Columbia where we have had, at the same time, the most attractive and effective delivery system, and the greatest problems in making that particular system work.

Over the past eight years the volume of overseas grain exports shipped through west coast ports has fluctuated between 37 per cent and 57 per cent of total Canadian grain exports. On the average the three western grain ports, Vancouver, Victoria, and Prince Rupert, have handled 45 per cent of overseas grain exports, yet these three ports have a total storage capacity of under 27 million bushels while the 30 terminals in eastern Canada have a capacity of over 141 million bushels, that is, five times as great.

I point this out to hon. members not only as a tribute to our current system of western grain exports and to the men and women who make it work, but also as an indication of what can be done if this western system is properly rationalized and suitably upgraded. Two steps in this direction, which I am pleased to note have recently been taken, are the Canadian Wheat Board's program to expand significantly west coast grain storage capacity, and the visit last month by the Transport and Communications Committee to western Canadian communities to study at first hand problems such as those being outlined here today.

One of the visits by the transport committee was to the port of Prince Rupert where members met with a number of local representatives, including Mr. Joe Scott, chairman of the Prince Rupert Port Authority, and the city of Prince Rupert grain co-ordination committee represented by Mayor Lester and Dr. William Hick. I am confident that the members of this committee have returned from their western trip convinced, as I am, that the key to the rationalization and expansion of the western grain exporting system is the port of Prince Rupert.

The problems of shipping grain through Vancouver are numerous and have been discussed in this House on more than one occasion. The advantages of Prince Rupert, however, are just now beginning to be realized. The current single grain elevator in Prince Rupert is owned by the Canadian Grain Commission of the Department of Agriculture, and is currently undergoing a three-year renovation and structural upgrading program. In addition, a facility study is currently being conducted to determine the possibility of increasing the storage capacity of this particular elevator. This study, I am certain, will bring back a positive report.

What is needed to rationalize western grain shipments is a greater utilization of lower volume rail lines; better usage of existing port facilities; an increase in storage capacity in areas where rail congestion and land prices do not make such a step impossible; a more wisely regulated pattern of ship movements; a full recognition of the strategic location of B.C. ports and their relative closeness to Pacific markets; and full co-ordination of the plans and activities of the several federal government departments and agencies involved in the western export of grain.

The first five points can all be facilitated by an increased use of the grain exporting facilities of the port of Prince Rupert. The sixth is already becoming a reality under the more than capable stewardship of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan).

As the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) has indicated by his motion today, it is after all not really a grain problem that we are discussing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to the hon. gentleman for raising this exceptionally relevant topic of interest to every Canadian, and I think particularly relevant to those who are regionally

disadvantaged. As a representative of such an area I feel it is important that this sense of regionality be communicated in this House.

In utilization of the ports in my area and, ports not being the only subject, also the utilization of present rail and other transportational infrastructures, we are an adolescent part of the world. Although we are mature in years, utilization has been, to use the minister's word, immature. Ever since the original building of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad, which was finally joined in 1912 with the "last spike" at Fort Fraser, in the centre of the constituency of Skeena, our northern half of British Columbia has been overwhelmingly concerned with transportation, and we have been eternally cognizant of the unequal battle that must be waged not only west to east but, similarly, north to south, as we have seen a giant concentration of traffic funnel first to the east, and then an even greater volume south through Vancouver and its environs.

Our CN northline—Edmonton to Red Pass, Red Pass to Prince George, and Prince George to Prince Rupert—seemed to languish, only partially utilized, although it has been acknowledged over and over again as economic and even superior in assessment of coal shipping potential—in fact just the other day I observed an article by an expert on unit trains who said it was possible to deliver grain at $10 a ton to only two ports in Canada, and I am sure the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) will be as happy as I am to know that one of those ports is Halifax and the other is the port of Prince Rupert.

In the transportation of minerals, for instance, the capacity of a rail route from mine to port is gauged by the "ruling grade"; that is, the most severe grade a train must pass on a given line. In the case of all southline traffic from Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia to southern ports, severe grades in the mountains require up to ten 3,000 horsepower locomotives to do what four can do on the CN northline. In addition transport over these reduced grades permits a significant increase in the tonnage that is carried.

In 1976, the CN has scheduled a $100 million capital budget for the mountain region alone. This represents 25 per cent of all capital outlays planned, including equipment, in the whole country. Part of this is for expanded terminal facilities in Vancouver and Edmonton, including two 12-mile sections of double track on the southline. CN anticipates an 80 per cent increase in tonnage in Canada over the next five years. Where will that put us? Double tracking becomes necessary above 35 trains per day. We are certainly a long way from that at the current rate of five trains a day. Estimates are that by 1990 Prince Rupert to Prince George traffic will be up to between eight and ten trains per day, and Prince George to Red Pass will be somewhere between 15 and 19. Now let us take a look at what those trains are or may be carrying in the future.

● (1530)

In the two years between 1972 and 1974 Canada's exports to Japan rose from $957 million to a record $2,220 billion. In imports, Canadians purchased $1,427 billion in producer goods, consumer durables, and non-durables including trucks, motorcycles, and the ever present Japanese cars. As well, a surprising new non-commodity trade is showing strongly as a projected 85,000 Japanese tourists visited Canada in 1975. Eighty per cent of these visitors spent more than 24 hours in this country—and spent money! And they used transportation—air, train and cruiseship, as well as highway travel.

Development between us and our pacific neighbour is the most dynamic element among Canada's trading patterns. British Columbia, the Yukon and Northwest Territories have combined to lead exports with an amount of $1.18 billion in 1974, of which $462 million was copper and $309 million was forest products; these two commodities alone accounted for more than one third of all Canadian export earnings in Japan. A further 53 per cent of Canada's total exports to Japan in 1974 was from the two territories and B. C. You will note that I did not mention coal, which accounted for $229 million in that export basket.

Until the development of northeastern British Columbia coal properties by Utah mines, Dennison, Minolta and Quintette, coal is still mainly a southern B.C. product. Access is coming though to the new Alberta coal field developments such as those I have just mentioned, as well as Coalition Mining, Sukunka and Teck Corporation, and if they are proved viable and economic there will be further access required under the transportation policy.

Last November the government completed an agreement regarding northern railway transportation which would have seen the access improve considerably because of the necessity for resource transportation. I say "would have seen" because this agreement is stalled, even though it generated considerable heat and light—not much light—last December during the B.C. provincial election. We now have the minister of transport for B.C.—whom many members of the House will remember, and whom indeed I remember very well as being the first to quote widely the $1 per ton saving in shipping coal through the CN northline—now seeming to do another about face and seeing in BCR access to Squamish another possibility. I can only hope that we northern British Columbia citizens will not have to live through another protracted political battle with the B.C. railway port of Squamish, and that economics and good sense, and not just politics, will prevail.

The proposed BCR Dease Lake sharing, which would have seen the federal government pay British Columbia $117.5 million in return for a one third sharing of the cost of construction of the CN northline from Terrace to Suskeena, has met with rejection from the new B.C. government, and so it is back to the drawing board again with a recommencement of negotiation. These transportation linkages are essential for and inseparable from the economic enhancement of northern B.C., and I am pleased to note that the federal Minister of Transport will soon meet with his opposite number in B.C. All I can say to Jack Davis is, "Your new government is now six months old and it is time to get on with the job." We await provincial planning priorities and we await impatiently in northern British Columbia the infrastructure that the north lacks in order that we might become equal partners with the south of our province.

The precedent has been established in Fort Nelson where millions of DREE dollars have been invested in municipal services, notably in sewer systems to the betterment of the community and enhancement of back-up services to indus-

trial expansion. If we cannot get B.C. "off the pot" in a reasonable amount of time, then I say, scrap the present agreement, formulate a new transportation and regional development co-ordinated federal policy and go it alone, if we must, to allow regionally deprived areas to survive these troubled times. I say, please do not keep the northern half of this country waiting any longer. Regionally deprived areas need transportation access in order to survive in troubled times, and in my view there are some towns and villages which cannot continue to endure without the implementation at an early date of the subsidy assistance in transportation mentioned by the minister today.

What are we as a nation selling? What does Canada move to market in exports? We export agricultural products and we have a rising market in pork. We export coal, aluminum, zinc, iron, fertilizers, and manufactured goods, furs, radar equipment, power driven hand tools, perfumes, cosmetics, art, antiques and collector's items, and do not forget our tourist trade. We provide ski trips to the Rockies and other western trips which are becoming increasingly important. I remind hon. members that tourism is a labour intensive finished product and a renewable resource, as well as a non-environmentally damaging industry. Quite apart from visitor traffic, there are new transportation linkages and the general cargo terminal at Prince Rupert now awaiting phase three final finishing with a target date for opening in November of this year. Neptune terminals is presently proving the viability of the bulk loading facility at Ridley Island near Prince Rupert which will have further impact on western trade opportunities.

Northwestern British Columbia is not just Prince Rupert. The potential of Kitimat as a complementary resource oriented port is seriously being investigated by other private investors. Recent Kitimat development oriented proposals included a Nippon-Kokan steel mill, and presently Trans-Mountain Pipelines Limited and the Ashland Oil Company are proving the viability of a mid-province oil pipeline. This is one that brings a great deal of concern for a well balanced environmental approach, but in addition to that a very healthy concern that the economic benefits accrue to the area affected by the development of the pipeline. It really does not matter whether it is a pipeline or a grain elevator. The area which is providing the resource has a need to receive the benefits from such a development. These areas require the support of the engineering arm of this government, namely, the transportation facilities.

To the north above Kitimat and Prince Rupert, adjacent to the start of the Alaskan panhandle is the once bustling gold town of Stewart, a place where it is reported that once some 4,000 people lived when it was a gold town. This border area now includes less than 750 souls whose destiny is tied to the illusive price of copper. It is another port probability, another area which is mature and historic but which could benefit mightily from the sensitive administration of the policy the minister has so clearly enunciated today of subsidization to areas as yet undeveloped which are developmentally in need of transportation access to reach maturity and add to the productivity of this nation.

There is another hinterland in the northern part of B.C., the tenth National Harbours Board port in Canada for Kitimat and Terrace and their untapped resources at this time. These future port, rail, road and communications linkages will, hopefully, bring the Yukon on stream again so far as Canadian transportation is concerned, bringing us back to greater utilization of our own facilities rather than the present practically economic and easily accessible Alaskan gateways of Skagway and Juneau. I look forward to the linking of Prince George through Watson Lake with the Mackenzie Valley as a development which common sense tells us must happen at some point in the not too distant future.

To perceive the world of the Pacific rim in all its variety I ask hon. members, this late Friday afternoon, to imagine a mathematics compass with Hawaii as your centre point. Inscribe a circle as broad as the world's biggest ocean. This Pacific circle has Alaskan and Russian shorelines to the north and west; there are China, Japan and a wealth of emerging and re-emerging small nations; further south are Australia and New Zealand, our Commonwealth neighbours. Then wing over to Antarctica, and eastwards up the coast of Chile and her southern hemisphere neighbours, Peru and Equador, to Central America, Mexico, the United States, and on to our home turf, the long coastline of British Columbia. This is the geography of future trade opportunities, each as potentially rewarding as the one we currently pursue with Japan.

To return to the specifics of mid-northern Canada and our B.C. requirements for greater transportation and communications access, the federal Department of Transport, under the leadership of the Minister of Transport, has initiated two areas of study which I predict will soon become household words in business and labour circles in every part of our nation.

● (1540)

Pacific Rim access is being studied first by the Department of Transport's policy planning and major projects branch to assess the effectiveness of transportation systems which carry exports to and from Pacific Rim markets. This MOT project affords a focus for three levels of government and the widely diffused array of Crown corporations, private entities, and agencies which comprise our access to the buyers of our goods and services.

Second, a task force is screening the gamut of transportation policies and has specifically delineated the need for alternate means of access to the west. This review forms part of the broad Pacific Rim access project and will profoundly affect us, particularly in western Canada, when completed.

Transportation and communications access are, in my opinion, the cornerstone on which our area's new economics must be built. We require a flexible system for the efficient shipment of grain; a fair recognition of third level air carriers and required subsidies, no matter where they operate in this nation; utilization of existing rail lines on economic rather than political bases; and regional transportation as an engineering arm of economic enhancement.

Reciprocal running rates are still being negotiated between the BC Railway and the CN and will have an enormous impact on the northern part of British Columbia when completed. The presently stalled CN line north from Terrace has received important impetus with the historic

commencement of tripartite land claims negotiation in the Nass Valley when the Nishga Tribal Council, the government of B.C., represented by the hon. Allan Williams, and the Government of Canada, represented by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan), committed themselves to resolution of the Nishga's 111-year-old land grievance. This matter is now out of the hands of politicians and into the realm of professional negotiators. Progress on this front will signal the release of a log-jam of discontent which will make possible responsible development in the northern half of my province. Make no mistake, the Nishga people are not opposed to development; they simply seek to ensure their just participation in it, with benefits accruing to them from such development as it does to the non-Indian sector of our society.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will allow me one more minute.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is seeking one more minute to complete her remarks. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mrs. Campagnolo: Thank you. With all the problems, in an extraordinarily difficult country, to co-ordinate a systematic and sensible transportation plan, I for one have every confidence in the ability of this minister to replace band-aids with a healthy, economically sound system of access.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the debate today on the user pay concept in transportation, and I would like to refer in my remarks to our national airline, Air Canada. I note that its president recently stated that he is going to be seeking a fare increase, so that the user is probably going to have to pay more to travel on Air Canada in the future. However, I am going to oppose this fare increase, and I have written Mr. Benson to notify him about the financial fiasco at the Air Canada finance branch in Winnipeg and the disastrous debt it is running up. Until this mess in Winnipeg is cleaned up there certainly should be no fare increase allowed for Air Canada.

There are other problems at the Air Canada finance branch, and these problems have been with the finance branch for over three years. One of them is a labour problem, and this related to job descriptions and overtime pay, and has nothing to do with poor accounting or auditing procedures.

For the last couple of months I have been asking that the Auditor General be directed to carry out a complete audit of the Air Canada finance branch and to establish a proper auditing and accounting system. This was recommended first by the Independent Review Committee which called for all Crown corporations to be audited by the Auditor General, and in the report it states:

> The Auditor General should audit the financial accounts of all Crown corporations whose expenditures directly affect the budgetary accounts of Canada.

The budgetary accounts of Air Canada are certainly affected because I notice in Air Canada's annual report this year that the federal government is giving Air Canada a donation of $5 million to build a hangar in Winnipeg. This is apparently a new procedure. In the past Air Canada had to build its own hangars, but now the government is contributing $5 million for a hangar in Winnipeg.

In addition, the Estey inquiry was established by the government to look into a $100,000 travel agency payment which Air Canada made. It was an improper payment, so the government had the Estey inquiry carried out at a cost of $400,000. If we are going to spend $400,000 to investigate a $100,000 payment, we should certainly have the Auditor General move into the Air Canada finance branch and carry out an audit there to investigate the fact that millions of dollars are going astray. I will get to that problem in just one moment.

In the Estey report it is stated:

> As we have seen, the auditors of the Corporation are appointed by Parliament and are the same auditors as those appointed for the CNR. By Section 67 of the Financial Administration Act the Auditor Generral is eligible to be appointed as the Auditor or joint Auditor of the Corporation but such has not been done in the past.

So, the Auditor General has every right to move into the Air Canada finance branch to conduct an audit and to establish a proper accounting system.

In the Estey report it is stated that the market facts study was a bona fide research job but that the costs ran out of control as a result of a lack of monitoring by Air Canada personnel. All through the Estey report it is pointed out that there have been unauthorized disbursements, and a number of recommendations for improvements at the Air Canada finance branch are made.

I am sorry that the minister is not here today. I find it rather strange that on a transportation opposition day the minister is only here for a short period.

Mr. Horner: He gave us his lecture and then left.

Mr. McKenzie: Yes. He gave us a lecture and then left. Some lecture. However, the parliamentary secretary—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You can't do as well.

Mr. McKenzie: Wait until I get going, Joe. The parliamentary secretary is well aware of the problems at the Air Canada finance branch, as he has debated these problems with me on a number of occasions during adjournment debates. However, I have received no satisfactory answers from the parliamentary secretary, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) with regard to the problems there. All I have been able to get out them is that Air Canada should not be run from the floor of the House of Commons. I certainly agree that Air Canada should not be run from the floor of the House of Commons, but when problems of this magnitude are brought to the attention of a member of parliament he would be derelict in his duty if he did not raise them here.

I find it very strange that the Minister of Transport has not given any constructive answers with regard to what he is going to do about these problems, and I hope that after today I can receive an answer from the parliamentary secretary as to what action will be taken to correct the problems at the finance branch.

The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) this week asked the Minister of Transport when Air Canada will be appearing before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and I hope we can receive an answer today.

I would just like to go over some of the problems at the finance branch. I raised this matter with the Prime Minister on May 21. I said to him:

● (1550)

I should like to point out to the Prime Minister that, since there are no longer any enforced controls on travel agents reporting ticket sales and, as of October, 1975, there were an excess of 96,000 unreported travel agent ticket sales, which represents a minimum of $2,208,000 unpaid for transportation, . . .

That is just one example, Mr. Speaker. If we can have the Estey inquiry because of a $100,000 transaction I think we had better get a little action on a missing $2 million. As I pointed out earlier, the President of Air Canada stated that he is going to need a fare increase. I hope the government will make sure that no fare increase is granted until the financial mess is straightened out.

I drew to the attention of the government that Air Canada's own internal auditors endeavoured to audit the refund bank drafts account in 1975. This account is not less than $2.5 million per month, about $30 million per year. They finally gave up and that account remains unaudited since 1972. Therefore over the past four years a $120 million account has been in question. When I bring matters like this up what do I get—"Do not talk about Crown corporations on the floor of the House." That is a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The government is obligated to take action when it has a mess like this on its hands.

I pointed out that a debt of $186,000 of Electronic Associates Canada Ltd. of Toronto had been written off. How could that be possible, Mr. Speaker? How could it be possible to run an account that high? You would think they would be alerted to it at about $20,000 or $25,000 and not let it go any further. I understand that all tickets have not been accounted for by this company and the debt could run much higher still.

I have pointed out that in the past Air Canada has broken IATA rules and regulations. They issued buyer vouchers to Tourist Mount Royal, of Quebec, to the tune of $27,384. All that Air Canada collected from this travel agent was $9,445; they wrote off $17,938, Mr. Speaker. Under IATA rules and regulations this is illegal and the Auditor General should certainly look into it.

I also reported a letter from Harveys of Bristol (Overseas) Limited of London, England. They are continually complaining to Air Canada because they persist in paying the incorrect amount. Certain bills are overpaid and other accounts are not paid at all. As I pointed out, In the past the Air Canada Heathrow office in London has been threatened by the gas and light companies that the gas and light will be shut off unless they pay their bills. Mr. Speaker, this is all because of the finance problems of Air Canada in Winnipeg, and it is another reason why the Auditor General should clean up this mess.

Another of Air Canada's strange practices is that of contracting out their work. The billing is being distributed to Office Overload in Vancouver, Montreal, and Toronto, and exorbitant sums are being paid for the work done which is coming back with a 50 per cent error factor. That means that they get into deeper trouble. The sooner this mess is straightened out the better. Most employees of the finance branch sit around doing very little work so it is strange that all this work is being contracted out. The minister should investigate the situation and find out why Air Canada is contracting work out, and put a stop to it. The cost ranges anywhere from $5,000 to $9,000 per week to individual companies.

I pointed out too, that there are in excess of 180,000 tickets which have been used but in respect of which there is no record of sales ever having been reported to the finance branch. At a dollar a ticket this represents a lot of money, but when one considers that the lowest charge on Air Canada flights is $23 there is cause for concern to the tune of a possible $3,843,000. Can anyone explain how many hundreds of thousands of ticket sales have been reported but in respect of which the fares collected are insufficient to cover the cost of transportation?

At the end of April this year Air Canada had a net loss of $14½ million, about $1½ million over last year's deficit. We can see the direction things are going and why the government should get the Auditor General in to find out exactly what is going on. This should be done before Air Canada is brought before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. As was pointed out earlier, the Auditor General has authority to go in and conduct a survey.

Another area I should like to touch on is security at airports. We have reports that Air Canada has been warned by police that security is lax. An example is the gold robbery at the Ottawa airport. Air Canada was warned repeatedly by the Gloucester township police that there was no proper security. The gold theft a couple of years ago amounted to $175,000. To my knowledge there has been little or no improvement in security.

Another example is a group of Air Canada employees in New York who were arrested for alleged gold theft. I have been in touch with them and they tell me that security was removed a number of years ago and that they were in charge of large gold shipments themselves. These employees were arrested and charged with gold theft. They were eventually acquitted as they had nothing to do with the robbery, but they were left with legal fees of $18,000 which they had to pay themselves. This makes Air Canada employees or any airline employees very vulnerable. If there is any theft at any airport and employees are charged, Air Canada immediately dismisses them. They have to pay their own legal fees. I do not know why security was removed from these airports a couple of years ago, but the Minister of Transport should be looking into it. Apparently as an austerity measure Air Canada removed the guards at some of the airports. I fail to see the logic in that.

If an Air Canada employee is arrested the judicial system is so slow that his case could drag on for months, with legal fees mounting. They do not have any financial support from Air Canada.

In the few minutes remaining, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the parliamentary secretary would tell the House what action the government will take regarding the Air Canada finance branch and if he would comment on the matter of airport security.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Stormont-Dundas (Mr. Lumley).

Mr. McKenzie: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the parliamentary secretary could give an explanation why he will not give me an answer to the two questions I asked?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale) will speak when he is recognized by the Chair. This is not committee of the whole so he cannot answer questions. If he used his right to speak to answer the hon. member's questions now, then he would not be authorized to answer other questions afterwards. He will do it by his own choice at the end of his speech, and only after being recognized by the Chair.

Mr. Ed Lumley (Stormont-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to compliment the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) for bringing forward this motion today. I think it is the first time in the House of Commons that we have had an opportunity to discuss the user pay concept which is very important to all Canadians. They must have a full understanding of what the government is trying to do.

● (1600)

I heartily endorse the concept of the importance of transportation to regional disparities. I think it is most important to apply the cost-centre concept in letting the people of Canada know the purpose for which funds are to be used. If moneys are to be voted for regional disparity programs, let us account for them under such programs and not bury them in transportation estimates. It is important to eliminate the patchwork solutions to problems which are not aimed at eliminating problems but are designed to meet political situations. Put in simple economic terms I suggest that, by and large, it is better for the people who use the service to pay for it. I commend the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and his predecessor in that portfolio for having the political will to do what is right and to ignore political expediency in preparing our national transportation policy.

In any consideration of a cost effective, efficient transportation system you must remember that, if rates are low because of hidden costs, there will be greater use of expensive modes of transportation than there would be if fares or rates reflected real costs. That entails a loss to all.

This afternoon I should like to discuss the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority. First, let me make a couple of comments. I am continually surprised because members of the opposition, who preach government restraint and less government intervention in the private sector, want to maintain the present subsidy system and not make our transportation system self-sustaining, which is what the user pay concept advocates. These remarks also apply to the business community.

When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made his statement during the Christmas holidays on television, the business community was upset about his comments concerning the free market system. But when the business community discusses, for example, increased tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway system, it wants the tolls to remain the same. It does not want government intervention on the one hand, but likes the present subsidy system on the other. I remind the business community and the opposition that they cannot have it both ways.

Let me now speak about the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority. It seems, because there has been so much talk of government restraint and so many questions about the effectiveness of government, that the press has not noticed something that happened in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority. When the chairman of the St. Lawrence Seaway appeared before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications I took note of the fact that administration costs in 1976 were lower than in 1973. In the past two years Seaway costs for maintenance, operations, and administration have risen only 12.8 per cent. I doubt if any government department, federal or provincial, any corporation, public or private, can boast of such a track record. That fact endorses, I think, what the Minister of Transport said earlier this afternoon. When the former minister of transport talked of the condition of this country's transportation system he was not referring to the managerial ability and effectiveness of those who operate this country's transportation systems.

It is important to reflect on the intent of the St. Lawrence Seaway Act, passed in 1951. It is also important to note that there was no opposition to certain clauses of the bill which were included at that time. For example, let me allude to section 17 which reads:

> The tolls that may be charged by the Authority shall be fair and reasonable and designed to provide a revenue sufficient to defray the cost to the Authority of its operations in carrying out the purposes for which it is incorporated, which costs shall include
>
> (a) payments in respect of the interest on amounts borrowed by the Authority to carry out such purposes;
>
> (b) amounts sufficient to amortize the principal of amounts so borrowed over a period not exceeding fifty years; and
>
> (c) the cost of operating and maintaining the canals and works under the administration of the Authority, including all operating costs of the Authority and such reserves as may be approved by the minister.

Clearly, parliament's wishes have not been met. Some moments ago the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain), a member of the transport committee for whom I have the greatest respect, commented on the government's band-aid approach. I remind him that in 1962 the Conservative government then in power eliminated tolls on the Welland Canal. That was a grandiose example of a band-aid approach to difficulties in transportation.

In 1959 the initial year of the Seaway operations, a tariff of tolls based on estimates of future traffic was established by agreement between Canada and the United States. Its

purpose was to obtain directly from the users the revenues required to cover operation and maintenance costs for this joint facility, as well as interest on loans and repayment of capital over a 50-year period.

From 1959 to 1973 combined revenues on the two sections had more than covered operation and maintenance costs but they were never sufficient to cover full interest or to enable any capital repayment. Since 1973, however, these costs have not been met and the annual deficit has been increasing steadily.

The main reasons why the original financial expectations were not fulfilled arise from circumstances which were not foreseen at the time the Seaway Authority's financial structure was established. Seaway tolls on the Montreal-Lake Ontario section have not been increased since the Seaway opened in 1959. Toll reviews took place in 1964 and 1967, but recommendations made by Canada to increase the level of tolls failed to obtain agreement on the part of the United States. Tolls on the Welland section of the system were suspended, as I said earlier, after an announcement in 1962 by the prime minister of the time.

The result has been that the Seaway's debt at the end of March of this year stood at $818 million. The difficult financial position in which the Seaway finds itself obscure, unfortunately, its true value to Canada as well as its operational success and over-all economic viability. Over 17 years of operations it has experienced a substantial growth in terms of tonnage. Long range forecasts of the traffic growth indicate a 12.5 per cent annual average increase during the next 15 years.

Many other benefits, including lowered transportation costs particularly on such key commodities to Canada as grain and iron ore, the development of increased international trade, and the impact on the labour and industrial sectors of the St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes area, have clearly established the Seaway's role as a vital element in our economy. Cabinet agreed some time ago that in principle the financial structure of the Seaway should be revised so as to provide the authority with a realistic financial base related to reasonable expectation of future revenues. The Minister of Transport has indicated his intention to recommend to his cabinet colleagues a revision that will have the added objective of providing a foundation for a new tolls policy.

Allow me to substantiate the benefits of the Seaway. Hon. members commented earlier about the importance of the Seaway with respect to the distribution of wheat. I remind hon. members that in 1958 the toll cost per bushel of wheat was 1.3 cents. In 1975 that cost, at 1.3 cents per bushel, remains the same. In other words, Mr. Speaker, between 1958 and 1975 the toll cost per bushel of wheat did not change. In addition, other costs during that period were increased.

The toll costs are not the reason for the increase in the price of wheat or other bulk products shipped through the Seaway. If I am not mistaken toll costs represented about 10 per cent of the sale price of a bushel of wheat in 1958. In 1975 those toll costs represented approximately 3 per cent of the sale price. Therefore tolls are an insignificant factor in total transportation costs, and form an insignificant part of the value of the merchandise when it finally reaches the consumer. The same may be said of coal and iron ore. The toll costs for iron ore in 1965 represented about 9.5 per cent of the total transportation cost. In 1975 the proportion of tolls was reduced to 5.3 per cent, or almost half the previous amount. This again demonstrates the insignificance of the increase in tolls.

[Mr. Lumley.]

A moment ago I talked about the situation in the United States. Incidentally the situation in that country is the basis for the argument used by the business community and the opposition for the government's not increasing tolls. It is logical for our American Seaway counterparts not to want an increase in tolls. In 1970 Congress and the President of the United States enacted laws whereby all interest, both past and to be incurred in future, was to be written off. Consequently surpluses which the American authority had been able to generate were applied against some of the debt it had incurred. Let us consider the statement, made both by the American and Canadian authorities, that both countries benefit from the Seaway equally. We must assume that the Canadian government is picking up the majority of the deficit on the Welland Canal because it is 100 per cent Canadian-owned. What does this mean? It means that we are, in fact, subsidizing the Americans. Consequently the Americans have no incentive to increase tolls.

The cabinet agreed some time ago in principle that the financial structure of the Seaway should be divided in order to provide the authority with a realistic financial base related to reasonable expectation of future revenues. The Minister of Transport has indicated his intention to recommend to his cabinet colleagues a revision which will have the added objective of providing a foundation for a new tolls policy. Personally I do not think the government should write off the debt but change it into some form of equity because the Seaway does have substantial assets. The replacement cost is estimated at between $4 billion and $5 billion.

● (1610)

A policy of freezing Seaway tolls, and indeed an outright cancellation of these tolls, may be looked upon by some as a tool for promoting economic development. A serious drawback from Canada's point of view is that Canada carries more than 90 per cent of the investment and that our country bears a corresponding share of any deficits, while both countries benefit more or less equally from the waterway.

If we are to reach an explicit objective of commercial viability in terms of both the operations of the carriers and the provision of infrastructure, the St. Lawrence Seaway will no doubt have to be given a new financial structure and tolls will have to be increased.

This means that the users of the Seaway will have to pay to a reasonable degree the costs incurred in the operations of this transportation infrastructure. We must use sense and judgment to determine what a proper charge should be. Yes, the prices for transportation services will have to go up, and likely more rapidly than in the past.

It is the government's responsibility that the transportation system be efficiently run, that unjustified price increases are avoided, and that whatever increases are necessary are reasonable and equitable in terms of their impact. I heartily endorse the comments made by the hon.

member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to the effect that the onus is on each member of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, representing all sides of this House, to participate actively and constructively in meeting the request of the Minister of Transport to develop a new transportation policy for Canada.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in the debate on the motion moved today by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). It attempts to pinpoint some of the fundamental problems of transportation in this country. In particular it deals with the problem of the new concept of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) of user pay as it applies, in his words, to mature and immature regions in Canada and to the different modes of transportation.

Earlier today the minister graced us with some remarks. We are dealing with something that is fundamental to each member of this House, be he from the east, west, or central part of this land. It was rail transportation and some of the problems of transportation that built this country and helped keep it together. Coming from the Atlantic area and having practised law in British Columbia, I know something about the history of the CPR. Members from all parts of the country know how vital transportation is in terms of their allegiance to and identity with this country. That is why there is a very real concern in almost a non-political way when any new minister comes in with a so-called new policy.

When the minister starts referring to user pay, and to mature and immature regions of the country, opposition members, and I am sure some government members, would like to know just what he means. What do his officials mean when they talk about mature and immature regions of the land? Those are the words used in the minister's announcement of the policy.

If the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale) does not know that in the enunciation of the minister's policy the words "mature" and "immature" were used, I can understand why transportation in this country is in a mess. I hope that before time runs out today the parliamentary secretary will amplify, clarify, or at least state what he means when he says I am misquoting when I talk about the mature and immature regions of this country in reference to the new transportation policy of his boss, the Minister of Transport.

The minister graced us today with an interesting lecture from the podium of the classroom on the problems in Canada and now we must be realistic. I was going to give some very fundamental and detailed equations and figures with regard to some particular problems. However, when I heard the minister's dialectical exercise this morning I weighed upon the transport committee chairman on this side of the House to ask if I could reply to the minister. When the minister spoke today he tried to define his concept of user pay. In effect he made the brilliant statement that if the user does not pay, the non-user must. We have to be realistic in accepting this proposition. As I say, I am glad the hon. member for Crowfoot placed this motion before the House and that the minister was here this morning.

In Atlantic Canada we have had what was called transportation week. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary will have something to say about this. Even though the minister said he would be there to amplify on some of the problems of his new policy, unfortunately at the last minute, for whatever reasons, he was not able to be there.

Mr. Goodale: The budget vote.

Mr. Nowlan: I hear someone saying the budget vote. I would hesitate to accept that because there is not a minister who cannot be where he wants to be when there is a majority government. With a majority government, ministers go where they want to be. We all know that the vote on the budget the other night was not a vote of confidence in the government.

The Minister of Transport absented himself later today, as he absented himself in Halifax from a conference which had been in preparation for six months. It was pretty fundamental to Atlantic Canada. I do not know what it is like in Saskatchewan. However, for the minister at the last minute to excuse himself from a conference in Atlantic Canada that had been set up for months was a sad reflection of his concern for transportation problems in Atlantic Canada. There was great concern in Halifax when the minister did not show up. It is the same type of disappointment, but to a lesser degree, that the minister is not here today. There may be a legitimate reason for that.

Rarely in Atlantic Canada has there been such concern about where we are going in transportation. That is primarily because of the rehash of some of these new or old ideas that the minister has been talking about. I am going to come to that.

The minister says we have to be realistic with regard to transportation. There is not a member of this House who does not appreciate there has to be some realism. However, I suggest to the minister that if there were realism and only realism in transportation, this country called Canada would never have been built.

This type of narrow minded professorial, restricted theory, with no inspiration or imagination in a field that is crying for inspiration, imagination, and new energy, is one reason we have these problems in transportation. In his speech the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas (Mr. Lumley) said you cannot have it both ways. Why should the people of Canada have faith in the Minister of Transport when he says we have to be realistic in our policy, and no longer have band-aids or political expediency in the area of transportation?

Never was the question of transportation more abused in more crass political ways than by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) at the time of the last election in his politically dishonest attempt to stay in power. Now the Minister of Transport, cloaking himself in the sackcloth of some vestal virgin, wants us to walk with him hand in hand down this little road, ride on the bumpy railbeds, and fly in the planes of this land. He wants us to do all these things and place our confidence in him and not talk about band-aids and political expediency, when the reality is that the government for 43 of the last 50 years has had responsibility for transport. It has had the chance to build rail beds, it has had the chance to take politics out of transportation and get down to basics. That is why we are a little skepti-

cal when the minister says everything will be peaches and cream and that the word politics will be taken out.

● (1620)

As far as some of his plans are concerned, the Minister of Transport was the minister responsible for the Wheat Board.

An hon. Member: He still is.

Mr. Nowlan: That is unfortunate for the Wheat Board. It was the present Minister of Transport who conceived the LIFT project—lower inventories for tomorrow. And we all know it became lower incomes for tomorrow.

An hon. Member: It did not.

Mr. Nowlan: It did, because it took hundreds of thousands of acres out of production just at a time when wheat was going from about $1.05 a bushel to $4 or $5 a bushel. The farmers of Western Canada were short-changed by this classroom concept which was promulgated by the Minister of Transport. Because he sometimes wears the cloth of a politician, he sold the idea to the government, and the wheat farmers of the West were the people who lost out. We are afraid we shall lose out as a result of some of the transportation policies envisaged today.

I wish to move on now in a non-partisan way; some of the words I intend to quote were spoken by people who wear Liberal sackcloth from time to time—provincial premiers who are concerned about where the federal government is going in the field of transport and so on. I might point out that the premiers of Atlantic Canada are, one might say, bipartisan—there were two Liberal premiers and two Conservatives. But on the Maritime Council, to which I shall soon refer, there are only three—two Liberals and one Conservative. I would draw the attention of the House to the final communiqué of the Council of Maritime Premiers issued in Charlottetown on May 26 of this year. With regard to transportation the premiers say:

> Bona fide consultation is required between governments to ensure that transportation is used to help rather than hinder economic development.

The premiers also expressed concern that the federal government is increasing cost recovery within some transportation systems without considering the effects on the over-all economy. The communiqué went on:

> Undue reliance upon the user pay concept should be replaced by the vigorous pursuit of cost-effective solutions . . .

That expresses the generality in terms of national transportation policy. Coming to specifics, one of them was mentioned by my hon. friend from Carleton-Charlotte who spoke of Bill C-61. I will read two paragraphs because they are so interesting. The one I intend to read first deals with the budget and explains why there is concern in Atlantic Canada about where transportation policy is heading.

It is, of course, easy for us all to say we are in favour of restraint, but there is real cause for concern when expenditure in an area which is so vital to Atlantic Canada, the area of transportation, is cut by over 50 per cent. Need I point out once again that we are talking here about a region of economic disparity, a region where wage levels generally are lower than they are in the rest of the country, a region which does not enjoy the same extended economic base as other parts of Canada? Those are not just my sentiments. Those words paraphrase the feelings of the Atlantic premiers, as is clear from this later statement in the communiqué:

> The premiers expressed disappointment in the federal budgetary restraint program as it applies to transportation expenditure. Recognizing the need for effective measures to control inflation and restore economic stability they endorse the principle of a restraint program but took issue with the discriminatory nature of the transportation section of the announced program, noting that of a total reduction of $41.2 million for the whole of Canada $21.9 or 63 per cent would affect the maritime region transportation program exclusively.

The communiqué went on to say:

> In view of the present economic situation in the Atlantic provinces and the effect transportation has upon it, the announced transport expenditure reduction would seem to be inconsistent with programs designed to correct regional disparity.

Those words, Mr. Speaker, say it all in a nutshell. I fail to understand how someone could hope to establish a viable program of regional development, while on the other hand making such savage cuts in transportation subsidies affecting the very region which one is supposedly trying to help. It is contradictory. It is one of the reasons why the program of regional economic development has failed to produce the economic results for which members on both sides had hoped when the department was set up several years ago. It is impossible to pursue a viable program of economic development unless it is complemented and supplemented by satisfactory transportation policies. Over half of the restraint measures announced in the federal budget hit Atlantic Canada right on the nose.

Bill C-61 was mentioned by other speakers and I shall not spend too much time on that aspect. As for Bill C-87, fortunately the government House leader has agreed to take another look at it. Some people say it will put an end to exports of grain and flour. These are things which give rise to legitimate concern among people in the region regardless of their political stripe.

● (1630)

I mentioned earlier the comments made by the Council of Maritime Premiers on budgetary restraints which feels, quite rightly, that a cut of over 50 per cent is a little heavy for an area of this kind which cannot stand that kind of cut.

They had this to say about the coasting trade in reference to Bill C-61:

> The Premiers expressed concern that the safeguards required to protect regional industries against high transportation costs which would result from the removal of Commonwealth shipping in the coasting trade do not appear to have been adequately provided in either the new act or proposed regulations. The Premiers said that at a meeting of the Council of Maritime Premiers and the Premier of Newfoundland with the Honourable Jean Marchand in September, 1973, it was announced that Canada would withdraw from the British Commonwealth Shipping Agreement and reserve coastal shipping to Canadian flag vessels. At the same time, assurance was given by the federal minister that safeguards would be introduced to protect regional industries against high transportation costs.
>
> The Premiers today are sending a telegram to the Honourable Otto Lang urging him to permit the use of non-Canadian vessels according to the dictates of availability and cost. This is essential to enable

maritime industries to benefit from one of the region's natural advantages.

I should also like to refer to the telex of May 26 signed by the chairman of the Council of Maritime Premiers, Premier A. B. Campbell of P.E.I. He is a concerned premier of Atlantic Canada and he had this to say in his telegram:

> Further to our telex to you of December 16, 1975, and other representations made to you and your predecessor, we are still deeply concerned about Bill C-61. Recent representations from industry have heightened this concern, giving it a new dimension.
>
> In view of this, we now urge you to take action which will retain for Atlantic industries their access to non-Canadian vessels for the coasting trade without serious impediment in the form of the necessity for either expensive or difficult-to-obtain waivers, licences or permits. Availability of suitable vessels and their cost should be the criteria for the selection of carriers, with the decision resting with the shipper.
>
> Existing industry and future industrial development in the Atlantic provinces will be seriously affected if this bill, and those regulations of which we have been made aware to date, come into effect. This legislation would tend to transform the Atlantic provinces into inland provinces in so far as coastal shipping is concerned without their concomitant advantages. High transportation cost to and from markets is already one of the most serious obstacles restricting growth in this region. By restricting competition, Bill C-61 will increase these costs for water, rail or truck.
>
> We urge you to withdraw or change this legislation as it pertains to coastal shipping and to permit the use of non-Canadian vessels according to the dictates of availability and cost, thereby enabling our industries to benefit from one of this region's natural advantages.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the remarks that have been made today are those not of partisan, political creatures that are worried about band-aids, but of Canadians worried about fundamentals. We want to know how this new policy of user pay as it applies to mature and immature regions of Canada is going to work. Perhaps the definition of mature is that we should remove subsidies or make cutbacks, for some paradoxical reason, in Atlantic Canada, which everyone would admit is an area of economic disability, that this in the minister's eyes will be considered a mature region. He did not say anything about that today. We have all heard about western alienation, Quebec separation, and B.C. isolation. I say that we are going to cry out for our maritime rights unless we get a better deal from the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale) would like to take part in this debate before the day ends, so I assure him that my remarks will be very brief and will leave him plenty of time, provided that Mr. Speaker calls on him when I sit down.

I should like to join with others in commending the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) for putting down this subject for debate on this opposition day. Like many days in this House of Commons, it is not a day on which we make decisions or arrive at any conclusions, but I do think it has been one of the better days of debate on transportation policy. Arguments have been presented from both sides, there has been a good deal of philosophy and many suggestions, and I hope that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and his department will take cognizance of what has been said in this day's debate.

It will come as no surprise to anyone in this House when I say that the reason that I ask for the floor for a few minutes is to underline once more what I think is one of the requirements of a transportation industry that serves the best interests of the country. That requirement is good employer-employee relations.

I come now to what might be called my favourite subject. I think that one of the ways to establish and to maintain good employer-employee relations is to have good pension programs. It has been a long struggle to get the pension programs of Canadian National and Canadian Pacific to their present level, but there is a tremendous need for still further improvement.

The fact is that nearly two years ago, as a result of one of the distputes in the railway industry, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) appointed Dr. Noel Hall as a special commissioner to examine all aspects of railway pensions. When I say all aspects, I refer to all railways in Canada, to the pensions of those already retired, the pension plans of those still working, and so on. We do not yet have this report. The Minister of Labour has promised it "soon" so often that the meaning of the word is hard to grasp, but I do hope we will get it within a few weeks. The difficulty is that it is taking so long to get the report and that many pensioners who had hoped to benefit from it have died, and others wonder whether they will live long enough to see the benefits of this study.

I have two things I want to say. First, I urge the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour, when they do get Dr. Noel Hall's report, to study it very carefully and if, as I am sure there will be, there are in it recommendations that will improve the pension position of railway workers I hope they will do all they can to see to it that those recommendations are implemented without delay.

The other thing I want to say is simply by way of underlining the point that I made in a question which I put to the Minister of Transport this morning. Although we have been waiting for the Noel Hall report a long time, one can at least say that the Canadian National Railways a short while ago did put into effect an increase, a small one but nevertheless an increase, in the pensions of those already retired or their survivors. It seems to me that that action by the Canadian National Railways should be matched by the Canadian Pacific. The point of my question to the Minister of Transport was to urge that he have a serious talk with CPR about this matter. I appreciated his reply that he would do so, and I simply rise now to make it part of the record at the end as well as at the beginning of this day. I hope this is something the minister will do at the earliest possible opportunity.

I agree with all who have spoken in this House as to the importance of transportation to this country and as to the need for making improvements. But I repeat that we will have a healthy transportation policy if we have happy and satisfied employees, and one of the best ways to achieve good employer-employee relations is to establish and maintain the best possible pension plan. Real improvements have to be made for our railway workers, and they must be made soon.

● (1640)

Mr. Robert Daudlin (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I was moved to make a few remarks in this debate by the response of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) today which made us more clearly aware of the direction we

appear to be taking in respect of transportation policy. I certainly am more clearly aware of this than I had been up to this point. I really feel the minister did a remarkable job in describing for us in rather simple terms exactly the direction we are taking. I cannot accept the suggestion we heard a few minutes ago, and earlier today from the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), that in fact the result of the minister's remarks today was greater confusion. The minister's response seemed to me to be a remarkable clarification of the issue, and I thank him for it.

Having regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott), and particularly those regarding the airline industry and its response to the cost factors and arguments put forward by the minister, I feel perhaps some response should be made, particularly in respect of general aviation in this country.

The aviation industry has obviously been a resource assistance to opening up this country. This must be recognized by the minister and his officials who contemplate this idea of cost effect and the user pay concept in the total transportation field. If in fact the airline industry is to be consulted with respect to how airports will be built in the future and what facilities are needed for the movement of passengers, and in respect of runways required for future type aircraft, and those sorts of things, then it seems to me these facilities will also be used by aircraft that do not require luxurious buildings, 10,000-foot runways, and six feet of concrete at the threshold. In fact these facilities will be used by aircraft flying into our hinterlands and carrying small packages on an express basis between cities. In this way we will have facilities substantially over-built for the type of aircraft using them.

I trust and I believe, because of what the minister indicated today, that there is a conscious awareness of this fact when considering the user pay concept. I trust there is to be some realization that a great deal of the time the use to be made of these facilities which are substantially over-built will be by these small aircraft, and that as a consequence some reasonable approach will be made in respect of that reality.

I should like to make one further suggestion, and I commend this to the minister's attention, in respect of the movement of passengers by rail and by other means. The minister indicated he really thought it would be unreasonable for anyone to suggest that people should not be moved by bus along an unused railway line. I hope he has in mind the fact that some people may not be travelling now by bus as a matter of preference over rail travel, but rather because of the mode of transportation that is available, the type of facility, etc. Many of them are using this mode of transportation because of the misuse and disrepair of the available mode of transportation.

We have to be careful that we do not impose on the people our position of preference in respect of transportation. We must pay more attention to the fact that people may not rather move by train than by bus, or by bus than by train. Having in mind some of the bus service between Toronto and Windsor and the length of time it takes, I feel certain that most of my constituents would express a preference for rail travel over bus, even if we were able to improve that service.

[Mr. Daudlin.]

One must also remember the Bruce-Grey Peninsula where in fact there used to be train passenger service available. That service no longer exists. One would hope that in fact we would not place ourselves in the position in respect of such areas that we will only be looking at the possibility of a bus service as opposed to the reinstitution of train service.

May I also say in respect of the situation in that part of my riding of Peeley Island that the transportation services seem to be deteriorating. There are pockets of people who will never be able to support the type of transportation they need. It would be unreasonable to suggest that the 200 island people should pay the total cost of an air or boat service to that island.

Let me indicate again that after listening to the minister today I feel confident that, notwithstanding the user pay concept, there will be an improvement in over-all transportation policy. I feel that in fact there must be a substantial amount of reasoning behind that concept to be followed by cost effectiveness, with the realization there is still the principle that the taxpayers as a whole must bear some of the costs of transportation. Having pointed out some of the concerns I have, and having expressed my complete satisfaction with the general principle as outlined by the minister, I want to compliment the minister again for a straightforward and clear exposing of this issue today.

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity during this debate to make a few remarks concerning the user pay concept in respect of mature and immature areas, regions, and modes. I think regions in this sense are of great importance, keeping in mind the many people involved in using the transportation system in Canada and those managing the system.

We can call a mode of transportation such as the airline industry mature today, but when we think of that industry serving areas such as Canada's frontier in the north we get an entirely different picture. We talk about the user pay concept, and I think of the five major airports in Canada which have a revolving fund. This fund gives us some measure of the performance of the industry, and we have the indication from public accounts that this fund is in fact operating at a profit, last year earning something like $12 million.

We find the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) advocating the user pay concept, and arbitrarily imposing a 30 per cent increase in landing fees and charges at these airports because of the over-all cost of operating all our airports. Let me point out that at the other 211 airports in Canada there must be a dollar loss of between $100 million and $250 million. For this reason I do not quite understand the exception taken by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale) to the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan).

The regional considerations represent the most serious aspects of this user pay concept that we will have to consider in committee. If the user pay concept is to work, if the new transportation policy we have been given is to be effective, and if we are to keep this country together we will require some innovations. We will require an effective transportation policy that works in fact to keep this country together, and we will not have such a policy on the

basis of what the minister was talking about today. Such a policy can only work in the context of national priorities.

Let me refer to the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). When he began to speak I thought he was going to get at the heart of the problem, namely, top priority items in implementing a workable transportation policy for this country. He then moved from what I thought was the key issue. He limited his remarks concerning the employees strictly to pensions. Pensions represent an important part of the benefit package of our working force, and I agree with the concern expressed by the hon. member for that segment of the working force involved in transportation.

● (1650)

I stress, however, that there is no point in spending hundreds of millions of dollars on improving transportation in Canada unless we have full and open co-operation from members of the work force who are involved in that aspect of Canadian life. There are thousands and thousands of lost man years of effort in our transportation system due to strikes. If the transportation policy which has been submitted to the thirtieth parliament by the government is going to work, we must first involve the nation's work force in the planning and implementation of this policy. There is no sense in improving the arteries to the port of Vancouver and in building more grain elevators so we can service the world faster and better, if the people manning and operating the system do not have the right attitude toward it.

A fundamental priority in making the new transportation policy of the government work—and I am basically sympathetic to it and I have worked pretty hard to gain an understanding of it—would, in my opinion, be the involvement of the employees and work force of this nation. We can no longer continue to serve this country well and to take our part and place in the world with a labour management philosophy which involves confrontation. We will have to turn to Europe and look at the results of co-determination, look at the results of industrial democratization of other industrial countries and integrate them into our lives in Canada as a first priority to keep us from spinning our wheels in trying to update our great transportation machine in Canada.

For example, I look at such things as the STOL experiment. I can understand $25 million or $30 million being thrown away on an experiment, but I cannot understand STOL when the need is for a high speed railway down the dense corridor of Canada. I notice that my good friend, the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas (Mr. Lumley), was commenting on the St. Lawrence Seaway and pointing out that the administration burden has decreased. That is probably the only example we could find in government agencies where it has. But I should like to put it into perspective. Here we have a $6 million administrative burden for $23 million of revenue which cost $22 million in direct costs and requires a $42 million subsidy from the people of Canada. If that is "user pay", then something has to give.

We in other parts of Canada—and I am very fortunate in coming from the port of Vancouver—have had an excellent track record in having been able to pay for our own facilities. We produce over 54 per cent of the profits earned by the National Habours Board of Canada. We would like to see the port of Vancouver developed and utilized. The port of Vancouver is not just in Burrard Inlet or on the Pacific coast, or on the tidemark line. The port of Vancouver starts somewhere up in the hinterland, and I am speaking specifically of the mechanics of the port. If we resolve the problems of that port and utilize it to its full effectiveness, we will have to start organizing the dispatch and utilization of all modes of transport and co-ordinate them. I have had more input from union members out there than I have had from management in the utilization of facilities that already exist there. If we dispatch trains from Kamloops and take away the competitive forces between the grain elevators there, we could increase our ship loadings. We cannot increase our ship loadings unless we have the input and co-operation of the labour force.

Time is running out on me, Mr. Speaker, but there are two more things I would like to say. We are talking about the user pay concept in transport. This means that we will have to start decentralizing the decision-making process because we in the west are just about at the end of our tether about some of the decisions imposed on us by the mandarins, bureaucrats, and so called experts here in Ottawa.

When we were out travelling on the west coast with the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications we visited the port of Seattle and the airport owned by the port. That airport is one of the finest installations that anyone interested in transport could visit. It has satellite stations, and the main terminal is served by a computerized underground railroad. It has fantastic immigration facilities so that people emerging from large airlines do not have to wait for hours. The customs and parking facilities are also excellent. Everything is made for man, as it should be. That airport cost only $150 million. It has two runways. It is financed locally, the interest is paid, it is non-profit and self-liquidating. Then I look at the over building for which we have a tendency here in Canada, and at the $450 million minimum that Mirabel will cost us. There is something wrong with us in Canada. We are a country of 24 million people and we cannot afford this kind of luxury, this nonsense, this over building in the light of examples of other airports on this continent.

The other thing we do in air transportation is to base everything on seasonal demands. We place full page advertising for charter flights to Europe on our national airline. We advertise holidays here and there, we tell people to spend their dollars somewhere else. The demand on our airports is to take care of the peak summer tourist season. Is this the user pay concept? The guy who has to travel back and forth selling and buying goods and seeking orders has to pay the load for the whole. We have to put this into perspective. The regular user of our airline and transportation systems is prepared to pay and wants to pay, but why should we pay for facilities that are over built and over designed for 60 days of the year for the tourist industry? This should be rationally considered in our consideration of the user pay principle.

I should like to say a few words now on Bill C-61. A special committee was called, of which there are no minutes, on Bill C-61, and we have been offered three major amendments to this bill in an attempt to keep it

from dying before the life of this parliament fades. Within hours of the last meeting I had those amendments telephoned to the west coast and they have been meeting on them ever since. I have just had the results of these meetings telephoned back to me this afternoon, and there is no way that the industrial groups on the west coast can go along with the bill even as it is amended. It has to go back to the drawing board because we have no faith and trust in the government any longer.

Mr. Goodale: You have been listening too much to Jack Davis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that, pursuant to Standing Order 58(11), proceedings on the motion have now expired.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, through the usual channels it has been indicated to me that there might be unanimous consent for me to make a brief statement on motions, an announcement which I think is pertinent.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is quite true, Mr. Speaker. We are prepared to hear the announcement.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We too would like to hear it, and I should like 30 seconds to express appreciation for what I understand is coming.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This is my concern. As hon. members know, Standing Order 15 provides the opportunity for hon. members to comment on a statement and even to ask questions. Is there consent to revert to motions for the statement by the minister, and then to see how it goes by consent and agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AID FOR MAIN À DIEU, NOVA SCOTIA

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as many hon. members know, a disaster recently took place in a community in Nova Scotia called Main à Dieu which suffered from a very severe fire which has caused great damage to the community and the surrounding area.

● (1700)

Among the many unhappy consequences it is obvious that there will be severe unemployment, although I hope it will be temporary. In the face of this, and along the lines of our response last year to the Springhill community disaster, we are going to make available immediately some funds from the Local Initiatives Program to try to provide the necessary resources for clean-up, rehabilitation, and employment. The amount has not yet been determined. That is simply because I have just been apprised of this, and we have not yet had the opportunity to determine exactly how much will be required. However, that will be settled in a matter of a very few days.

Applications for projects designed to aid the community and employ local people will be considered as soon as they are received. All projects submitted under this special phase of the Local Initiatives Program should be capable of immediate implementation, and they will be allowed to begin just as soon as they can be put into operation.

Project officers will be available to work with local organizations and the citizens of Main à Dieu and to assist them in designing projects. As I say, this is being provided to the community of Main à Dieu in view of the very unusual circumstances involved, and although the Local Initiatives Program is primarily intended to relieve seasonal unemployment, it is also designed to aid and improve local communities. I think these circumstances really do fit, and I hope this will receive the approval of hon. members.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the official opposition I would like to commend the government for this act of compassion in an area which suffers in any event in terms of employment. I am satisfied that the officials of the minister's department will move with dispatch in processing the applications, and in terms of the bureaucratic necessities which must take place for public funds, I know it will be in the mind of the minister and all his officials to cut those necessities to the very minimum.

I am sure I join all hon. members in the House, particularly my colleagues from that area, in thanking the minister on their behalf and on behalf of the people who will be the beneficiaries of this program.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to thank the minister for his courtesy in making this announcement here in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We join in the sentiments already expressed by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) and express our pleasure that the minister and his officials have been able to move on this issue.

One of the particular reasons I hoped I would get 30 seconds is that a few days ago my colleague, the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan), raised this matter in the House, and in view of his not being able to be here this afternoon, I want on his behalf to express appreciation, but even more so on behalf of the citizens of Main à Dieu.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my turn, on behalf of my party, I would like to congratulate the minister for making such pertinent use of moneys which could be used for other Local Initiative Programs. We know that when such disasters affect a part of the country, it is important that the federal government be in the position to take steps as quickly as possible to

help the victims, instead of deliberating for weeks and months before coming to a decision. Therefore I congratulate the minister on taking such a quick decision. This proves that in many circumstances when a minister makes up his mind to take action, he can do it and we should all commend him for what he did today in the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being past five o'clock, the House stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m., pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 2(1).

At 5.08 p.m. the House adjourned without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 14, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONGRATULATIONS TO FIRST NATIVE, DR. ANTONE, TO GRADUATE FROM FACULTY OF MEDICINE AT WESTERN UNIVERSITY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I wish to move a motion that I am certain will receive unanimous consent from both sides of the House.

It was my privilege to witness the graduation ceremony this past Friday for the first native student to graduate from the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Western Ontario. It may interest the House to know that Dr. Irwin Nobert Antone is from the Muncey Reserve and will be serving his internship at Victoria Hospital in London. My son informs me Dr. Antone and he will commence their internship this coming Monday on Obstetrical-Gynecological Service and it is Dr. Antone's intention to establish a practice on his reserve at the completion of his training.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald):

That this House recognize this milestone in native education and through you, Sir, send the appropriate letter of congratulation on behalf of all members of the House to Dr. Irwin Antone.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, the unanimous consent of the House is required to put the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

PROPOSAL TO STUDY SIX ALTERNATIVES TO DAIRY POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the seriousness of the problem facing the Quebec industrial milk producers and the difficulties experienced in working out a satisfactory dairy policy, and since it is urgent to remedy that situation, in order to protect our farm producers and thus stabilize an important sphere of activity for the economy of our country, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House immediately consider the six alternatives to a dairy policy set forth by the Food Prices Review Board in its report of February last, so as to bring out their main lines with a view to establishing a balanced and economic dairy policy and thus contribute to a positive settlement of the present conflict.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REASON FOR DISBANDMENT OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity concerning the so far unrevealed number of 6,437,907 cheques issued in Ontario in the last year by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the 538 isolated individuals, all outside the commission, who were actually prosecuted for fraud during that period of time. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington):

● (1410)

That the Minister of Manpower make a statement giving all reasons the Unemployment Insurance Commission's special investigation division was disbanded on 24 hours' notice, whether or not it was investigating at the time the possibility that up to 5 per cent of cheques issued in Ontario for 1975 could be fraudulent, and whether or not it had uncovered evidence that certain unemployment insurance officials in metro Toronto were aware of forged record of employment forms being sold to newly arrived immigrants.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FINANCE

PROPOSAL TO MAKE GOVERNMENT DEFICIT SPENDING ILLEGAL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask, with the unanimous consent of the House, for permission to propose a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. Given the crippling effect our inflation rate has on Canadians by reason of the fact that it erodes their real purchasing power, and the fact that most economists including John Kenneth Galbraith, philosopher-king to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) recognize that excessive government spending is a major cause of inflation, I would therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp):

That this House instruct the government to introduce legislation to make government deficit spending illegal.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—KNOWLEDGE OF PRESIDENT OF TREASURY BOARD OF VERBAL AGREEMENT ON FINANCING ON DECEMBER 2

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the conflicting answers given in this House concerning who was in the know concerning the verbal agreement between the Department of National Defence and Lockheed for Lockheed to provide interim financing for the LRPA purchase, would the President of the Treasury Board inform this House, did he or did he not know on December 2 that the agreement for Lockheed to provide financing was only verbal?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to the statements made last week by the Prime Minister on this matter.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*English*]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE OF TREASURY BOARD APPROVAL OF SIGNING OF CONTRACT

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister last week contradicted his own statement of the previous week, so I was asking for clarification as to whether the President of the Treasury Board knew what was going on at that time, since the Prime Minister did not. Did Treasury Board give its approval to the signing on March 31 of the contract between Lockheed and Canada, which called for payments of up to $16 million to Lockheed in case Canada did not exercise its option?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I will have to check the exact date. We authorized the signing of a contract and then asked the minister to put it in escrow until the financial problems were solved by Lockheed.

* * *

[*English*]

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF ANY PAYMENTS MADE

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Supply and Services? The signed contract between Lockheed and Canada dated March 31, 1976 indicated that Canada would pay to Lockheed $6 million on April 1, 1976 and $4 million on April 30, 1976, plus a possible $808,000 for milestone payments, plus other payments. Can the minister advise the House if any or all of these payments have been made and if not, what is the present status of these liabilities?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am unable to give a detailed reply to the hon. member, but those figures are accurate; there is a direct incurred cost of $10,808,000. We are now in the process of estimating with Lockheed the additional costs which we will have to disburse to reach a maximum of $16 million, taking into account contract agreements that Lockheed had engaged in with possible Canadian subcontractors. All this is obviously subject to verification by my department.

[*English*]

Mr. McKinnon: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I may have lost something in the translation. Could the Minister of Supply and Services assure us that no money so far has been paid to Lockheed under that contract?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: No, I could not give the hon. member this assurance. All I know is that we definitely have direct costs to incur, amounting to $10.8 million. As for the balance it must be determined and checked by government officials.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR REFERRING MR. STOPFORTH'S CASE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the President of the Treasury Board. Aside from the Canadian public which has lost $16 million as a result of this contract, a public servant to whom the President of the Treasury Board owes a special responsibility has had his reputation lost or at least damaged by statements by the Minister of Supply and Services. That civil servant cannot now save his reputation except through remedies which are really meaningless through the ordinary course of things. As the minister in government responsible for the public service of this country, will the President of the Treasury Board intervene with his colleagues to have this matter referred to the appropriate standing committee of this House so that Mr. Stopforth, the Minister of Supply and Services, the deputy minister and the Minister of National Defence can appear? Members of this House could then examine this matter in order that the relationship between Mr. Stopforth and the government can be clarified. I ask this in view of maintaining the principle of ministerial responsibility.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what was said in the House on this subject last week. Moreover, I think the official in question has decided to take legal action, therefore I do not intend to interfere in a dispute between citizens and the courts.

* * *

[*English*]

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY WHETHER MR. STOPFORTH GAVE REPORTS TO DEPUTY MINISTER WHO REPORTED TO MINISTER

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the official involved has decided to go to the courts because the government had determined not to give him any help as they have something to hide with respect to this matter. Mr. Stopforth said publicly that he gave accurate and complete information to his superiors in the Department of Supply and Services in respect of this matter. I ask the Minister of Supply and Services whether he received reports from his deputy minister and the extent of those reports with respect to what that deputy was told by Mr. Stopforth?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I dealt with this question on June 1 in a very comprehensive manner. I think that if the hon. member takes time to look at my statement, he will see that it is very precise. It was fully backed by my deputy minister who took action because he has the prime responsibility for dealing with these matters.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

ACTION OF DOME PETROLEUM TO PROVIDE INFORMATION TO REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY DRILLING IN BEAUFORT SEA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Beginning today, the Can-Mar Corporation, a subsidiary of Dome Petroleum, is providing representatives of the communities affected by drilling in the Beaufort Sea with the financial capacity to send representatives from each community to view their drilling equipment in Victoria. I understand that in addition to paying their expenses, they are providing $100 a day spending money. How does the minister view this action? Does he see it as an innocent public relations gesture or as a possible attempt to diffuse or buy off criticism of the project from these communities?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Basically I see it for what it is, Mr. Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Buchanan: Sorry about that, Mr. Speaker. I see it as an attempt to help inform these communities. They will also, I understand, be represented on the drill ships when they get into position so that the process can be watched and reported back to their communities. I think it is really an informational or an educational process.

● (1420)

Mr. Broadbent: I know the minister is accustomed to saying yes to the Prime Minister, but in view of the fact that it cannot be expected that these community representatives, any more than members of parliament, can possess any degree of expertise in this field at all—

Mr. Paproski: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Broadbent: —would the minister consider requesting the Dome Corporation to open their facilities to the same community representatives accompanied by neutral experts in the field?

An hon. Member: Who are they?

Mr. Buchanan: I will be happy to convey that suggestion to the appropriate quarter. I think it may well have some merit.

POSSIBILITY OF DELAY IN MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE PENDING DECISIONS OF BERGER COMMISSION AND ENERGY BOARD

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A final supplementary on the Mackenzie Valley project itself. Is it still the intention of the government to await the result of the hearings being conducted by the National Energy Board and Mr. Justice Berger before granting a pipeline permit? Will the government permit these hearings to consider possible routes for a pipeline via the Alcan High-

way as currently under consideration in Washington and by the Polar Gas group?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Resources): I believe they have made an application in connection with the Northwest project; they are in the process of putting together a proposal to submit to the National Energy Board.

Mr. Broadbent: Can the Berger Commission look into that as well?

Mr. Buchanan: As the hon. member knows the Foothills application, to the extent that it differs from the Mackenzie Valley or the Canadian Arctic Gas application, was referred to Mr. Justice Berger for inquiry. We have to take the other question under advisement.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

DATE OF SIGNING AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE WITH NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a year and a half has elapsed since the announcement of the subsidiary DREE agreement on agriculture between Nova Scotia and the federal government, would the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion inform the House when the agreement will be signed, because considerable disruption is being caused to farmers planning to expand or consolidate their operations in the province?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed now over a year that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the government of Nova Scotia have been holding discussions to come to an agreement which would permit the development of agriculture in that province. We have received representations from our colleagues on this side of the House in particular and I have personally received some from Nova Scotia people but I can inform the hon. member and the House that this project is entering the final stage and that within a few weeks we shall be able to announce that the two governments have come to a conclusion and signed the agreement.

* * *

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED BLACK MARKET IN PLUTONIUM—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. It arises from the hon. gentleman's call last week during the Habitat Conference for immediate check into the possible existence of a black market in plutonium. Since the Prime Minister indicated last Thursday in the House that he expected the Minister of Justice to pursue his own initiative in this matter, would the hon. gentleman tell us what kind of investigation he has launched into this very serious question?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked the association making the allegation that there was a black market in the sale of plutonium to provide me with material and they have subsequently provided me with an affidavit which really does not indicate very much. However, I am forwarding it to the proper authorities within the government in the hope that the matter will be pursued.

Miss MacDonald: Since the implications of the possibility that plutonium is no longer within the complete control of government go far beyond the legal aspect and relate to the whole question of hazards and safeguards concerning the nuclear industry, would the minister undertake to have this matter referred to a parliamentary committee for full discussion and examination?

Mr. Basford: Whether it is referred to a committee or not is really not a matter for myself. I am in agreement with the hon. member that the matter is obviously a serious one; I said so in Vancouver and that is why I asked for particulars. The matter goes clearly beyond a purely police affair and it was not referred to me in my capacity as Minister of Justice. Since it involves safeguards in international affairs, I am in the process of referring the material to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and to the minister responsible for the Atomic Energy Commission.

* * *

ENERGY

POSITION OF HABITAT CONFERENCE ON DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR POWER—CANADIAN RESPONSE

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Justice as head of the Canadian delegation at Habitat and concerned directly with the number of issues raised there, including the one just referred to. Since the Vancouver symposium took a strong position on the moratorium on further export and development of nuclear power and the development of alternate sources, and since there was considerable representation made to the Canadian delegation at Habitat in respect of public hearings and the future development of nuclear power, I wonder whether the minister would indicate to the House what was the Canadian delegation's response and what follow up there may be on behalf of the government of Canada with respect to the considerable public concern registered.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think the position of the government has been stated a number of times by the Prime Minister, including in Vancouver.

Miss MacDonald: He said "live dangerously".

Mr. Basford: The question of public hearings was referred to in Vancouver, and I indicated that I would refer that matter to the Prime Minister and my colleagues when

I returned to Ottawa, which I will do. The Prime Minister is, of course, today at the first ministers' conference.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

ALLEGATION BRITISH COLUMBIA BANKS CHARGING SALES TAX ON OLYMPIC GOLD COINS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Postmaster General perhaps the President of the Treasury Board would care to respond to my question. I wonder whether the President of the Treasury Board would comment on the fact that in British Columbia banks are presently charging 7 per cent tax on the gold coins, which I understand are coins of the realm. Is this practice approved by the government, what is the government's position in regard to it, and are any other provinces charging a sales tax on Olympic coins?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I will seek information about it because I do not have an immediate answer. I do not know whether it is a provincial or a federal tax. I will, however, take the necessary action to inform the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Brisco: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of clarification, I can assure the President of the Treasury Board that the 7 per cent tax is indeed a provincial tax and is indeed being levied. Constituents in British Columbia are forwarding their money orders here to Ottawa, or even to Alberta, in order to purchase these coins.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak on behalf of the provincial government of British Columbia which has decided to tax this product which is sold across that province.

* * *

[*English*]

DIVORCE

POSSIBILITY OF ADOPTING NO FAULT PRINCIPLE AND UNIFORM MAINTENANCE RULE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome the Minister of Justice back from his "love-in" in Vancouver, though since he has had his "love-in" he has had something to say about divorce.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: If we are going to have a divorce law in Canada, it should be realistic, workable, less costly and less embarrassing. In view of this fact, is the Minister of Justice when he meets with the attorneys general of the various provinces, going to put on the agenda and discuss no fault divorce on the ground of marriage breakdown with the object of obtaining from the provinces their views on this matter—which is not a new thought; the committee discussed it in 1968—and also is he going to endeavour to obtain from the provinces uniform law as to maintenance and support, particularly for children, that will be enforceable by any jurisdiction in Canada, even if the order is made in a province where the parties affected are not residing at the time of the order?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I got the agreement of the provincial attorneys general at our meeting last October that at our June meeting, which will be next week, we would devote a day to discussing the report of the Law Reform Commission, as it relates, not only to the subject of divorce reform but family law reform generally. This is what we will in fact be doing.

The hon. member will apreciate, having undoubtedly read the report of the Law Reform Commission, that a number of issues of federal-provincial interest are raised therein, this is the report we will be discussing. Any action to be taken by the federal government or any measures to be introduced to the federal parliament will depend on the nature of those consultations and discussions. However, when the Law Reform Commission report was published, I indicated that I thought it was an excellent report. I hope that the question asked by my hon. friend from Calgary, whose welcome back I appreciate, is an indication that he and his party also support the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission.

● (1430)

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, because of the two articles, the one on Saturday in the *Globe and Mail* under the headline, "Proposal for no-fault divorce approved by federal Cabinet", and the other which I found when I picked up my morning paper denying that fact, I should like to ask the minister whether he had the approval of his colleagues in discussing this matter, and does he approve the kind of law that would cover "no-fault divorce" meaning, of course, the breakdown of marriage?

Mr. Basford: As my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board knows, the *Globe and Mail* is not always accurate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: How about the minister?

Mr. Basford: As the hon. member knows, I do not discuss any matters with anyone without the leave of my colleagues, and I indicated some time ago that we would be discussing the Law Reform Commission Report with the Attorneys General.

* * *

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

ALLEGATION OPERATIONS CONTRAVENE ACT—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General and has to do with a matter which has been referred to him by his colleague, the Minister of State (Fisheries), regarding the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation which is obviously in contra-

vention of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act, 1968-69. Would the Solicitor General indicate what action he has taken in that matter?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the detailed answer to that question. I will have to get the information and provide it to the hon. member.

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer just given by the Solicitor General, I wonder whether the Minister of State (Fisheries) could indicate what if anything, and I find it incredible—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Whiteway: Could the minister indicate what, if anything, he has done in this matter?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I have consulted the legal advisers of the Fisheries and Marine Service, and their answer leads me to believe that the hon. member is either misinformed or is trying to distort the function of the corporation.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

* * *

FISHERIES

ROLES OF CANADA IN ICNAF AFTER EXTENSION OF FISHING ZONE 200 MILES—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of State (Fisheries) whether he can report to the House on the outcome of the recent ICNAF meeting in Montreal and, more specifically, whether he can tell the House what new role was discussed for Canada through its membership in ICNAF after our unilateral declaration comes into effect on January 1?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet been briefed in detail on the latest development as I have just returned to Ottawa within the last half-hour. The discussions which were going on last week were very much about the role of ICNAF in light of the extension of jurisdiction by ourselves and the United States. We made it very clear that we saw a continuing role for ICNAF outside the 200-mile economic zone since the ICNAF area does cover a number of fisheries outside that zone, and we are interested in the orderly management of that zone in order to avoid any adverse effect on the economic zone itself. I think it is a little early to indicate to the hon. member and to the House how the discussions are going, but they were quite positive in the report I received last week.

MEASURES FOR SURVEILLANCE OF 200-MILE FISHING ZONE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister whether he can enlarge upon the comments he made in Montreal regarding Canada's capability in respect of surveillance of the new 200-mile zone. Can he give the House some kind of timetable in respect of the acquisition of new equipment, and the new role proposed for the armed forces in this regard?

[Mr. Whiteway.]

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I said in Montreal, and I say here, that we are doubling the level of boardings and inspections this year, which will mean about 1,200. This will be done with the assistance of the Department of National Defence and the Department of Transport in those areas where they can be of assistance, air identification and especially vessels used as platforms for fisheries officers. I also tried to make clear, and obviously this has not come across yet, that the jurisdiction of the zone will give us a very different management régime from what we have now, under which violations are reported to the state which penalizes its nationals. In the case of extended jurisdiction, ships violating the regulations within the Canadian zone will possibly see their permits lifted and see themselves taken to Canadian ports and subjected to Canadian law.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED POLLUTION OF WATER SUPPLIES AS RESULT OF DEVELOPMENT OF TAR SANDS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment and concerns pollution from the tar sands. It rises from a report the minister tabled in the House on Thursday. In view of the fact that the Alberta government has been ignoring for some time the arguments from its own officials, as well as federal officials, that the environmental controls over development of the tar sands are inadequate, and in light of the authority which the minister admitted he has to enforce water quality standards, can the minister assure this House that, since a report from his department has concluded there is a danger to water quality in the area from developments in the tar sands, he will use his authority to enforce reasonable water quality standards?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can do, and this is what I have done, is get in touch with the government of Alberta, talk and discuss the matter with Mr. Russell. I think he has agreed that the level of pollution should come down, and he is taking steps to have the company agree on that. The company has agreed to do better than it is doing now, and that is all I can do for the time being.

SYNCRUDE PROJECT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO REDUCE LEVEL OF EMISSION OF SULPHUR DIOXIDE

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister does have authority under the Canada Water Act to take more stringent action, I should also like to ask, in light of assurances already given to the House by the minister that he regards the projected emissions from the Syncrude plant of 287 long-tons of sulphur dioxide a day as too high, and that he would be pressing for a reduction in the emission levels from the Syncrude plant, can the minister assure this House that if he is unable through negotiations and co-

operation with the Alberta government to reduce this level of emission he will use his authority to enforce what his department regards as appropriate environmental standards?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say is that at Syncrude we can, of course, do much better than we could with the old plant which is there, but this will require a lot of investment. As far as Syncrude is concerned, however, I think there is a good chance the standards will be met.

SYNCRUDE PROJECT—INQUIRY IF FEDERAL STANDARDS WILL BE APPLIED TO EMISSIONS OF SULPHUR DIOXIDE

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I am confused by the answer just given to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie. Does the minister regard the Syncrude project as a federal project and, if so, is there any hesitancy on his part to take action to see that federal standards are applied? Forget what Alberta is doing. He has a federal responsibility if he regards this as a federal project. Is he saying that the federal standards shall apply as contained in the act?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows very well what the nature of the Syncrude company is.

Mr. Jarvis: I think I do.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): It is a joint organization and a joint venture, not the sole responsibility of the federal government. Even if it were a federal government plant or company it would be subject to the criteria established as standards by the province. It would be on exactly the same footing as the others.

SYNCRUDE PROJECT—POSSIBILITY OF FEDERAL AID IN PURCHASING NEW EQUIPMENT TO CONTROL EMISSION OF SULPHUR DIOXIDE

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, it is known that better equipment is available to control pollution in the atmosphere than that which is being installed at the Syncrude site. I think the minister knows that part of the reason for installing the inferior equipment relates to cost. Would the federal government be willing to participate in a greater way in supporting the increased cost to put in the different kind of equipment which would result in less pollution to the atmosphere?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, all I can do as the Minister of the Environment is insist, in co-operation with the provincial government, that the standards are met, and this is what I have done as far as we are concerned.

An hon. Member: I am asking you about federal funding.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I am not the one who gives federal funds, and you know that.

IMMIGRATION

REJECTION OF REFUGEE STATUS FOR TWO URUGUAYAN FAMILIES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, in view of the present political upset in Uruguay will the minister now be looking at the case of two Uruguayan refugees and their families who, up to now, have been denied refugee status? Will the minister not agree that their civil rights would be in serious jeopardy should they be returned to Uruguay, and, if the minister cannot use his usual humanity, will he advise these people of their rights under the Immigration Appeal Act?

● (1440)

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the case has just come to my attention. Their plea for refugee status has been reviewed by the interdepartmental committee. They have made appeals to the Immigration Appeal Board and to the Federal Court of appeals. In every case their claim has been dismissed and the appeal rejected.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, is the minister suggesting that the stability of the democracy in Uruguay is such that these two persons can return without any question about their safety.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the first part of the question where the hon. member suggested that I tell them their rights before the Immigration Appeal Board, those rights obviously have been exercised and the Immigration Appeal Board and the federal court have reviewed the case. I just received notice of the case this morning as a matter of fact. My discretionary powers are very limited because the deportation has been upheld by two court appeals, but I do want to look at the case again myself.

* * *

MANPOWER

PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT STRATEGY—DATE OF CONSIDERATION BY CABINET

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In his speech on the budget the minister stated:

> I expect to be able to recommend to my colleagues an employment strategy for the year ahead.

Now we know that the details of the strategy will not be given until the fall. Is the minister stating that this strategy will not be placed before his cabinet colleagues until the fall,—I hope this is not the case—and if I am wrong when does the minister think this important matter will be placed before his colleagues for their consideration and approval?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as sometimes happens the hon. member is wrong. I will be placing this before my colleagues much in advance of the fall, but in so far as the actual details of the program are concerned and the public announcement about it, that will be in the fall just as I said in my speech.

Oral Questions

PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT STRATEGY—POSSIBILITY OF CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES AND PRIVATE SECTOR

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, the minister has cleared that up. It was not clear before. Is there a role for the private sector in this strategy and is consultation with it and the provinces required before the many complexities of design can be worked out as referred to by the minister in answer to a question by the hon. member for Halifax.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will be consulting most certainly with the provinces and to a large degree the private sector through the advisory committees available to me and any other contacts I can make.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

PROPOSAL TO CONSULT QUEBEC ON INVESTIGATION OF FINANCING

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the President of the Treasury Board.

Since the Quebec premier declared during the weekend that he intends to instruct a parliamentary committee after the 1976 Olympic Games to consider the causes of the rising costs, could the President of the Treasury Board advise this House whether he would be prepared to communicate with the Quebec Minister of Finance to ask him that, in accordance with section 81 of the Quebec financial administration legislation, the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the Quebec Treasury Board ask the provincial auditor to investigate and report to the National Assembly so that the parliamentary committee which will consider the matter have all necessary information available to perform such a study?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be improper to try to explain to the Quebec Minister of Finance what are the requirements of the Quebec financial administration legislation, but I imagine that he must be informed. I will convey him the hon. member's question, but I am pleased to learn that it has been publicly stated that a public investigation will be held, as I mentioned before the committee last week.

* * *

[*English*]

ENERGY

OIL—SUGGESTION DEALS MADE WITH IMPORTING COMPANIES BY PRODUCING COUNTRIES—POSSIBILITY OF IMPORTERS OPENING BOOKS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources I will put my question to the Acting Prime Minister. Is the Acting Prime Minister aware that it has now been revealed that for the past two years OPEC nations have been discounting with under-the-table deals the price of their oil from that stated to be the price and allowing the companies that deal in the products to speak of one price and pay a different price? If the Acting Prime Minister is so aware would he indicate what precautions have been taken in respect of government compensation payments to the international refiners and other persons who import crude oil and petroleum products into Canada to ensure that rip-offs at the expense of the people of Canada have not occurred.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the hon. member's question, but I would point out to him that the Energy Supplies Allocation Board, which will soon become a group within the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, runs a careful check on all imports into Canada to make sure that this sort of rip off does not occur. However, I will bring it to their attention.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Since in his answer he referred to the Energy Supplies Allocation Board. I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary could indicate if the government or that board has been successful in any way in having international companies open their world-wide books so that an examination may be made to make sure no one has benefitted from Canada's compensation payments while receiving an undisclosed discount from one of their suppliers.

Mr. Foster: No, Mr. Speaker. They have to do a careful audit of all the companies importing oil into Canada or the compensation is not paid.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary.

PROPOSED REFERENCE OF ALLEGED DEALS WITH IMPORTING COMPANIES TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I now return to the Acting Prime Minister. As the possibility of these rinky-dinky deals was discussed at length when the energy supply bill was before the committee, and as the 1977 estimates covering this item will be deemed to have been passed by Tuesday, would the Acting Prime Minister indicate if a reference could be made to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs so that this specific matter can be dealt with bearing in mind that $1.4 billion in compensation is planned to be paid this year alone?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the members of the board are well aware of the possibility of pricing actions of the kind the hon. gentleman has referred to. They are always looking to be sure that the Canadian treasury is protected against any unwarranted payments. If the hon. gentleman has some specific information I would be very happy to pass it on.

URBAN AFFAIRS

HABITAT CONFERENCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister I will direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. Were the Canadian delegates to the UN Habitat Conference expressing this government's policy when they were voting on ratification of documents presented to the conference?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Elzinga: Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Acting Prime Minister for his answer. On Wednesday June 9 agreement on the document entitled "Recommendations for National Action" was unanimously approved. This document urges among other things public ownership of agricultural land. Does this government support the policy of public ownership of agricultural land as the Acting Prime Minister just stated.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might answer for the Acting Prime Minister in this case.

Some hon. Members: Oh! Oh!

Mr. Basford: I think the question represents a gross over-simplification of the statement which, however, in my view represents the first time we have had in Canada a comprehensive statement of principles as to the use of land which certainly makes it very clear that land is held or should be subject to public control.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fraser: What are you talking about?

Mr. Basford: I am delighted that my friends over there see the point I am trying to make, that land is and should be subject to public control which the hon. gentleman who asked the question did not seem to agree with. It indicated that one method of proper land planning was the acquisition by public authorities of land, farm land or otherwise, as a means of proper urban planning and as a means of preventing urban sprawl.

Mr. Elzinga: Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to either the Minister of Justice or the Acting Prime Minister. They have hesitated to answer whether the government does or does not support the policy of public ownership of land.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the question was directed to me. I re-directed it to the Minister of Justice who was the head of Canada's delegation at the Habitat Conference and who is in a position to answer with a great deal more competence on the specific question. The question which has been put was answered by the minister. The hon. gentleman is now putting another question which has nothing to do with Habitat.

● (1450)

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

An hon. Member: Yes or no.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

AGREEMENT WITH MR. MORRIS ON SUBJECTS TO BE DISCUSSED AT CONFERENCE—POSSIBILITY OF NATIONAL STRIKES

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Can the minister advise the House whether there is any agreement now in effect between the government and Mr. Morris of the CLC settling the specific matters which will be discussed at the meeting later this week?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can advise the hon. member that there have been meetings with Mr. Morris. I talked to him last week in Geneva. We discussed the general tenor of how we hope the meeting will go. We will certainly be talking about policies involving the post controls period, and we will be endeavouring to respond positively to labour's desire to have greater input in the consultation process which will lead to any government policies during that period.

Mr. Fraser: Can the minister advise specifically whether the CLC is prepared to withdraw the threat of a national strike in return for any commitments from the government, and if so, what might those government commitments be?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): At this stage I think it would be presumptuous for me to state what may or may not be in the minds or the planning of the members of the CLC. I can only say what my hope would be, and my hope would be that the meetings will be of such a successful nature that the CLC may find that such action is no longer necessary.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTION DEPORTATION OF URUGUAYAN REFUGEES BE DELAYED PENDING DISCUSSION WITH MINISTER

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It concerns the same matter which was raised by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal. I would like to get the Department of External Affairs into this because it seems to me that the question of refugees concerns an international convention, the United Nations convention on refugees.

Someone in the Department of External Affairs apparently has said that the present regime in Uruguay tolerates peaceful dissent, and one of the representatives who is represented to be looking after Uruguayan issues exclusively said she did not know very much about what is going on in Uruguay. I would like to ask the parliamentary

secretary whether she would discuss with her own minister—or if he is not available, with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration—at least the postponement of the carrying out of deportation orders until the true situation in Uruguay can be determined, instead of having the matter dealt with by people who apparently know nothing of what they are speaking.

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to draw this matter to the attention of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, since the Minister of Labour and Immigration is ultimately responsible for decisions made in this connection. I feel he gave a very frank and very favourable answer to the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

I might add, however, and I do so without any hesitation, that the role of external affairs through its representative on the interdepartmental committee is to ensure whether the international political situation, as we are aware of it, is favourable or adverse to refugees, according to the file and evidence they themselves present to the various courts involved. I have never seen any external affairs member give interviews by telephone in this manner, and the department is well known for its humanitarian sense which has always been evidenced in favour of refugees coming to Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

POSSIBLE CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES ON ALTERNATIVES IF LEGISLATION RULED ULTRA VIRES

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. Can the hon. gentleman advise whether it is the intention of the Prime Minister to discuss with the first ministers the question of emergency or standby powers, such as the constitutionally accepted method of delegating authority, for either the continuation of or the orderly dismantling of the anti-inflation program in the event that the legislation before the Supreme Court is struck down as being unconstitutional?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to assume that it is going to be struck down.

An hon. Member: He is just asking.

Mr. Sharp: That seems to be the purport of the question. I hope that is not a case of the wish being the father to the thought, because I think it would be a very serious matter if that were to happen. The Prime Minister and the government, of course, cannot help but consider the possibility, but no consultations are taking place at the present time.

[Mr. Brewin.]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REASON FOR ABOLITION OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION—SUGGESTED DISCLOSURE OF MATTERS UNDER INVESTIGATION AT TIME DIVISION DISBANDED

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration arising from the abolition of the special investigation division of the Unemployment Insurance Commission within the last year, at a time when the need for such a division seemed to be clearly demonstrated. Will the minister tell the House why the special investigation division of the UIC was abolished and the reasons some of its members were then sent to far distant points in the UIC system after abolition took place?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I most certainly will. The special investigation division existed, and it was found that there was a very considerable overlap between its function and the function of the benefit control operation. After considerable analysis and discussion, including some discussions with me, we decided to make the change.

The special investigation division was also very centralized here in Ottawa, and the cases to which we wanted attention paid were obviously very often in the regions. It was a very logical organizational decision made in March of 1975 to integrate the SID into the regional benefit control operation.

On the second part of the hon. member's question, I would have to check the details, but I presume that since we did want to decentralize and get the investigation where the action is, as it were, some people were transferred in order to make it more efficient.

Mr. Cossitt: Having been forewarned that the minister would use decentralization as the reason, I will ask him this: Specifically will the minister agree to make public all matters which the special investigation division had under scrutiny at the time of its abolition, and if he will not agree, why will he not agree?

Mr. Andras: The reason should be apparent to everyone. This is an investigation into potential or alleged fraud or misdemeanours or that sort of thing. Often the case being investigated proves to be nothing, but it is very close to being a criminal investigation in many cases, and when a prima facie case develops, we call in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to proceed. So, I think it would be utterly unwise to disclose all the details of what they have or have not investigated.

Mr. Cossitt: Pretty weak.

* * *

INCOME TAX

KNOWLEDGE OF DEPARTMENT OF PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON MORTGAGE TO OFF-SHORE LENDING COMPANY

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue. Can he tell the House how the government knows that Canadians who

own property off-shore and who are paying interest on mortgages to an off-shore lending company or agency have declared this obligation to the Canadian government.

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with that situation. I will have to check it out.

SUGGESTED PUBLICATION OF STATEMENT OUTLINING LEGITIMATE ACTIVITIES OF CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of National Revenue. A few weeks ago I asked the minister whether any pressure had been brought to bear by his department to cancel the proposed demonstration on behalf of religious dissenters in the U.S.S.R., and at that time his department indicated that it was giving information to these organizations to the effect that they were getting involved in quasi political activities. Despite the fact that CPRI has now had its charitable status returned to it, has the minister prepared and distributed written statements of clarification for organizations which have a charitable tax status in which the department has defined what is considered legitimate activities of those organizations and what is regarded as political?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, there are some 30,000 organizations which have that particular status in Canada, and those involved in this particular activity at any time or those which are concerned about it have had this brought to their attention. We have been able to work it out without any problem. I think the fact that there has not been one appeal launched speaks well for the equitable way in which they have been treated. There was in fact no pressure brought to bear. I might say that I read a speech given in the other place by Senator Forsey with some concern. I intend to have a meeting with him to get his views on the subject because it is a matter of some concern.

Mr. Epp: If requests for written statements as to the definition of legitimate activity for organizations of that type are made, are they made available to officials of those organizations?

● (1500)

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I think to attempt to codify something of this nature would create more problems than it would solve.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE MINISTER LEARNED FINANCING ARRANGEMENT WAS VERBAL

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Supply and Services. Would the minister now clearly and simply state when he learned that Lockheed was to provide bridge financing to the government of Canada? Would he also simply and clearly state when he found that the arrangement was purely a verbal arrangement?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I have fully answered those questions. I think the hon. member should perhaps make the effort of referring to the House of Commons debates.

[*English*]

Mr. Bawden: A supplementary question. Will the minister say if the reason he will not come clean is that if the true facts even known he would be forced to resign?

Mr. Schumacher: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which concerns the dress of members of the House. I was going to raise the question about the neckwear worn by a particular member, but I see he has left the chamber so I shall not. In this connection, I was wondering if members of the House in general could have some direction from Your Honour, because I have noticed more and more of the leisure-suit type of apparel and I do not think this is a place for leisure. There is also the question of leather jackets which I, personally, do not think are in order. There has just been a general deterioration in the mode of dress. I think it might be pertinent if a memo were issued in regard to the standard of dress that should be adhered to.

An hon. Member: Where is your motorcycle, Warren?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will, of course, take under advisement the very strong representations of the hon. member for Palliser.

Mr. Muir: On the same question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in this matter, for the simple reason that on another occasion the Chair drew attention to the hon. member for Joliette. On another occasion I remember attention was drawn to the hon. member for Mount Royal in the House. Certainly, we all got here in the same way, and I do not think someone should be allowed to dress as he wants and just quietly be told to ease out. I think the matter should be brought to his attention.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I may say that the particular matter which I believe was the subject of remarks today has been already brought to the attention of that hon. member by the Chair. The reason for the lack of formal dress was one of medical treatment, and the hon. member left the chamber until the matter was rectified. The matter did not go without notice, nor did it go without notice in being brought to the attention of the hon. member.

Order Paper Questions

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

TABLING OF PROPOSALS ON COST-SHARING OF HEALTH AND POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to revert to the item of tabling documents. I should like to table copies, in both official languages, of the federal proposal regarding the major shared-cost programs in the field of health and post-secondary education which the Prime Minister presented at the first ministers' conference this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the House agreed to revert to tabling of documents for the purpose requested by the President of the Privy Council?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,963, 5,367, 5,525 and 5,652.

[*Text*]

TOBACCO GROWERS

Question No. 4,963—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

For each of the past ten years, what sums has the government (a) accorded tobacco growers or cigarette manufacturers in the form of (i) loans (ii) grants (iii) subsidies (b) expended in advertising to discourage members of the public from smoking?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed as follows: Agriculture Canada: (a) (i) nil; (ii) 1967-68—$141,864.77 to tobacco growers; (iii) nil. (b) nil. Health and Welfare Canada: (a) nil; (b) 1975-76, $359,-333; 1974-75, 203,968; 1973-74, 395,600; 1972-73, 385,000; 1971-72, 381,271; 1970-71, 163,619; 1969-70, 260,436; 1968-69, 239,649; 1967-68, 200,281; 1966-67, 161,843. The above figures are for printing, design and art work, for posters and information materials, and production of films and T.V. clips for use by private and public organizations. Industry, Trade and Commerce: (a) For each of the past ten years, the government has accorded tobacco growers or cigarette manufacturers grants to the extent of: 1965—nil; 1966—nil; 1967—nil; 1968—$190,000; 1969—$158,000; 1970—$93,000; 1971—$199,000; 1972—$99,000; 1973—$136,000; 1974—$262,000. Figures of grants for 1975 are not yet available. No loans or subsidies have been made. These grants relate to the development or improvement of tobacco and cigarettes with emphasis on lowering tar and nicotine levels through cultivation and production techniques. A portion of the grants supports the updating of research facilities. (b) nil. Regional Economic Expansion: (a) Under the Regional Development Incentives Program there are four net accepted offers outstanding to tobacco processors and none to cigarette manufacturers as of January 31, 1976. (i) nil; (ii) $68,582 (estimated); (iii) nil. (b) Nil.

[Mr. Speaker.]

NOTE: Under the earlier Area Development Incentives Program statistics were not maintained in a way that permits the question to be answered.

FITNESS LEVELS IN CANADA AND SWEDEN

Question No. 5,367—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. What is the name and country of residence of the male who plays the Swede in the Participaction ads on television?

2. (a) How many Fit Kits were produced (b) what was the cost of each (c) what are the government sales projections for 1976?

3. Does the government have any explanation or information that could suggest for what reason Canada has won more medals in the Winter Olympics than Sweden, if the Swedes are in much better shape than Canadians?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The information requested should be sought directly from Sport Participation Canada (Participaction). This is an independent organization which receives annual contributions for operational purposes from the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare. (It encourages financial support from the private sector to subsidize media messages with fitness themes).

2. (a) See answer to Parliamentary Enquiry No. 4,950 tabled May 19, 1976. (b) Projected unit cost is $2.66. (c) 75,000 kits for the first nine months of 1976; 25,000 kits for the following six month period.

3. Sweden, which has a reputation of being a physically fit nation, achieves this image as a result of it's people's active participation in outdoor recreation. In previous years, cross-country skiing has been one of the few sports where Swedes have excelled at the international level, although that dominance is decreasing. Currently, a few individual Swedish athletes (diving, men's alpine skiing, swimming, canoeing) have achieved international success. At Innsbruck, their best performance was a bronze medal in the men's alpine skiing slalom event. Canada by contrast had 3 olympic medalists.

OTTAWA AIRPORT PARKWAY

Question No. 5,525—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. Is the National Capital Commission responsible for the roadway to the airport and, if so, from what point?

2. Does the Commission consider the highway to be in acceptable condition and, if not, for what reason?

3. Who was the contractor for the highway and what was the contract price?

4. Were there any over-runs and, if so, by what amount?

5. Does the Commission plan repairs for this road, and, if so, what are the projected costs?

6. Are there any plans to convert this road to a four-lane highway with beautified surroundings?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Acting Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Yes, from Heron Road to the Airport.

2. No. Frost penetration has caused uneven settlement of the roadway surface.

3. Dibblee Construction, $1,968,993; Francon Limited, $2,056,467; McKay-Cocker, $1,558,000.

4. Yes, by the following amounts: Dibblee Construction, $149,170; Francon Limited, $73,474; McKay-Cocker, $5,782.

5. Yes. Projected cost of inital repairs is $25,000.

6. The roadway was originally designed and constructed to permit the addition of two more lanes thereby creating a four-lane, median separated roadway. Construction drawings and specifications have been completed and the roadway will be built as funds are available and as the need arises. Site development work will be continued on a seasonal basis.

Question No. 5,652—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. What government involvement, if any, was there in the construction of the Ottawa Airport Parkway?

2. Did any other jurisdictions contribute towards the cost of construction and, if so, to what extent?

3. What has been the total cost to date?

4. (a) When was the Parkway last paved (b) what was the cost of the paving?

5. At the time the Parkway was built or last repaved, was it anticipated that driving conditions on it would have deteriorated so badly by this date?

6. Is the government aware of any accidents or injuries resulting from the present, dangerous state of disrepair of the Parkway and, if so, how many?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Acting Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. The Ottawa Airport Parkway was constructed by the National Capital Commission.

2. No.

3. Capital cost to date: $9,213,561.

4. (a) Early summer of 1973; (b) $308,452.

5. No.

6. No.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,327 could be made an order for return, the return would be tabled immediately.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

SCHOLARSHIPS GRANTED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Question No. 5,327—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1970 to date, how many scholarships has the government granted through the Canadian International Development Agency or any other agency, to foreign students studying in Canadian colleges and universities?

Capital Punishment

2. For each year (a) how much has the government spent on such scholarships (b) how many students received scholarships and what were their countries of origin?

3. For each year, what were the colleges and universities attended by the students and what was the distribution of the students in each case?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, at one o'clock, I was speaking about the O'Donnell case in Toronto where a man had killed a young school teacher, going across the Don in Toronto, by hitting her with a stone, raping her and then dragging her out of the Don Valley. A few days later he was picked up by the police for the murder he had committed on a defenceless young school teacher who had no chance of saying a word to defend herself or to prepare for the next world.

There was also the case of a young sex offender who was released from penitientiary because the psychiatrist said he was unlikely to kill again, but within two years he had killed five young men in Quebec City. Just a couple of years ago, a 26-year old female was taken by an intruder who had entered her locked apartment by using a master key. She and her husband had been awakened by the noise, and in their night-clothes had gone to see what was happening.

The husband was warned not to call the police or his wife would die. The wife was taken by the intruder at knife point. He drove her around Toronto for nearly five hours, then raped her, subjected her to all types of sexual aberrations, and when she was not complying, the ever-ready knife was poised. The criminal in this case was a 19-year old youth who had been in psychiatric care from the age of five. He had recently been released from the hospital for the criminally insane at Penetanguishene, Ontario. This young woman is still not working. She cannot work. She is still suffering from the ravages of that night and the indelible imprint the tragedy made on her. She will probably go through life suffering, as a result.

Mr. Peters: They should hang the psychiatrist.

Mr. Rynard: You have an idea. At least you are in favour of capital punishment. These are the responsibilities, Mr. Speaker. Then there is the little girl of ten years of age who just a couple of weeks ago was raped and had her

skull blown to pieces. That little, innocent girl never had her day in court or a chance to repent.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that these are our responsibilities to keep law and order in society. That is why we have police forces. That is why social workers and all our levels of courts are needed, to try to see that justice is carried out on this earth. I have tried to point out that in no way can I watch prisoners sentenced to 15 years or longer walk up those corridors day after day, with bars on the windows and doors bolted. It is dying daily, inch by inch. The chance of rehabilitation goes out the door as the never-ending days pass. Is this what we really want—the torture, the wasting of the mind, the cruelty of long years of suffering?

I have heard people say they are abolitionist because they want to make the criminal live and, day after day, relive and suffer through a long prison sentence. Over and over again I have heard the relatives of a critically ill patient say it was nice to see him, or her, die so quickly and not suffer through a long, agonizing and lingering illness. What is one's philosophy as an abolitionist? The ultimate in cruelty is not the humane way. You can let a man leave this world quietly and peacefully. A judge in Barrie said recently, according to a report, that he had a prisoner before him who had spent more than half his years in prison. Because of the long years spent in prison, this man was unable to communicate with the court. He could not communicate, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the many years he had spent in prison. Do we want long prison terms to do this to people? If there is to be hope for us, society must have a better understanding of how to prevent crime. Second, we must provide an effective deterrent by imposing the shortest possible sentence in the circumstances. Unfortunately, what the shortest possible sentence is has not been discovered. We do not know how to prevent crime.

● (1510)

I cannot support the idea of long prison sentences taking the place of capital punishment. The cruelty of the long sentence is not in keeping with my philosophy, nor that of my riding of Simcoe North.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will intervene briefly in this debate. It has been a long debate and I know hon. members are trying to keep their speeches short. I intervene to indicate that, as Minister of Justice, I support the statement made by my colleague, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), in this House when he began the debate on May 3, as reported on page 13088 of *Hansard*. In introducing the bill, he gave a long and thorough exposition of the reasons why it is being introduced and why at this time we feel capital punishment should be eliminated from the law.

Capital punishment has been debated in this House four times in the last ten years. It seems to me, with all due respect to what many have said in the four debates, that the real issue facing parliament and the country is not the issue of capital punishment: the real issue is how best the criminal justice system can be made most effectively and adequately to protect society. The issue is not whether we shall execute one, two or three prisoners a year: the issue is how the whole criminal justice system, the Criminal Code, the administration of that code in our courts, the legal system, police enforcement and prevention systems of the country can best be made to work and protect our society and its values.

Quite apart from my personal opposition to capital punishment, I am convinced, beyond any shadow of doubt, that even if all murderers convicted of capital offences in the past ten years had been hanged, this would have done nothing to prevent the increase in violent crime which we have experienced in this country in the last few years. During the past 14 years, Mr. Speaker, in 70 per cent of all murders the suspect and victim were related or had some kind of social relationship. In my view, the prospect of hanging in no way influenced whether or not a capital offence in those cases was to be committed. Another 10 per cent of murders were committed during the commission of some other crime such as robbery, arson or sexual assault.

The execution of a few murderers will not deter crimes of passion, murder by sexual perverts, or gangland killings involving hired "hit-men." It will not stop violence. In my view, the very fact that there is on the law books a provision calling for the hanging, every year, of one, two, three or more people for the offence of capital murder gives our society a false sense of security and diverts us from what ought to be the real issues concerning the criminal justice system. To support my view, I wish to quote briefly, as my colleague the Solicitor General did, the words of Sir Robert Mark, the 38-year veteran of police work in Britain and current commissioner of the London metropolitan police, better known as Scotland Yard. Addressing the Canadian association of chiefs of police in Canada last summer, he said:

> I am therefore opposed to the death penalty and so are most of my senior and most experienced colleagues, simply because its continuance prevents the reforms necessary to increase the effectiveness of criminal justice.

That is my position. It seems to me that the best and most effective deterrent to any crime, murder included, is the certainty of apprehension and the certainty of conviction. To bring about that certainty requires, under our system, better methods of crime prevention, crime detection, apprehension of criminals, and reforms of procedures in our criminal courts so that the determination of guilt and innocence is carried out more effectively and without the prolonged delays which so often are the case now. It seems to me that significant improvements must be made to our criminal justice system if that system is to serve its central purpose, the protection of society. That is why the government last July introduced the bail reform bill to which I introduced further amendments in October which became effective on April 26.

We introduced amendments specifically designed to make the bail laws of this country more effective, to protect society against those charged with murder, to protect society against repeaters within the criminal system, and against those who traffick or conspire to traffic in narcotics and who are responsible for up to 70 per cent of all crimes in our centres of population, including the crime of murder. And that is why the government introduced Bill C-83 which is now before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

That bill contains measures concerning gun control. There are to be greater penalties for the misuse of firearms, greater abilities for the police to deal with criminal elements using or possessing firearms, improved measures to keep firearms out of the hands of those who should not have them. Also, we included in that legislation—which I hope will be reported back from the committee shortly—measures to allow for the isolation from society of those deemed, by the legal process, to be dangerous offenders. They are to be separated from society for long periods. Bill C-83 also provides for the tightening of rules relating to the temporary release of criminals from prison. It provides for a more effective parole system, by which I mean that there is to be a more effective way of keeping within our penitentiaries those whom it is considered unsafe to release.

There is to be more effective examination of prisoners seeking release in order that we may release those who may safely be let out and participate in society. Included in that measure are controversial proposed changes with regard to electronic surveillance, or wiretapping, by police authorities after appropriate judicial authorization has been obtained. They are designed to strengthen the ability of police forces in this country to wage a more effective offensive against the bosses of organized crime who hire others to kill and often are instrumental in bringing people into the criminal system.

Later this week, as I said in the question period, I shall discuss with the attorneys general of the provinces other measures which will further improve the administration of our criminal justice system. The changes in the penalties for murder contained in Bill C-84 are related to the earlier measures I mentioned. The very stiff, no-pardon provisions will protect society by ensuring the prolonged incarceration of the convicted murderer. As I have indicated, the central purpose of our criminal law and administration of justice is the protection of society. Society has a right to be protected. It has a right to perceive that the criminal justice system is protecting it. That is why the long prison term provisions are there. They are, in fact, to protect society, to give society what it must have out of the legal system—that is, a perception or feeling that the system is serving to protect them, their communities and their values.

● (1520)

That is why the central issue in this debate is not whether we in this country hang one or two criminals; the central issue is whether we can build a more effective criminal justice system which, without hanging, protects society. It is my view that we can. The fact that we have a law relating to capital punishment gives our society a false sense of security, a sense of security that is undeserved. We should be addressing ourselves instead to how we can improve our criminal justice.

During previous debates on the capital punishment question, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has made very distinguished and important contributions. It disturbed me to read his speech of the other day in which he indicated that he is reversing his position in order to ensure that capital punishment remains for treason. The incidence of treason in this country is extremely low. In fact, Louis Riel was the last person hanged for treason—and that was in 1885.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert has had a long and distinguished career as a lawyer, as a member of this House, as prime minister and as an avowed supporter of the abolition of capital punishment. I hate to think that on the current bill he will be voting against sending it to committee. If he feels so strongly on the particular point that he has raised, because of his long-standing support of the abolition of capital punishment and his long-standing belief against hanging—which I have always taken to be a sincere and deeply-held belief—his proper course of action, knowing his long work in this area, would be to ensure that this bill is referred to committee. If he then wanted to suggest in the committee that there be some change in the bill, that would be the proper parliamentary course of action for someone who feels so strongly about the question of abolition as the right hon. member for Prince Albert.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: There are others in this House who are thinking of making amendments, and some who still have some doubts on the issue. I hope they will see the logic of my persuasion and will vote for the bill on second reading in order to put it into committee where their amendments can be considered or their doubts resolved through debate. I suggest, with the greatest deference, that would be the proper parliamentary course.

As I mentioned earlier, as Minister of Justice my chief concern must be the protection of society. It should be the concern of all members when they consider the measures now before the House. I am satisfied that the sentencing provisions contained in Bill C-84, together with the other initiatives we have taken and are taking through the measures introduced by the Solicitor General and I in Bill C-83, changes in the Bail Act and discussions we are having with the attorneys general as to improvements in the criminal justice system, are an adequate response to the need to make the criminal justice system work better for us and for its central purpose, the protection of society. That is the central issue in this debate.

We are not going to protect society by giving it a false sense of security by hanging one, two or three people a year. We are not going to make our criminal justice system more effective by all the debate, energy and thought that for so many years have gone into the issue of hanging. We should devote that same time, energy and thought to reforming our criminal justice system, to providing better methods of crime prevention and detection. The only effective deterrent there is to crime is the certainty of apprehension and conviction. That is the central issue in this debate and the debate on Bill C-83. It is the job of myself, this parliament, the provincial attorneys general and those responsible for the administration of justice to address themselves to that issue, rather than the capital punishment issue. They should address themselves to how we can develop better methods of crime prevention, detection, certainty of apprehension, and conviction.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Capital Punishment

Mr. Ritchie: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would accept a question.

Mr. Basford: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ritchie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) if, in the new process and plans for the apprehension of criminals—if capital punishment is abolished—we will have a type of capital punishment carried out by law officers. I think this has happened in a good many cases recently, where the number of bullet holes in people in the process of being apprehended by the police suggests much more than is necessary or accidental in carrying out a duty. It is a form of capital punishment by law officers.

Mr. Basford: As I understand the question, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with it. Obviously, police officers get into situations where they have to act to protect their lives or the lives of others. That is their duty under the law. In that way, pursuant to the law, they have the right to take life. I do not think there is evidence that the police forces of this country are abusing their rights under the law in that regard.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, while I did have some notes and remarks to make on Bill C-84, I consider it fortunate that I follow the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) in order to respond to some of the shallow arguments he has presented and, indeed, some of the deception he has inflicted upon us. I wonder whether the minister has even read Bill C-84. He said that hanging would have done nothing to prevent murder. The minister stated that 70 per cent of recent murders in Canada were those of a domestic nature, crimes of passion. However, what he patently failed to say was that those same crimes of murder within that context of 70 per cent are the very crimes that will not be included in this bill under supposed capital punishment, or first-degree murder. In other words, those who are responsible for crimes of passion involving murder are not the ones who would pay the supreme penalty.

● (1530)

By failing to state this, the minister tries to delude Canadians. He indicates that 10 per cent of other crimes resulting in murder would, similarly, not be affected. He says capital punishment would do nothing to stop violence. I have one reassuring comment to make: the murderer who pays the supreme penalty will certainly no longer resort to violence. The minister says Canadians feel a false sense of security when they talk about capital punishment. I do not think this is true at all. I think they believe that for too long the government has failed to recognize its responsibilities in this area. Canadians do not feel a false sense of security. On the other hand, they want to see the law enforced; they want capital punishment and it is in this area that the action of the government has been open to criticism. I ask the Minister of Justice why, today, so suddenly, would he express concern over the escalating crime rate in Canada? Why did it take him so long to address himself to the responsibilities of his ministry?

He speaks of improved methods of apprehension and improved methods of conviction. They certainly have not been demonstrated to date, and I see nothing in the legislation before us which is likely to change that situation. The minister spoke of Bill C-83 and the marvellous effect it would have in removing guns from the hands of criminals. Surely he is aware that this measure dealing with gun control has been a total disaster. Refer me to any other bill in the memory of the House which has been the occasion of the introduction, at committee stage, of 43 amendments!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): By the government.

Mr. Brisco: By the government, to its own legislation. Thirty-one of them dealt with gun control alone. Who does the minister think he will delude? Who does he think will turn in their guns according to the provisions of Bill C-83? Surely the criminals will not do so. Guns will be just as readily available to the criminal element as they are now.

The minister talks about the need for an effective system of criminal justice. I could not agree more, but I suggest this is the responsibility of the government, one whose exercise is long overdue. The law with regard to capital punishment has not been enforced. The hon. gentleman says the idea of capital punishment gives Canadians a false sense of security. Then he tells us this is not the issue. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were debating Bill C-84, a bill which deals with capital punishment. If that is not the issue, I wonder what the issue is.

The minister complains about the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). He expresses disappointment. He says, "Here is a man who for years has opposed capital punishment, and now he is in favour of it because of one clause, the clause dealing with treason." The minister reminds us there has not been a case of treason since Louis Riel. Mr. Speaker, the way this government is going, and the way the quasi-governments of some of the smaller nations today are going, it will not be long in my view, before we shall have cause for concern about treason.

In my view, my right hon. friend expresses a very valid concern. Moreover, his concern about the effectiveness of the committee in dealing with such a clause is well founded. I can easily understand what would happen at the committee stage. I have sat through all the proceedings in connection with Bill C-83 for many weeks dealing with the clauses of the so-called peace and security package. I have seen amendments introduced by the Conservatives and by the New Democrats, amendments which were well reasoned and unobjectionable. But on grounds of policy, because the idea of resistance has been engraved on the brains of Liberal backbenchers, these amendments were voted down en masse. What else could one expect?

The view of some abolitionists is that if parliamentarians support capital punishment, they will have on their hands the blood of the people who are destined to pay the supreme penalty, be it by hanging or in some other way. I wonder whether these abolitionists take the same attitude with regard to the victims. I wonder whether they feel they have the blood of the victims on their hands. If I had to make a value judgment on that point, I certainly would not opt for having the blood of the victims on my hands.

A government, of necessity, legalizes war. It is kill or be killed. A government may, of necessity legalize, approve, adopt or implement capital punishment. I accept absolute-

ly no responsibility. I have no conscience or concern about having blood on my hands when some murderer faces the supreme penalty. I do not agonize over this bill. My mind has been made up. I was convinced of the position I have to take prior to my coming to the House of Commons. I do, however, agonize for those true abolitionists who for one reason or another are sincerely concerned about the reintroduction of capital punishment.

I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard). We have heard comments from physicians on both sides of the argument in the course of the present debate. I cannot but feel that those of us who have, in one form or another, worked in the healing arts for many years and who have inherited or developed a special degree of compassion or concern for their patients, must reflect on the important question of whether this same degree of compassion and concern can be expressed with reference to a murderer. Doubtless there are physicians who may not have been able to transfer their compassion from their professional background to the House of Commons. And there may be physicians—in fact, there are—who have been able to sever that particular connection of compassion in reference to the bill before us. I agonize for those who most genuinely and sincerely, perhaps by virtue of a deep-seated sense of compassion, feel that capital punishment is the wrong road. But I do not apologize to these people.

I was concerned, when reading the addresses of other members, to note that some of them failed to make a distinction clear between first and second-degree murder. Just recently I was reading the address made to the House by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn). It was obvious in the arguments that he was putting forward in favour of abolition that he was not prepared to define the difference between crimes of passion and the "contract" murder. I object most strenuously to the attempts to brainwash the Canadian people that have been made by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). I think it is basically dishonest. I liken—

● (1540)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Allmand: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I do not have any objection to the hon. member, or to any other hon. member, disagreeing with what I have said from time to time, but to declare openly in this House of Commons that what I have said or done is dishonest should be ruled out of order, or the remark withdrawn.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest to the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Brisco) West that he is skating a very thin line, that he should get back to the subject and withdraw that last remark.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to withdraw the remark provided the minister would give me a chance to complete what I was saying.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. Once again, I suggest to the hon. member that he is skating a very thin line, that he should be careful in what he says.

Mr. Brisco: I will be careful, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to complete my statement. There is a basic dishonesty in informing the public of one side of the argument and not informing the public of the other side of the argument. That is where the basic dishonesty lies. To present members of parliament with the report of Ezzat Fattah from Simon Fraser University and with arguments very persuasive of the minister's cause is one thing, but is it not more honest to present both sides of the argument in a similarly persuasive fashion? This is what the minister has failed to do, and that is where I see the dishonesty. I am not alluding to the minister's integrity itself, far from it. I have every regard for the minister as an honest member of parliament. It is the policy that I consider to be dishonest. Having made that clear, I wonder whether the minister would care to comment.

Mr. Allmand: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is suggesting is something that I have never heard suggested in the House of Commons in the whole history of this place. Presumably, when a minister or member of parliament puts forward a policy, he puts forward arguments to support that policy. He does not put forward arguments to support the other side of the question. I would not expect that from the hon. member who supports the retention of capital punishment, so I do not see why he should expect me to put forward arguments in favour of retention. We all strongly argue our points of view and put forward arguments in favour of them, but I do not think that is dishonest. We put forward what we think is right, and we argue our point of view. We do not argue the other point of view. I have never seen this done by the government, by the opposition or any member of parliament.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I should not say "the same point of order", because I do not think the matter raised by the Solicitor General is a point of order. I would think it is rather a point for debate, though I think I understand what he is driving at.

If I could look into the minds of some members of the House with respect to this matter, I think this is a little different from an ordinary party position on a matter, or at least I have always understood it to be. This matter is subject to a free vote by members exercising their discretion based on all the information available. If I understand him correctly, the hon. member was indicating, in this rather unusual kind of situation, that there might be a duty on the part of the government to put forward both sides of the question. I think that is what he had in mind. In any event, I do not think this is a point or order in accordance with the rules of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I suggest that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is raising a point for debate. It is government policy, and has been for many years, to introduce government measures. If the other side object and put forward their side of the argument, there is then debate. I would suggest to the hon. member for Koote-

nay West that he had better get back to the subject of Bill C-84.

Mr. Brisco: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Bill C-84 is one of those rarities of the parliamentary process in which we have a free vote, or a so-called free vote, in which we have a mutual sharing of thinking on both sides of the House in regard to both sides of the coin, I consider it incumbent upon me to present to my constituents both sides of the question. However, when my constituents are made aware of the fact that the Solicitor General handed out a contract to the research and systems development branch of his department—although he says that the views of the author do not necessarily represent his own views—and when I see in the report that the author, Mr. Ezzat A. Fattah of Simon Fraser University, an institution of cynics and socialists, tells the Canadian people that it seems that the better educated tend to be more tolerant in their attitudes toward punishment and more opposed to the death penalty than the less educated, and when he goes on to indicate that those who are in poor financial circumstances are more apt to be in favour of capital punishment than the well-to-do, then I am inclined to turn that around.

It is very simple to turn that around, Mr. Speaker, and to ask this question. Is Mr. Fattah suggesting, since the people of Kootenay West, on the basis of the poll that I conducted, support capital punishment by the astonishing figure of 92 per cent, that this is a reflection on their intelligence? Is this, then, a reflection on their income? Is this, then, a reflection on the fact that they are uneducated? Is that what this gentleman is implying? Indeed, the same expression could be applied to every riding in Canada. To extend the argument a little further, those areas of the country that show a high degree of support for capital punishment are, according to this report, those sections of Canada where there are large numbers of unemployed and uneducated people.

I have a great deal more regard for the intelligence of my constituents, the hard working and industrious people of my riding, than apparently this report or this fellow from Simon Fraser University has. He goes on to indicate that there is a very strong pattern in favour of the death penalty associated with income and religious belief. He concludes that the few studies which have attempted to examine some psychological determinants of attitudes to the death penalty tend to show that people who approve the death penalty are people who are insecure, who were severely brought up and who are socially maladjusted. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this professor, so-called, has said. What a condemnation of the Canadian people! How can the minister possibly accept the thrust of this man's report when he makes a statement like that?

Mr. Allmand: Let us hear the quotation verbatim.

Mr. Brisco: I just gave it to you. He says that the few studies which have attempted to examine some psychological determinants of attitudes to the death penalty tend to show that people who approve of the death penalty are people who are insecure, who were severely brought up and who are maladjusted socially.

Mr. Allmand: Read the rest.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

Mr. Brisco:

People who are opposed to it are people who feel secure, who were brought up by mild disciplinary methods and who are pleased with life.

Is that a statement that the minister can accept? Is it a statement that this House accepts? Is that the position of this government?

● (1550)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The Solicitor General rises on a point of order.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. My department has financed many studies, including one by Professor Bibby of the University of Lethbridge, and Professor Grenier, and so on. These many studies have presented many views, some of which I think would support the hon. member's position. I just want to make clear that these studies are done from time to time and they do not express the views of the department, as the hon. member said at the beginning. Even in that regard, I don't think he was being fair because he quoted at random from the report. He could also quote from other reports financed by our department which give the opposite view, such as those expressed by Professor Bibby and Professor Grenier.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could respond to the minister. He has indicated that his department has produced other reports which apparently deal with the other side of the coin. That is the very point I was making a few minutes ago in respect of which the minister challenged me.

Mr. Allmand: Because you were wrong.

Mr. Brisco: I was wrong; you just finished telling the House—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I would suggest to the Solicitor General and the hon. member that they are getting into a debate. I suggest that the hon. member get back to Bill C-84.

Mr. Brisco: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that the Solicitor General is overly concerned about my remarks.

An hon. Member: He is a bit touchy.

Mr. Brisco: Yes, he is a little touchy today. If the minister wishes, I am quite prepared to read into the record all the opening statements by this individual, and if he cares to trot over some books and reference papers in support of capital punishment, I would be pleased to read those into the record also.

Mr. Allmand: You were giving just one side of the story, and there are two sides.

An hon. Member: You never circulated the other.

Mr. Allmand: Oh, yes.

An hon. Member: But not widely.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Kootenay West has the floor, and I suggest that we listen to him.

An hon. Member: Tell the minister to be quiet.

Mr. Brisco: It is unfortunate that I am getting all this heckling from the Solicitor General. Quite frankly, I do not mind it too much because I do not find it difficult to respond to.

Mr. Allmand: I didn't start it.

Mr. Brisco: One of the most strange parts of this capital punishment matter and the hanging of murderers is the absence of concern and alarm by the public when a convicted child murderer or rapist pays the supreme penalty in a prison at the hands of other inmates. In that case do we see agonizing in the press, and do we see many letters to the editor?

Mr. Allmand: Yes.

Mr. Brisco: Do we then hear the expression of concern in the House, or elsewhere?

Mr. Allmand: Yes, very often.

Mr. Brisco: The minister knows, as does everyone here, that the degree of concern expressed in respect of justice taken into the hands of inmates in this type of case is very minimal compared with the type of press and concern reflected in the House and outside when such an event takes place as the one in Saskatchewan last year when a murderer took the life of two small children. We know that according to the testimony of the murderer, one small child asked him, after witnessing the death of the other, "Are you going to kill me, too?" When I think of that kind of response from a child, when I think of the brutalizing of children, and when I think about our concern for the victim—which so rarely seems to be expressed—I think it is time people of that ilk started to pay the supreme penalty. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that society simply does not need these mad dogs. Society knows full well that these people are beyond the pale, and 25 years in jail is not going to contribute anything to their recovery.

Today, in cities such as New York we see apartments and office buildings under security, with armed guards and wire fences. The same situation exists in Philadelphia and Chicago. How far are we away from this situation in Canada? How long will it be before we see this kind of security escalate in Vancouver and Montreal? How long will it be before we see security escalate in the House of Commons? In my view, we are progressively moving into jungle warfare, with criminals having declared an open season on innocent victims. The question is: Should we stand idly by, or should we begin to fight? Are we going to allow this guerrilla warfare to overwhelm us, and turn the other cheek?

Some abolitionists, in their arguments, tell us how horrible and barbaric it is to hang a murderer and what a terrible thing hanging is to witness. Perhaps we could appeal to the public conscience and cause nationwide revulsion for capital punishment if we televised the event. Let me suggest that if we are going to televise that event, it should be preceded with a few pictures of the victims, particularly the children. Let us precede that with pictures of drug pushers who have run afoul of their bosses, with their hands wired behind their backs, shoved into bathtubs and machine-gunned. Before the coverage of the hanging, let us fill the television screens with pictures of the brutality inflicted by contract murderers.

Contract murder is a lucrative business, the hours are short and the responsibility is nil. This House and this country would condone that kind of thing: we would put these people away for 25 years. Perhaps it is mercenary to refer to the cost of putting these people away. Perhaps that is an unfair part of the argument. Perhaps it is distasteful to suggest that in terms of dollars and cents it is very expensive to the state to incarcerate these people. If I am not mistaken, it costs the taxpayers of Canada, at the present time, $17,000 a year to keep a criminal in jail. The Solicitor General would be more conversant with these figures.

Mr. Allmand: That is the per capita cost, not the incremental cost.

Mr. Brisco: Thank you. If we work that out over 25 years, and allow a rate for inflationary escalation, it would not be too hard to extrapolate that figure to a quarter of a million dollars for a contract murderer, a murderer of a child, or a rapist. I wonder if the taxpayers of Canada feel comfortable with that thought? Murder in British Columbia is no different from murder in Quebec. It is just as horrible, revolting, and just as final. I wonder what the circumstances are now in respect of the parole date for the murderer who ran wild in the Christian Valley between Rock Creek and Fauquier. He went on a rampage, shooting and killing several people and wounding many others. He cut up some of his victims and conveniently surrendered in such a fashion that he would save his own hide, because he knew that his hide was on the barrel. He knew full well—indeed, he spoke of it—that if he did not think of the manner in which he was to give himself up, he could very well end up dead like his victims. Is this the type of man society wants to protect?

● (1600)

Then there was the murderer in the Creston area who slew a woman and some children some three or four years ago. He did not kill just one, but three or four. He was on a real shopping trip. We talk about capital punishment as a deterrent! Not too long ago—and the Solicitor General will be more conversant with the case then I am, because all I had was a one-shot version on television—a criminal in Quebec, along with another criminal, had taken a hostage. He was being interviewed on television. He was asked whether or not he would have killed the hostage. He indicated that he was fully in accord with the actions of his partner and, if it became necessary, yes. He was then asked if he had killed anyone else. He did not say yes, but he did not say no. Because of the manner of his answer, the television audience at least was left with the strong impression that this man in fact was not new to the game of murder. Certainly, there are many persons in the criminal element in Montreal who are not at all unfamiliar with the game of murder.

That is the deterrent factor. Would this man have been in a position to take a hostage if he had been apprehended and convicted in the manner suggested by the Minister of Justice today? Quite frankly, I cannot see some panacea or some sweeping effect this legislation will have on Canadians and on crime. I fail to see an indication in Bill C-83 or in Bill C-84 that all of a sudden, overnight, we will change the system of conviction. We will have a lot more, and we will have a lot more apprehensions. In my view this is simply a red herring and has nothing to do with this particular bill.

Because of the type of legislation this government has been introducing, I would not be surprised if before long it also decided to certify the unions that are being talked about in prisons. I really do not think that the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice would accept that, but it certainly gives many people cause for concern. I wonder what the government's response is to that question, in its peace and security package.

Let us talk for a moment about the clause in the bill dealing with treason. Truly this is the treason season. This is the time of the year when Canada, by drafting this piece of legislation, is saying to the terrorist such as the PLO or any other ilk of the same nature, "Come on over fellows. There is no death penalty here. We do not even cut off your hands. Come on over and murder." One of the most shocking comments I ever heard with reference to the PLO question at the last Olympic Games was an endorsement of their action and their conduct by one of the leading members of the labour movement in Quebec, a man who subsequently to my utter consternation was endorsed—not in the same context; I would not want to delude the House in that way, because it was in respect of another matter—by a former leader of the New Democratic Party, David Lewis. I must say I was shocked that David Lewis would lend any kind of support to Mr. Chartrand after he had supported the actions of the PLO and felt that they were doing the right thing. Are we to be witnesses to the same tragedy this time around? Hopefully, not.

Because the treason season is here, because this is the terrorism time of year and the government has decided there shall not be capital punishment, we are inviting these people over here, at enormous cost to the taxpayers in respect of security, a cost which is escalating daily. The other day a soldier told me he was being discharged from the army. He told me that he had been asked to stick around until after the Olympics. He refused. I do not blame him. In dealing with this legislation, the government is in my view swatting at gnats while swallowing camels.

Many speeches have been made in which the Bible has been quoted. It has been asserted, and I think rightfully so, that indeed one could argue in this way on both sides. I believe the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) suggested that prostitution, arson and any other crimes could be argued on both sides of the question in biblical context. Although I shall not quote from the Bible, I will repeat that the government is swatting at gnats while swallowing camels.

Let me say to the minister and to the House that I accept the mandate of the people of Kootenay West that capital punishment should be retained. I respond to my own feelings and to the feelings of the people of Kootenay West who by 90 per cent plus are in favour of the retention of capital punishment. That, Mr. Speaker, is the way I shall cast my vote.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in the House on such an important matter as Bill C-84 which among other things deals with the abolition of the death penalty in Canada.

In connection with the decision of any hon. member on this matter, it seems to me that in our system we are not delegates to Parliament but members elected to Parliament. If we want to establish a system aimed at sending delegates to Parliament, to a democratic assembly, then those individuals would have to vote, according to the specific mandate given to them, this is another thing. But under the present system, a member must obviously listen to his own electors, his fellow citizens, even try to find their position and understand them, but having done that he ought to take the decision.

If the issue involved changing the system, I would oppose it because, in my opinion, a member of Parliament must have a political conscience, a social conscience, and he must be concerned especially by those issues. That is why he must take a decision after listening to the various points of view and having made an effort to understand them.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to a remark made by my predecessor while concluding his speech. He said, and I heard him clearly, that 90 per cent of his voters were in favour of the retention of capital punishment. I would ask him how can he come to such a conclusion. How can anyone tell at any moment what really is the opinion of the general public, what really is the opinion of Canadians on capital punishment or on any other issue? Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to reach such a conclusion. What these members should say is that they made a survey, an analysis, scientific or otherwise, and give the number of replies they received. But one cannot reach a conclusion until such a survey, scientific or otherwise has been made, then one cannot say in all fairness that Canadians think this or that on capital punishment or on any other issue.

● (1610)

[*English*]

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would accept a question on the point he just raised.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): That is not a point of order. I believe the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is to be the next speaker, and I suggest that if he has time left the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) may accept a question.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I would have been ready to accept the question now, but I will abide by your ruling.

Mr. Stevens: May I ask the question Mr. Speaker? The hon. member raised a very interesting point. I wonder if he would be prepared to recommend to the House that we have a referendum in Canada on the very important issue

of capital punishment in order to determine the will of the Canadian public on this issue.

Mr. Breau: I probably would have come to that point. I am happy that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is so interested in my speech that he anticipated what I was going to say. I think we live under a system in which issues like this one should not have to be decided by a referendum.

Mr. Stevens: Why?

Mr. Breau: A short while ago I was speaking about the social and political conscience of members of parliament in our system. In my view we are elected to consider these questions, to study them, to listen to the Canadian people—

Mr. Stevens: And ignore them!

Mr. Breau: —and to search for their views, but once we know those views we should have the courage to decide what we think is right or wrong and we should have the courage to make up our own minds on this question.

[*Translation*]

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that under our system a member of Parliament is not a delegate to Parliament, but he is elected, and when the constituents in his riding elect him, they are sure he will listen to them, he will try to understand them and he will truly represent them in the House.

I have listened seriously and very attentively to all the arguments coming from my constituency. I have even tried to understand more fully the position opposed to mine, I mean the position advocated by those in favour of the retention of the death penalty since I support this bill and may be described as a total abolitionist. Yet I have tried to understand the position of those opposed to this legislation.

In my opinion, the views I have heard fall into three categories. First, there are those who, as a matter of conscience, are in favour of capital punishment, those for whom it is a matter of morality, of religion, a spiriual matter, a matter of conscience and who are proclaiming: An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. I am referring to those who believe that society should, in revenge or otherwise, take the life of those convicted of having taken someone else's life, the circumstances being taken account of, and the circumstances in their position, of course, can vary depending on whether the murder is qualified or not. To that group I must say that I have the duty, not only as a member of this House but also as a citizen, to accept and respect their point of view, and I respect it. I never tried to convince someone who tells me that he believes in conscience that capital punishment is not only a solution, but is acceptable in Canada or elsewhere. I respect that point of view.

As for the second and third groups, however, after discussion I found that their position is less based on conviction than on their intepretation of the facts, the law or the penalties. The second group is composed of those who believe that capital punishment is an effective deterrent to murder or crime. It seems to me that these people ought to prove their point clearly before deciding in favour of capital punishment, because when you decide that the state must remove somebody's life, you have to make sure beforehand that the decision is fair. Nowhere in all the studies I have seen—I probably did not see them all but I did look into several of them—nor in all the arguments I have heard have I found anything indicating clearly that the death penalty is an efficient deterrent. Nothing indicates that clearly. Some studies seem to indicate that it is not an efficient deterrent. Opinions vary in this regard.

To my mind, it behoves those who claim capital punishment is a deterrent to prove their point, more so than those who claim the contrary. Until such time as an international scientific study is made, since all men are very much alike, until such time as I have seen such a study indicating clearly that capital punishment can be a deterrent, I must tell those people that they may be wrong.

A while ago I said that three groups want to retain the death penalty. The third is made up of those who are concerned about crime in our modern society, who are concerned about the fact that society does not seem to be protected well enough. Those people favour capital punishment but, very often, what they really want, is better protection.

They are told that in many cases, these are administrative matters, these are judgments made by civil servants, law officers of other groups. They are told that it is possible to amend some laws and to modify administrative procedures to ensure that those who are guilty of murder, individuals who are really sick from the social and human viewpoint, who have no control over themselves, are kept away from society.

And it is important to remind the House, and those people from the third group, of the change brought in for example by clause 21 of the bill. Clause 21 redefines the process through which first degree and second degree murderers will be eligible for parole. And I do not want to take the time of the House to read clause 21 entirely but I think we can sum up by saying that there is a fundamental and important principle to be considered in redefining first degree and second degree murder. And one of the important elements is that life imprisonment represents 25 years, for first degree murder and up to 25 years as well for second degree murder, depending on the judge.

About first degree murder, which is the planned or contract murder, there is an important change in the process of parole: the National Parole Board itself will no longer be able to realease anybody convicted of first degree murder, planned or contract murder before 25 years. That person will be released only through a commission of judges of the same court where he or she was found guilty and the comission will review his or her case after 15 years. Then and only them, after 15 years, will the judges be allowed to consider the eligibility for parole of the prisoner or the convicted person.

It is a major change because right now releases on parole are determined by a simple body such as the Parole Board which is made up of civil servants and full time commissioners and it is possible that this board, at least many think so, may not be so sensitive to the situation as are those whose responsibility it is to consider the eligibility of prisoners. If society undergoes a change, those persons

may be isolated and as a result their judgment would not be reliable for other members of society.

The fact that judges are brought into the picture, that a panel of judges will decide on the eligibility of a prisoner beore the board considers his case is, I think, a fundamental change. Even if we did not have this 15 year minimum before judges may consider one's eligibility for parole, the judgment will remain very important.

Therefore I tell them that there are ways to protect society against dangerous criminals which might be released without being completely rehabilitated. Of course, there are other changes such as those in Bill C-83. Although we cannot hope to cover all cases, we are trying through firearms control to reduce at least the accessibility of dangerous persons to firearms and ammunitions.

I would like to point out another matter in this debate, which has often been discussed by jurists or legal experts because it is normal that the public, facing such a question, turn towards the legislators and ask them to find a solution. It is normal that the public exert pressures on politicians and say: We want you to solve this problem, we want you to try to fight crime in Canada and perhaps you may do so by reinstating capital punishment and particularly maintaining it.

It is normal because we have to be elected, we are known to people, they know that we sit in the House and it is thus normal that pressures be exerted on us. Consequently, it is normal that people require this from us. But one must not believe that all decisions concerning murders or any crime in any circumstances, in any region of the country, in any of the various sub-societies of all countries or in any of the various sub-cultures of our country, one must not believe that the House can pass whatever legislation which could, once and for all, ensure a balanced justice and fight crime or murder or make sure that murderers will never live out in society.

That is impossible to do. Why? Because by its very nature the system is in a way fragile, flexible, sensitive. For instance, the guilt of a person accused of murder is not determined by the law-makers, nor even by a judge. There is the question of the Crown attorney. How competent can he be? What kind of morality does he want to follow? What is his background and what kind of culture does he have? What are the views of the Crown attorney and of the defence attorney?

Many people know that the jury system can be influenced by the level of qualification or competence of the defence attorney. An emotional plea, for instance, by a defence attorney who is a better orator than an another attorney. It has often been heard that a poor person had been found guilty because he or she did not have the best lawyer. Some will say that we now have a judicial aid system and that no one will appear before a Canadian court without judicial help. That is true. However with the kind of society we are living in we will never be able to provide individuals without the necessary financial means with the best legal defence possible, we will never be sure that a judicial assistance system could assure them the best lawyer or the best legal defence possible.

There is, of course, the jury. It is an essential factor, sometime more important than any others. We want to have a supposedly sociological, political and social representation of the community to assume the judgement. Consequently, we are not the ones, as legislators, who have something to say but we bear however, the public pressures. We are not the ones who decide those issues. It will be the jury and the judge and it is, to a large extent, what gives its strength to our society, its flexibility but in some cases it can bring about a lack of unformity in sentences. The competence of the Crown or the defence attorney can decide the issue of a trial. Consequently, those factors will decide whether or not a person charged with murder or any other crime is guilty or not.

Mr. Speaker, I only want to answer those who stress before us the illness of our modern society, its weaknesses which make some individuals choose to commit criminal acts, to harm others, to attack them and even take their life. Faced with that problem, although we, as members of Parliament, are subject to public pressure because we are in the public eye, having been elected, society must not, nor must we believe that that problem can be solved, because even if Bill C-84 is defeated, even if all those people convicted of crimes, whether it be love tragedies, deliberate crimes or contract crimes, there is nothing that says that those who are charged with murder will actually be convicted of murder, precisely because of the jury system, because of the system of legal defence. I said earlier that nothing really proved that by applying the death penalty, even if it were applied to all people convicted of murder, first or second degree, or only even first degree, we can actually make sure that all people guilty of murder would be brought before the courts and convicted.

● (1620)

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that a factor in my decision is the fact that a mistake is always possible when it comes to judgments. I said earlier that there could be degrees of competence, that there can be an influence due to the environment, culture or history which may be quite different in Newfoundland and British Columbia because this is a diverse country. We live in a pluralistic society, so it is quite normal to have different points of view in different areas of this country. One must also take into account the degree of competence, the quality of the defence, the quality of the prosecution and the element of error. It is possible to have a better police force in one area of this country than elsewhere. It is possible for certain police elements to be more aggressive in one area of this country at a certain time in certain circumstances than elsewhere. The police in certain areas could be prejudiced against certain groups in society, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the major reasons why I cannot accept that capital punishment be acceptable to our society.

I do not see much difference between murder and capital punishment. I think the individual who takes away someone's life is a sick person, a person with something wrong. But I cannot accept that the state cold-bloodedly, after consideration, after legal defence procedure, after action by the police, action by the experts, the Crown attorneys, after all that, probably six months, one year and maybe two or three after the crime, society, the state can coolly decide to take someone's life. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this penalty is not useful, that it will not necessarily protect society, because the number of murders in Canada

is perhaps 10 or 20 times higher than the number of people who are found guilty by the courts. How can we say that the death penalty can really protect society efficiently?

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to say I am sorry that in this whole matter, in the House and elsewhere, we forget an important factor of criminality, we forget that there still are human, social and community conditions which result from human, cultural and often deep problems which contribute to violence. In poor urban or rural environments, young people of 14, 15 or 16 have known only bootlegging, drug trafficking, broken families, crime or other unpleasant things. If someone starts on the road to crime at 14, 15 or 16, I wonder if he should be the one to be punished.

I would hope that society, instead of emphasizing punishment, would try to show him that there may be some people who love him, that society is not limited to the environment he has lived in. I find there is within society as a whole a lack of understanding, delicacy, common sense, kindness and love for teenagers who are living in some environments. If we had not known something else, we would most probably do the same.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, I urge the House to pass this bill because it is in my view a humane measure, one which says that the state cannot coldly take someone's life, and which, when considered against other government administrative measures or legislation, says that whenever there are sick elements within our society, it should do everything in its power to find a humane, non-violent solution, designed to rehabilitate these people or at least their environment when their own rehabilitation is impossible.

● (1630)

[*English*]

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I have lost count of the number of times I have taken part, since 1957, in debates on this important subject. I can honestly say that this is not the most inspiring, nor the greatest of debates in which I have participated. I thought the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford)—because I am his friend, I think he will not mind my saying this—was less than inspired and less than inspiring when he attempted today to defend the bill. It is not for me to read another man's mind; but, I wonder if he has lost the confidence in this measure which some of his predecessors in earlier days displayed. I remember well, when we discussed amending the Criminal Code to provide for a five-year partial ban, thinking I would not be so narrow-minded as not to give the five-year conditional ban a chance. But we have not been given that five years and in that regard the government has made an egregious error.

I think, too, that many members of this House and many citizens of this country are troubled by the way this matter has been orchestrated, are troubled by the coupling of Bill C-84 to C-83 and the confession of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) that, in order to get as much as he could under the one bill, he had to include as much as he could in the other. This kind of calculated quid pro quo is hardly conducive to a high-level, inspirational debate on a matter of conscience. The fact that the minister found it necessary to make the confession is not helpful. I am convinced that no matter how I decide to vote on this bill—and I have not yet decided—my vote will bring me no great feeling of pride or satisfaction, because the bill contains many things which it ought not to contain and the existing legislation contains many provisions which in my judgment are reprehensible.

I have always opposed the sort of idea central to legislation we passed last time. In most sections thereof we subscribe to the idea that capital punishment is not a deterrent, yet when it comes to dealing with murderers of policemen and prison wardens we say that it is a deterrent. In all logic, if the imposition of capital punishment is a deterrent, let it be applied. But let it be applied in the case of the little girl who was raped and murdered, of the old gentleman in the corner store who was robbed and killed, and in the case of the Canadian citizen who was the victim of violent assault leading to death. Logically, capital punishment is either a deterrent or it is not.

Clause 5 of the present bill disturbs me. It provides:

> Every one who commits first degree murder or second degree murder is guilty of an indictable offence and shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life.

I am neither jurist nor lawyer; yet, surely, if we have learned anything from the advance of criminology, it is this: there is a vast difference between first and second-degree murder. I do not like this little extra provision thrown in for the so-called hardshells in order to make the bill more palatable for them. I wish, sir, I could be in that easy position of some of my colleagues and stand up and say, "I am against the taking of life on moral grounds and for moral reasons, and the taking of life by the state is a sin." I do not believe that. If I were convinced that the taking of life by the state would make society safer and the lives of citizens more sacred, I would subscribe to no moral code which would prohibit my allowing that to take place.

Nor am I in that other happy category of those who say, "Hang them all, the short and the tall; that is the way to make society better." It would be easy to say it, but I don't believe it. Nor am I in that other category of those who say, "My constituents say, do thus and so; therefore I must do thus and so." I agree with the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) that in the final analysis we have to make our own judgment and we have to live or die politically by the exercise of that judgment.

● (1640)

I want to say how very much I was moved by the speech of my seatmate, the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard), one of the great medical practitioners of this country. I was much moved by his thoughful considerations respecting the whole matter of life expectancy of those who are under duress of state action. I was much moved by the eloquent address of my colleague, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), one of the articulate and sincere members of the party who in my judgment has a great contribution to make to Canadian public life. However, as is well known, we in this party enhance our reputation one with the other and our regard one for the other by the candour of our remarks, and I would disagree with him on one matter. I refer to the suggestion that the Palestinians, or PLO, are terrorists or that the PLO is

responsible for the dreadful and heinous activities at Munich.

While I could be critical of the Solicitor General, I will not suggest that anything he is doing in his advancement and manoeuvrings in respect of this measure is in any way connected with making it easier for terrorists. In fact, I sometimes criticize him, through his department, for making life a little too difficult for a lot of innocent Arab people who, with good intent in mind, want to come to this country.

We have to try, with this measure, to make a clear, conscience-based judgment. I regret the bill makes that difficult. I would be happier—and I have never been a starry-eyed abolitionist—had the government come forward without coupling gun control, without throwing in the tough penalty for second-degree murder and all these extraneous things and asked us to make a judgment. I think it would have been a more meaningful and a more intellectual exercise.

Underlying the whole aspect is that no matter how we talked in the last decade and a half, it really did not matter. The government, through its executive clemency, made this a *de facto* abolitionist country no matter what hon. members said or thought. This has entered into the whole discussion an object of resentful unreality, if I may call it that.

The Solicitor General this afternoon indicated what I have said for a long time. While technically we are engaged upon a free vote, it is in fact something less than a free vote. He suggested that, naturally, he could not produce argumentation on the other side of the question. If this were a free vote, a mere testing of parliament, why would he not? I sat in this House when we discussed this measure when it was a private member's bill. That is the way it should be today if it is truly to be a free vote.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macquarrie: I have said many times, and I say it with endearment to my beloved whip, there are too many votes on which the whip is on. This parliament should express itself on many, many issues without the whip being put on. Naturally, I exclude the budget speech and the Speech from the Throne. However, when you have a measure brought in by an individual minister, knowing full well the whole cabinet is going to abide by the law of cabinet solidarity, which the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) may forget occasionally, but not for long, you do not have a 100 per cent free vote. It is not right to suggest to the Canadian people that that is what is taking place.

Generally, this debate has been on a high level. However, I do not think this issue has been helped much by rumours that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the Solicitor General would resign if it did not go through. That makes it too close, not only to being a government measure but a political measure. If I were not holding my conscience in very close check, I would be tempted to vote against the measure for these reasons. However, I think that would be wrong. They have no right to say on the left hand, the weaker hand, that it is a free vote, and on the right hand that they will resign if it does not go through and have cabinet solidarity laid down.

The debate generally has been on a high level but there are two aspects which I have resented all the way through. I do not appreciate retentionists telling me that because I do not support the return of the noose 100 per cent, in some way I am supposedly helping the criminals, that I do not believe in law and order and that I like all these rotten stinkers who make society a hell for decent people. On the other hand, I do not like to have it suggested to me that all civilized, sophisticated people are abolitionists. I do not think that is the case. This is an exercise through which we must move our way carefully and intellectually, guided by the fullest possible information available and by our own feelings as citizens who want the safest, freest society for our people.

I would be quite prepared to stand up and call for the reinvocation of the death penalty if I could be convinced that by that means society would be safeguarded and the rights of the individual would be more secure. I have been looking for many years for that evidence. It is that evidence that I find great difficulty in obtaining. I do not know whether the findings of Mr. Justice Branca have been put on the record. If they have, I will say that I agree with them and support the hon. member who put them down before. In a very brilliant speech to the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, in British Columbia not long ago, he gave a little catalogue of countries which were abolitionist and countries which were retentionist. He gave the murder rate as follows. In 1965 it was 2.8 in abolitionist countries and 4.95 in retentionist countries; in 1966, 3.45 in abolitionist countries and 5.9 in retentionist countries; in 1969, 4.0 in abolitionist countries and 7.0 in retentionist countries; in 1970, the latest figures available, 4.65 in abolitionist countries and 7.65 in retentionist countries.

Noting the dreary and dreadful indication that it is increasing terribly in most countries, I cannot draw the conclusion that the retention of the final penalty has in fact curtailed, limited or diminished the murder rate. This is a significant, stirring and saddening statistic. When I relate that as best I can with the anomalies and contradictions in the bill, I will try to make up my mind fully how I shall cast my vote on this very important subject.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard)—Immigration—Medical examination of immigrants—Government action to ensure adequacy; the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray)—Industry—Proposed closing of RCA Laboratories in Montreal—Government action to prevent; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)—Publications—Possibility of action to control distribution of magazines—Government position.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

● (1650)

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Bill C-84, the legislation currently before this House which, if passed by parliament, will introduce a new and significant phase into the criminal justice system of this country. This has been an extremely difficult decision for me to make, and I want to assure the constituents of my riding that I have reached it only pursuant to a great deal of discussion, research and careful thought.

There is no question that the preponderance of the voters of Scarborough West will disagree with the position I am taking in connection with this controversial aspect of social legislation. As a parliamentarian, I have no choice but to live with the knowledge that, having in the final analysis made up my mind against the justification of continuing with capital punishment legislation as a legitimate form of penalty, I am casting my ballot on this issue in a direction which flies in the face of the current trend of thinking, not only in the riding of Scarborough West but, quite clearly, across this great nation that we are all so proud to call our homes and native land.

All I can say to those I represent during this thirtieth parliament is that I have indeed considered very carefully each and every representation which has been made to me, whether in writing, in the course of the six public meetings held in Scarborough West in recent months on peace and security issues, or in numerous and often heated private discussions.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that I have also considered it part of my mandate and my specific responsibility, as an elected member of our nation's parliament, to conduct private research on the issue through those many facilities available to me and, as well, to listen carefully to those Canadians, including members of parliament, who have definite and well developed views on the opposite side of the issue. This research and these latter discussions, based as they were on circumstances in some ways uniquely available to me as a member of parliament, have led me through an agonizing period of indecision to one clear conclusion.

The conclusion I have reached is that the onus must fall on the supporters of capital punishment as a legitimate form of penalty in today's society to prove their point that the advantages to Canadian society to be gained from this brutal and violent form of punishment, one which is really nothing more nor less than a legalized form of state murder, be it by way of hanging or whatever other method might be evolved, outweigh the disadvantages that become so obvious when the state is empowered through legislation to execute some of its members. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, in spite of the feelings of my constituents on the question, that logic dictates I really have no alternative other than to support a Criminal Code in Canada which, in attempting to both make the punishment fit the crime and at the same time ensuring adequate protection to Canadian society from those who would do its members harm, moves away from the last vestige of state-sanctioned physical violence that still includes murder, killing, hanging, or call it what you will, as a desirable method of handling some of the more heinous crimes which may be committed from time to time. Surely we must not permit our governing authorities in this day and age to engage in this form of legal violence unless the benefits outstrip the detriments accompanying such action.

Let us examine what is really being proposed in the legislation. Whether we like it or not, there has been a *de facto* absence of capital punishment as a form of penalty in Canada since 1962. A similar situation has existed in Belgium since 1863, and in such countries as Germany, Finland, Italy, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden and Great Britain of more recent date. None of these countries has completely legislated the death penalty off their books; they simply refuse to implement it through various legal means available to them under their respective laws. That has been the situation in Canada. Our criminal Code provides that the Governor General has the authority to commute death sentences. The fact of the matter is that the cabinet must review the record of evidence and recommendations from a judge who orders the sentence of death.

On the basis of this review it becomes a responsibility of the cabinet to recommend to the Governor General whether or not the death sentence should be carried out. What has been of some concern is that all such reviews have resulted in deferral of dates of execution or outright commutation of the death sentence. What I believe is less understood and less appreciated is that there have been only six commutations since 1967, half of which concerns cases which came to cabinet with the jury's recommendation for mercy.

Mr. Speaker, one must ask why all these automatic checkpoints are built into the legal system. They are not there in the case of any other sentences. Are we afraid, as a society, to make an error? If so, why are we less afraid in the case of other penalties? Why have we in years past carried out the death sentence in such secrecy, with as few witnesses present as possible? Have we been ashamed of our actions? Why have the cabinet and governors general of this country not authorized any executions since 1962? Surely the answer is obvious. Those in positions of authority and responsibility in Canada—and, I might add, in most other western countries—have had a nagging and horrendous feeling that the process was brutally wrong. Therefore, they have simply avoided the responsibility by exercising those safeguards provided in the law to the fullest extent possible.

I have no particular sympathy for the man or woman who takes the life of a fellow citizen in cold blood, regardless of the degree of provocation save complete self-defence. I really have no idea whether such persons can ever be completely rehabilitated or restored to society as

normal human beings. There may be some who will respond to treatment, but I fear a large number will not. On the other hand, I am concerned about the families of the victims and earnestly believe that our criminal justice system should direct far more attention to their needs. I intend personally to work toward seeking improvements in this area in the name of a just and honourable society. The point remains, however, that my concerns for the victim and his or her near and dear ones, plus my lack of any particular sympathy for the guilty man or woman, do not in themselves lead me to accept that, even if such persons may have lost their right to live in society in the normal way, the state somehow inherits the right to take away all possible vestige of life itself through the brutal and final act of hanging them until they are dead.

Mr. Speaker, the state can be empowered by its citizens to be the weapon or the instrument—depending on how you look at it—for any deed we may consider to be desirable and within the means of the state to perform. On this basis, the reinstatement of capital punishment could be argued to be acceptable even if it meant restoring physical structures for that purpose in some provinces where they have long since been destroyed, for the provinces are called upon to administer the hanging procedure; even if it meant reverting to condoning a violent form of punishment by the state at a time when society is supposedly searching for every available means to reduce the amount of violence in society; even if it meant going it alone, as it were, as a nation when most countries of the industrialized west have long since abandoned this form of punishment.

● (1700)

Yes, the state can be given this power and this authority, but the question before us today is whether or not it should be given such power when for nearly 15 years we have indeed limited the authority to such an extent as to almost encourage the governing bodies of the state to choose not to exercise the brutal legislation at all. We seem to have done everything we can over the years to support what might be referred to as almost a weasling-out attitude on the part of authorities so that they might virtually ensure a discontinuance of this act of execution. We have done everything, that is, with the exception of removing the penalty itself from the statute books.

I have stated my position on the issue and have indicated some of the rationale leading me to the conclusion that, in the context of Canadian society in the latter half of the 1970s, it is my view that the proponents of the death penalty must be prepared to support their case against the increasingly forceful arguments that prevail on the other side. I have mentioned, among the latter, the situation prevailing in other western nations, the de facto experience, as it were, in our own country over the past 15 years and the obvious reluctance of governing authorities actually to implement the death sentence for whatever purpose or reason.

I would like to move, now, to the argument as to why the death penalty is inappropriate. If we are to give the state the power to take the life of a citizen by legal means—whether or not they implement it is almost beside the point—then this authority must, as mentioned earlier, be based on the argument that the existence of such power will surely act as a deterrent against future crimes of a like nature and/or that the carrying out of such a sentence is a suitable and appropriate form of retribution—that is "the punishment fits the crime" philosophy.

Let us look, first, at the deterrence aspect. A careful review of all available statistics reveals that at best there is an extremely marginal case to be made for the death penalty as a deterrent; and on the other side of the coin there is indication of a reducing rate of first-degree murders where capital punishment has long since been abandoned as a legitimate punitive measure. Looking back a few centuries, we see that during the 38-year period of the reign of Henry VIII in England, from 1509 to 1547, there were 72,000 executions in that country, or an average of about five every two days. Bear in mind the relatively small population of the country at that time. Obviously, these executions were having little or no effect on the number of crimes committed for which the death penalty was considered an appropriate punishment to fit the crimes of the day.

By the year 1810, some 300 years later, England had moved to the position where some 300 different offences were punishable by capital punishment. Forty of these offences related to the area of forgery alone. It was only through the intervention of the banking fraternity itself—with some 1,000 bankers presenting a petition to the House of Commons at the time of Sir Robert Peel—that most of the forgery offences were deleted from the list of offences punishable by execution.

The simple reason for the reluctance to move was the concern that the absence of the authority of the state to take the life of the offender would indeed lead to an increase in the number of crimes relating to forgery. It never happened, Mr. Speaker. After 150 years of debate, England ultimately passed an act of abolition in 1965. This was followed by a continuing decrease in the number of murders per 100,000 of population in each of the next six years, with the exception of one. A recent move to reinstate the death penalty, owing largely to the terrorism rampant in some parts of the country, was turned aside by the British House of Commons. At the time the Home Secretary argued simply that to bring back the death penalty would be wrong and counterproductive in the fight against violent crime and terrorist murders. So much for the deterrence argument. In my view it contains little or no substance.

I want to move now to the argument whether the reinstatement of the death penalty in Canada, bearing in mind its *de facto* absence over a 15-year period, would be just and appropriate as a form of penalty best designed to fit the crime of first-degree murder. Here we are referring to the retribution argument. In speaking to this aspect, Mr. Speaker, let me make one viewpoint quite clear—one that my six public meetings in the riding confirmed as being largely in tune with the thinking of the electorate—and that is the clear intent that capital punishment, if continued as a legitimate form of penalty in Canada, should be made applicable to all those convicted of first-degree murder and not simply restricted to the murder of prison guards and police officers. It is my understanding that the police officers themselves would share this viewpoint, and so would many constituents who were abhorred over the cold-blooded murder of a Scarborough taxi driver a year or

so ago. Thus, we are talking about the legitimacy of the death penalty for first-degree murders, period, with no restriction as to its limited application over a designated sector society.

It seems to me that the retribution argument must in itself be viewed from at least three aspects, Mr. Speaker. First, there is the age-old argument of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Surely this went out long ago. Philosophically, we might compare the teachings of the New Testament to this Old Testament concept. That, alone, is some 2,000 years ago. In the intervening period we have seen the disappearance of most sadistic and torturous forms of punishment imposed by various states in their endeavour, presumably, to relate the punishment more closely to the nature of the crime. Some people argued, at my public meetings, for a return of some of these crime-related punishments. However, by and large the most convinced retentionist does not argue in this vein.

Accepting this, why should we accept capital punishment as an appropriate form of penalty for the crime of murder? If we refuse to accept a violent form of state-instituted bodily harm, such as stretching, dismemberment, or, indeed, the cat-o'-nine tails in today's society as a fitting retribution for heinous crimes by the guilty person on the body of the victim, why continue to accept the violence of breaking a person's neck in two for a crime of murder? I have received no satisfactory answer to that question.

The second aspect of the retribution issue is the expressed desire to ensure an adequately severe form of punishment for what is undoubtedly the most brutal of all forms of crime—taking the life of another person. In my view, imprisonment for life may result in an even more severe form of punishment in many aspects than the relatively simple and "once and for all" aspect of hanging. There has been one recent and well publicized example of this, where a lifer being interviewed on television stated unequivocally that he would rather hang than linger on indefinitely behind bars with little hope of any form of normal life in the distant future. It seems to me that is a most forceful argument in favour of life imprisonment in that the guilty person himself looks upon it as a more severe penalty than the single and yet final act of execution.

The third aspect of the retribution argument relates to life itself and who should have the power or authority to take it away. The state grants each one of us the freedom under which we live, but it by no means is the instrument through which we were granted life. I would thus argue that the state is quite entitled to remove our individual freedom at any time we indicate an inability to use this freedom in a responsible manner, as in the case of the commission of a crime against another member of society.

● (1710)

However, this entitlement does not extend, in my view, to the taking away of life. That is a matter that should be more appropriately left in the hands of those responsible for giving it in the first place. Thus, I can readily accept the argument of a murderer having lost his right to freedom and a normal life in society. What I cannot accept is this argument being extended to the point where society commissions the state as the appropriate authority, not only to ensure that the loss of freedom aspect is respected through the means of imprisonment but, further, that the state be empowered to take the violent step of dispossessing the guilty individual of life itself.

I have attempted to present my argument in a rational and logical manner, eliminating as much as possible the emotional aspect. Yet I know and respect the emotions that are generated among Canadians today, both in Scarborough West and elsewhere in the country, when they witness an increase in the area of violent crime in general and a seeming disinclination on the part of the courts and the justice system to act in a speedy and definite manner to apprehend and punish the offender in a suitable way. I share this concern and, in addition to prodding the government to give more careful consideration to the needs of the victim and his or her close family, I also intend to press for more concerned action in the area of speedy apprehension and trial of persons charged with crimes against other members of our society.

I also intend to watch carefully over provisions relating to the early release of those charged with more serious offences. Many of these aspects are covered in the legislation accompanying this bill, and I believe it is essential that both Bills C-83 and C-84 receive the approval of this thirtieth parliament as quickly as possible. This will enable Canadian society to take a major step toward securing a reduction in the extent of violent crime in our country.

While my stance today indicates my objections to capital punishment both as a deterrent and as an appropriate form of retribution in the context of today's society, I do not condone an overly lax or inattentive attitude to the frustrations of society and its law officers to the problems relating to inadequacies in the administration of our justice system.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon there was an exchange in the House between the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and the member who was speaking at the time in which I was involved in the form of a point of order. There was a question raised as to how the government ought to have proceeded in respect of the dissemination of material setting forth both sides of this issue. At that time I advanced the argument that this was a free vote—at least, in terms of our party it is to be absolutely and completely free—and that perhaps in those circumstances there was a duty on the government to advance the arguments, statistics and learned writings on both sides of the case.

I found later on that there was in fact a precedent for that point of view during the time of the late Hon. Guy Favreau when he was minister of justice and there was prepared a guide for parliamentarians in respect of the legislation put forward at that time. I regret very much that that kind of attitude was not taken and that that kind of material has not been made available to hon. members of the House at this time.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to point out to the hon. member that the material he has referred to which was put out under Hon. Guy Favreau was brought up to date in 1973 and put out again. This was

the Grenier report to which I referred in answer to the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco). I pointed out there were other reports that covered both sides as well. The one the hon. member referred to originally was put out under Mr. Favreau and was brought up to date by my department in 1973 for the debate then. Recent statistics put out have brought that up to date again.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It seems to me, though, Mr. Speaker—and this is the reason I raised it—that this debate has taken upon itself something less than a free vote—something less than it ought to be. I am, quite frankly, very much concerned by the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has stated, in terms of the Liberal party, that this is a matter of solidarity at least in so far as the position of the cabinet is concerned.

An hon. Member: He never said that.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We can debate that point, and there will be other speakers follow me who will refer to it. This is a government bill in so far as the cabinet is concerned. I am very much concerned about this matter in terms of the freedom of the vote.

The other thing which worries me is the attempt by the government and those who would ask us to support the bill to suggest there is some form of onus on those who would oppose the bill to justify the position they have taken or will take when they vote. We heard that this afternoon, and we heard it pretty well every day during the course of the debate. I am not questioning the good faith of those who argue for this bill but, quite frankly, I think that aspect of our affairs is completely reversed.

I recall in 1973, when we last dealt with this bill and when I came into the House for the first time, listening carefully to the speeches made at the time, listening carefully to the solicitor general of the day put forward the bill, and listening to those who supported him by indicating it was a reasonable and proper proposition at the time to ask this House to support a bill which continued the experiment of abolition of the death penalty which had gone on five years before. Those who supported the measure at that time also said there was a good case for continuing the retention of the death penalty for the murderers of policemen and prison guards who were murdered in the course of performing their duty.

That proposition was put to us on the basis of the evidence that existed at the time. I supported the bill at that time. But the question I must ask myself today, as a member of parliament considering this legislation and who must stand by himself to vote and decide, is whether the circumstances of our society to which this bill applies in terms of the death penalty are better or worse today, and whether in view of those circumstances I can in the exercising of my right to vote in this place change the position I took in 1973.

● (1720)

Quite frankly, I have thought and I have worried about it because I do not take any vote lightly. I have come to the conclusion that the circumstances are such that I cannot support the proposal by the government which would abolish the death penalty for the killers of policemen, prison guards and other people in authority acting in the course of their duty.

The interesting thing about this bill is that it does not make a different individual out of a policeman or prison guard as a person, but only relates to that person in the course of his duty. We ask something of prison guards, of policemen, of constables, of custodial officers, of wardens, of jailers, of keepers, of guards and of permanent employees of prisons, to use the words of the statute, that we do not ask of ourselves—that is, we ask them to enter into circumstances for our protection. If there is an argument to be advanced, or if there is a statistic to be advanced which would indicate that the position taken by the government in 1973 ought to be different in 1976, then I would like to hear it. Until I hear it, and until I can be satisfied that that position is changed for the better, then I think I am bound to be consistent with what I stood for in 1973.

Given the very limited circumstances in which we speak of retention as opposed to abolition, the other question that has arisen in the course of this debate is the whole matter of deterrence. What has happened in the course of this debate, and even this afternoon out of the mouth of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), is that we have heard arguments both for and against capital punishment as if we were talking today about a law which said that all murderers were to be hanged. But we have gone far beyond that. I say, with respect and with some deference, that it is coming quite close to intellectual dishonesty to use the arguments that would have applied in the day when we were discussing the first movement away from the death penalty, at a period of time when we are now discussing the death penalty as it applies to a very narrow class. That is the first point.

I have looked for, and I have not found, one statistic which advances or supports the limited position. We are asked to accept the argument that in no case is the death penalty a deterrent. I cannot believe that is so. I cannot bring myself to accept the position that in every case involving the death of persons in the cases I have described, which are set forth in section 214 of the Criminal Code, where there has been an opportunity, in a way perhaps of husband and wife, or businessmen dealing one with another, do not have the opportunity to premeditate and think in advance, the death penalty is not a deterrent.

It is my fate, I suppose, as best I can, with my training and background in the law as a defence counsel, and as a Crown attorney—and I am very proud to have served in both capacities—to have to put my feet in the shoes of the accused and ask myself, if this were me, would I be deterred by the knowledge of the penalty?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If this were "I".

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I stand corrected. If this were I, and I had a certain knowledge of the consequences, namely, the imposition of the death penalty, would I be deterred from committing a crime that would lead to that even? Looking at it personally, I have to say that I cannot conceive of a situation, given a level of understanding or given a level of sanity, in which I would not be so deterred and in which other people would not be deterred. So I believe it is a false argument to say that the

death penalty is not a deterrent, because I think there are cases where it is. If there are cases where it is, as I believe we can find, I think it is incumbent upon us to ask ourselves what we are asking of those who, as the Minister of Justice said, are acting in the protection of society. We should ask ourselves what they are undertaking, with the setting aside of the death penalty.

So far as the statistics are concerned, when we are dealing with a matter of this nature with respect to the number of murders that have taken place, it is my respectful submission that there is no statistic available anywhere to indicate the number of murders that have not taken place as a result of the consideration of the penalty. Surely, if lesser penalties are regarded as deterrents for lesser crimes, then the supreme penalty must be regarded as a deterrent for the supreme crime, the taking of human life. So, sir, I do not intend to support this bill.

Another matter which has come up in this House is the whole question of conscience. I refuse to accept that in one way or another votes taken by members of parliament on an issue of this nature are matters of conscience and that other votes are not matters of conscience. I think that in one way or another all votes taken by members of parliament are matters of conscience. While I would want to retain the independence of my own conscience, in terms of any vote I take, whether on capital punishment or otherwise, I cannot condemn, and I would not condemn, members of parliament who have decided that as a matter of conscience they wish to represent, in their vote, what they feel are the wishes of their constituents.

Surely, if a member wishes to represent the 100,000 or so people who sent him or her here, this is a matter for the conscience of that member of parliament. We are sent here to make judgments. We cannot confer on every issue with our constituents. We have to decide how we will vote, we have to decide on what basis we will vote, and we have to decide what will motivate us with respect to voting. I have not taken a poll in my constituency. I do not think I have to do that. I think I know my constituents well enough to know that in terms of their feelings about this piece of legislation and the issue of capital punishment they feel as strongly as any other group of Canadians.

● (1730)

However, with that feeling which I know exists, as a member of parliament I have to make a decision on the legislation which is put before me, on the debate I have heard and on the consequences, as I see them, if this bill passes in terms of the custodial people I have described. I believe we will be doing them and, indirectly, society a disservice if we do not make the proper decision. I do not accept the argument that the retention of the death penalty for the limited number of people it would affect in any way is exclusive to the whole issue of improving conditions in society. Nor do I accept that there is no place in our system of justice for the proper use of the royal prerogative of mercy. The emphasis has to be on the words "proper use".

I recognize too that there can be difficulties in terms of the trial of an accused. Mistakes can be made in the course of trials. Those mistakes can be made no matter what crime or accused is being tried. We might consider the offence a lesser offence or a greater offence, but those are the vicissitudes which have to be faced in any human institution. The system of justice which we use in this country as it is incorporated in the Criminal Code in terms of criminal law and the appellate process is perhaps the best in the world, and if those aspects of the legal machinery should fail there is a place for the proper use of the royal prerogative of mercy. I think that if there is any doubt in terms of whether an accused was properly identified, whether evidence was admitted which ought not have been admitted, whether there was some question of the mental balance of the accused, or a host of other matters which might arise in a capital case, then no one who is reasonable in this country could condemn a cabinet for exercising that royal prerogative of mercy.

I know that generally cabinets in the past—and I assume cabinets of the future will do so—perhaps took more time with respect to commutation matters than other matters which might have come before them. The cabinet decision has a profound effect on the life of a human being, and that is as it should be. However, the responsibility to administer the law and to act in accordance with the law is an important one. What has happened, unfortunately, in the operation of our system is that there has been a suspicion abroad that government decisions have been based more on how ministers feel—although perhaps honestly and strongly—than on administering the law. I hope that that is not so because I do not believe we should be subject to the rule of man but rather we should be subject to the rule of law.

This is not a very easy speech for me to make, and it will not be an easy vote for me. I am not a violent person, but I believe that there is a case to be made for the retention now in the law on the basis of the deterrent effects the death penalty can have on those who have an opportunity to think about what they are doing, and having had that opportunity, go ahead and act anyway. It is because of that very important aspect of premeditation that the present law ought to stand and that this bill should be defeated.

I respect the opinions of those who differ with me. I am sure that those who differ with me feel as strongly as I do. I believe that this House should come to a decision fairly quickly with respect to this matter, subject to the right of each hon. member who wants to speak on the principle of the bill to do so.

I had not intended to speak at all in the course of this debate, but after I read and listened, I felt that I had to rise and put my position as honestly, fairly, succinctly and as briefly as I could, and I want to thank the House for its respectful attention to what I have had to say.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, this has to be one of the longest debates I have seen in the House of Commons since I became a member of parliament back in 1968. I think this is one of the issues upon which hon. members have really had to dig down deep and put their thoughts, minds, hearts, and souls on the line because it is an issue which deals with life and death. These life and death issues are not always easy to deal with.

I am not going to speak very long in this debate. Many of the arguments have been made, and made well, by speak-

ers on both sides of the issue. This will be a free vote for all of us, despite what some hon. members opposite might try to say. It will be a free vote for the cabinet.

Mr. Stevens: Oh, no.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): It will be a free vote for the cabinet despite what some hon. members opposite might think or say.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): I know each member in our caucus, and with all honesty and from my own knowledge of each of them I can say that they will truly be voting according to their consciences and according to what they believe. In my own case, I have wrestled back and forth. There was a time in my life when I was a retentionist, absolutely. I was concerned about some of the rather heinous crimes, the rather rotten crimes that were foisted upon us by criminals, such as the killing of young children, young men or young women. But after I surveyed the issue and looked at it very carefully I came to the conclusion that there is no place in the law books of our country, a civilized country like ours, for the death penalty.

● (1740)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I am going to support Bill C-84 and vote in favour of abolishing the death penalty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): The chief motivation I have for voting for the bill is my respect for human life. There is a lot of opinion on this side of the issue and I think some of it is best expounded by the various churches. I think the largest group of public opinion that makes the point on this side of the issue comes from the churches, and I should like to read some brief statements by the churches that back up my statement. Bishop G. Emmett Carter, President of the Canadian Catholic Conference, states:

> Parliament should abolish the death penalty and "bring about the reforms which are necessary in our penitentiary system and in all areas of justice.
>
> A society which really respects life cannot use the death penalty to protect itself and at the same time create an atmosphere wherein other human rights will be respected. Moreover, violence engenders violence and the death penalty is a violent act. The spirit of the gospel is one which leads us to favour mercy and clemency."

The seventeenth General Council of the United Church of Canada states:

> We affirm our belief that capital punishment is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Christ.

The statement of the Anglican Church, written by Dr. Leonard Hatfield, is equally profound:

> Surely the taking of life is not conducive to the recognition of the worth of the individual and the consequent protection of society.
>
> There can be no question about the unfortunate influence of an execution upon many other persons. For instance, prisoners often identify themselves with the condemned person. They see in his death the ultimate rejection of those who through life have been rejected by society, so they hate society the more.

There are just some of the statements. I could go on. There has been a lot of debate about whether capital punishment is a deterrent. I think if people read with an open mind and and open heart all the information that is available they should be convinced, as I am, that no case can be made for taking a man's or woman's life as a deterrent to murder. It just is not so. You can look at the statistics and consider the body of opinion and you will see fluctuations and changes from year to year all around the world.

Countries that have been abolitionist have shown fluctuations, and countries that still use the death penalty have shown wide fluctuations in their views. One year the statistics would be very high and another year they would be very low. If you look at the so-called murder graph, if you want to put it that way, in terms of countries that are retentionist versus countries that are abolitionist, it comes out very clearly on the side of those countries that are abolitionist.

In 1975 the murder rate in abolitionist countries was 2.8 per 100,000 population; in the retentionist countries it was 4.95 per 100,000 of population. In 1966 the figures were 3.45 abolitionist, 5.9 retentionist; in 1967, 3.25 abolitionist, 6.35 retentionist; 1968, 3.9 abolitionist, 6.7 retentionist; in 1969, 4.0 abolitionist, 7.0 retentionist, and in 1970 they were 4.65 abolitionist and 7.65 retentionist. I think these figures show very clearly that taking a human life is not a deterrent to murder.

One of the fears that many of my constituents have is that people get out on easy parole terms and I must say I have been somewhat concerned about that as well. I am glad to see that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) has taken steps to change the law so that there is really no such thing as easy parole.

I am also pleased to see a clause in Bill C-83 that would deal with the habitual criminal. Criminologists and others who deal with the penal system know very well that there are some people who can be described as an accident looking for a place to happen. These people will no longer be turned out into society if it can be shown that they really are in the category of an accident looking for a place to happen. They just will not ever get out again. I think that is fine, because society must be protected. That is what Bill C-83 and Bill C-84 are all about—the protection of society. We must be concerned with it, and we must find the best way possible to protect society against violent crimes.

From 1920 to 1974 182 persons were granted parole often a death sentence. Only 14 had their parole revoked for misbehaviour, and only nine of these had again committed an indictable offence.

Between 1867 and 1975, in the entire history of our country, only one who had his death sentence commuted committed a second murder. These are pretty substantial bits of evidence that the death penalty is not a deterrent.

I said in the beginning that I was not going to speak very long, and I shall not, as I think there are other members who wish to speak. I just wish to reaffirm my position that I shall vote in favour of Bill C-84. I do not think there is

any place in a civilized society for the death penalty, and it should be abolished.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I for one was not going to enter this debate until I saw some of the tactics being used by the government to manipulate the House into an early passage of Bill C-84. As a result I have reviewed the situation, and tonight I should like to say a few words touching first of all on the whole question of urgency. Why does the government seem to feel it is so urgent that this legislation be passed quickly without, I would suggest, due committee review, and before the House recesses?

I say that because the last time we dealt with this general question was in the last parliament. It was only in December, 1973, that we passed Bill C-2. It provided the limited continuation of the death penalty, until December 31, 1977. You will recall that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) almost pleaded for the bill to be accepted; he said he needed extra time in which to gather statistics in order to make a meaningful review. He was concerned about an 18-year review, and specifically about figures relating to the periods 1956-62, 1962-68, and 1968-74. He made a good argument at that time.

● (1750)

Having read the minister's most uninformative statement as reported in *Hansard*, and the 55-page statement which was not reported in *Hansard* but which was delivered outside the House on the same day, I conclude that the minister glossed over certain statistics; which were allegedly, the very reason for his wanting an extension of the provisions of Bill C-2 to which I have already referred.

The minister indicated that the murder rate per 100,000 of population rose from 1.2 in 1962 to 2.4 in 1974. He included these facts in the statement, made in this House and outside. But he did not point out that in the previous six years the murder rate had remained static at about 1 per 100,000 for the period ended 1962. In those previous six years it hovered at approximately one per year, and the significant increase in the murder rate occurred in the last 12 years.

I believe, as does my party's House leader, that if the government was serious about allowing a free vote on the bill the Solicitor General would have presented as ably as possible all statistics bearing on those three six-year review periods to which I previously referred. Therefore the first point with which I wished to deal this evening was the question of urgency. There is no urgency.

Second, I wish to touch briefly on the 55-page ministerial statement to which I alluded earlier. I shall quote certain parts of that statement to show that it contains conflicting positions. Before I do so, I wish to deal with this general proposition: is capital punishment a deterrent? I shall review the experience of other countries.

Contrary to what the Liberals and socialists like to think, there is no stampede on the part of the world's nations in the abolitionist direction. States are not stampeding to become abolitionist. Certainly United Nations records make that clear, records prepared by United Nations officials who themselves, obviously, are abolitionists, show capital punishment is increasing. They state, in despair, that the nations of the world are increasingly imposing the death penalty, that such imposition is on the increase, not on the decrease. I point out that the Communist states of the world are uniform in retaining the death penalty. Not one has done away with the death penalty; yet those in this House who espouse the virtues of some of those states say we should be abolitionists.

Mr. Gilbert: I didn't know you were a Communist.

Mr. Stevens: Such hon. members are selective when referring to their Communist friends in other countries. They like to quote them when it suits their purpose and to ignore them if it is embarrrassing.

I should like to review specifically the provisions of the bill itself. Some hon. members including those on the government side, have spoken about so-called tough parole provisions. I wish to refer hon. members to certain specific clauses to which, for some reason, the minister did not refer, either in his lengthy statement made outside the House or in the statement he put on the *Hansard* record. For example, there is this provision: even though a man may be imprisoned for life, he may leave jail if he has an escort. Mr. Speaker, I have checked this. The bill would give a person who has been jailed, presumably for life, the privilege of absenting himself from jail, provided he has an escort. How can you call that being harsh with the criminal, being harsh with the convicted murderer?

I am sorry the minister did not deal specifically, clause by clause, with some of these provisions on which I wish to touch later this evening.

Mr. Allmand: This is second reading.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member cannot do that at this time. He should discuss the clauses of the bill in committee.

Mr. Stevens: The hon. member on my left says I cannot do that at this time and that I should leave the discussion of such matters until the bill is in committee. Are we not to comment on certain provisions in the bill, which the minister introduced, which are unduly lax? When the hon. member speaks of the committee review I ask, what sort of committee review will take place with regard to this bill? The guillotine is to be used. The chairman of the committee is an abolitionist; he has sat in the House, pounding his desk to applaud every abolitionist speech made in the House. But still we are told that there is to be meaningful review in the committee, a committee dominated by government members without the courage to accept this bill as a straightforward, government bill, and without the courage to ask the nation to endorse, or otherwise, their actions. We are told that the vote on the bill is to be a so-called free vote; but the cabinet is required to vote en bloc.

If I had time before six o'clock I would quote the minister's words, words which suggest that this is a government bill and that, contrary to the suggestions of certain ministers, the vote, as far as the cabinet is concerned, is not to be a free vote.

Mr. Allmand: How can you sleep at night?

Mr. Gilbert: He doesn't.

Mr. Stevens: I say this because some in this House wish to act in a manner against the will of the Canadian public. To me, if democracy is to flourish, it must continue to evolve. This House must facilitate the expression of the public will and provide for the implementation of that will. I suggest that our system has developed certain rigidities which allow the few, in this case the abolitionists, to impose their view on the majority in this country. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

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

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, before the six o'clock adjournment I was touching on various matters coming under Bill C-84. I felt I should set the record straight this evening concerning the question of a so-called free vote with respect to Bill C-84. When this matter was before us in October, 1973, in the last parliament, the question of the free vote was dealt with, and at that time the Solicitor General was relatively free in his comments. I draw the attention of the House to *Hansard* for October 18, 1973, page 7015. At that time, referring to Bill C-2, the Solicitor General stated:

This is a government bill. For the members of our party and all other parties, as far as we are concerned it is a free vote, but not for the government, meaning the cabinet.

I refer to that because as far as I know—

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member is quite correct that I did say that. However, within a few days I was corrected by both the House leader and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who said, contrary to what I said, that it was a free vote for the cabinet and all those on the government side. I was, therefore, corrected in that.

Mr. Stevens: If the Solicitor General is correct with regard to my reference in 1973, perhaps he will be rising on a further question of privilege in a few moments because, on February 12, 1976, dealing with Bill C-84, the bill before us, there is a long exchange between my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), and the Solicitor General, at which time my colleague was trying to get this identified. He asked whether in fact the Prime Minister said he would resign if this abolitionist legislation did not go through. There was some fencing that went on, and finally my colleague from Calgary North asked the Solicitor General, and I quote:

—I should like to ask him pointblank if he can assure the House on behalf of the government, and particularly members of cabinet, that there will be a free vote in this House on capital punishment when the bill is presented?

The minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, it will be similar to the last occasion when we dealt with this. There will be a government bill to which the government will be committed, but members of this House who are not with the government will be free to vote on it as they see fit.

The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) then said:

You have said it all now—no free vote.

Mr. Allmand: I was again corrected after that. Maybe I tried to give expression to my wishes.

Mr. Stevens: The Solicitor General keeps commenting that he has been correcting statements made on earlier occasions in this House. I think it is fair to ask him when do we believe him and when do we not. On two separate occasions dealing with two separate bills, C-2 and C-84, he categorically stated it was a free vote for everybody but the cabinet. Then he says that on two separate occasions he corrected the record after discussion with two members of the cabinet.

● (2010)

An hon. Member: He was corrected. He did not correct.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The hon. member for York-Simcoe has the floor and I suggest he be given the chance to make his point.

Mr. Stevens: One or two members on the government side are obviously feeling very touchy about this item. They ask, "What has it got to do with the bill before us?"

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: I suggest it has everything to do with it. This is a government bill and the fact is that there will not be a free vote. The government does not have the courage to tell the Canadian people that it is trying to inflict abolition on the nation against its will.

Before the House rose for dinner I mentioned that in my view for democracy to flourish it should continually evolve. I believe it essential that public opinion should be allowed to express itself. I said our system had developed certain rigidities, a situation which is presently allowing a minority, in this case a minority of abolitionists, to assert its will over the majority of Canadians. The parliamentary system is allowing this because there has been so little change in that system over the past century.

Governments have learned that by catering to minorities they can secure re-election and deal harshly with certain sections of public opinion. They have learned that they can frustrate the will of the majority—it is just the question of choosing the right time. In the view of the administration, this is an opportune moment, about two years away from the next election, to inflict abolition on the state. That is one of the issues I intend to deal with tonight.

Few electors in this country can comprehend the degree of power held by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) today, though many senior officials in the public service and his intimate advisers do. Oscar Wilde's quip, made some 80 years ago, that democracy meant simply the bludgeoning of the people by the people might well be an apt description of the government's approach to this legislation. It appears that between elections there is little need to court public opinion. After an election date is decided upon, the wooing process begins. New programs are offered with

particular appeal to vocal minorities. Regional interests are championed. Stress is laid on proposed new handouts with little mention of their eventual cost to the public at large.

Once re-elected the government is subjected to little restraint or discipline. With a majority in parliament, it is supreme. This situation has arisen here and elsewhere after 30 years of Liberal-socialistic rule in western democracies. Those who once were reformers, who indeed sought democracy, have become unresponsive to the wishes of today's majority and impatient with the democratic process itself. They now use our parliamentary institution as a device to impose their minority views on the majority. They are confident the next election will turn little on today's issues and more on personalities and the floss of the day. Examples of this attitude are numerous.

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), leading spokesman on this bill for the NDP contingent in parliament, speaking in favour of the government's bill to abolish capital punishment, sums up his thinking when he says, as reported at page 13096 of *Hansard* for May 3, 1976:

I regret that so many people in our society misunderstand and think that they have the right, because they believe they have a majority, to decide how we should vote.

I hope all members noted the odd terminology used by the hon. member for Greenwood while, in effect, seconding the passage of this bill on behalf of the Solicitor General.

Mr. Abbott: You hate democracy.

Mr. Stevens: That is right. The hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) said "They hate democracy." The hon. member put it very well. If he reads what the hon. member for Greenwood said a little later on he will find he elaborated on this question of how parliamentarians should relate their votes to the wishes of their constituents.

I would draw attention to the fact that the Solicitor General took the same tone with respect to this bill as did the hon. member for Greenwood, saying—as can be confirmed by reference to page 44 of the prepared text of his speech—that somehow or other members should sit in this House and vote according to their own consciences or according to their own convictions, in spite of evidence that the public will would have them do otherwise. Both those hon. members referred to Edmund Burke, a Conservative, to justify their stand on this issue. Mr. Speaker, Edmund Burke is a well-known authority, but surely for two members, the minister and the hon. member for Greenwood, to suggest we should be bound by the views of a Conservative politician 202 years ago is absolutely ridiculous. I question whether either of them troubled to check out the situation in England at the time the speech to which they were referring was made to the electors of Bristol in 1774.

At that time, when Burke spoke of his role as a member of parliament, the total number of people who were actually able to vote in England was less than 100,000. Members were in fact elected through "pocket boroughs" and other cozy arrangements; the age of widespread enfranchisement in England had not yet been reached. When Burke spoke, the population of England was some seven million. Means of communication were sketchy. There was, of course, no radio, no telephone network, no television. There was no way in which the public at large could be rapidly informed concerning the issues of the day.

What I find interesting is that when members opposed to abolition quote from the Bible or from other religious sources concerning capital punishment, the response from the other side is always, "Do not take those statements out of context." Yet this is exactly what those very members have done with respect to Edmund Burke's comments. What he was saying was merely this: he was asking the voters of Bristol to realize that when he went to Westminster they should not expect him to vote only in the interests of the electors of Bristol but, rather, that they should expect him to vote in the interests of the nation as a whole.

Put in a different context, he was saying that when a member is elected from Toronto he should not be expected to go to parliament and become a protagonist for the interests of Toronto as against, for example, the interests of Montreal or some other city. Edmund Burke was suggesting that we should sit here to consider the interests of the nation, not local issues. If I may quote him directly, he said:

● (2020)

Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interest each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one purpose, that of the whole;—

I hear the House leader applauding that.

—where, not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not member of Bristol, but he is a member of parliament.

I was hoping that the Solicitor General and the House leader as well as others on the government side would applaud that as they did, since they do not seem to know in subsequent years Edmund Burke said something entirely different. For example, in his speech in 1780 on the economical report Edmund Burke had this to say, and I would draw it to the attention of the Solicitor General he said that the people are the masters.

Mr. Sharp: Of course; the people can throw them out.

Mr. Stevens: The House leader says that the people can throw them out. I can assure you that the people will throw you out if you give them half a chance. Call an election on this issue before us today and just see what happens.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. Stevens: Edmund Burke, in his tract on the property laws, also said this:

In all forms of government the people is the true legislator.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Read it all. Tell us what he went on to say next.

Mr. Stevens: That is the quote that is relevant. If the hon. member wishes to quote Edmund Burke he can get up a little later and do so. Let me give the House another quotation from Edmund Burke, since this has been intro-

duced by abolitionists in an attempt to make members of this House feel a little better when they vote against the wishes of their constituents and on the basis of their own convictions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for York-Simcoe has the floor.

Mr. Gilbert: I thought Edmund Burke had it.

Mr. Stevens: The whip on the government side was asking for some additional quotations from Edmund Burke. In his letter to the sheriffs at Bristol, Edmund Burke had this to say:

> If any ask me what a free government is, I answer, that for any practical purpose, it is what the people think so.

The point I want to make is that in a democratic society it is wrong for any government to be imposing the abolition of capital punishment on the people without at least asking for their views by way of a referendum, so as to guide the government. The people want retention. So do I. That is why I oppose this bill.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Why does you leader support it? Tell us about Joe Clark.

Mr. Stevens: I would ask the government why it has consistently refused to hold a referendum. As we all know, in California five million people, some 67 per cent of those who voted on the plebiscite or referendum in that state, voted for capital punishment, and the California state legislature in 1974 re-enacted capital punishment in response to the referendum. Why does this government wish to duck out of the issue and not consult the public on this important question?

Mr. Allmand: That provision is in their constitution.

Mr. Foster: Why don't you become an American?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I find the comments from hon. members opposite typical of an arrogant government that is ready to fall. In fact one of their members was telling me just before the break that he was hoping to get on tonight with his abolitionist speech because he was wavering and may have to speak for capital punishment tomorrow, he was so undecided.

Mr. Allmand: That shows how free the vote is.

Mr. Stevens: The Solicitor General keeps raising this question of a free vote. Perhaps he could clarify this. Does he anticipate that any member of the Cabinet is going to vote against his bill?

Mr. Allmand: Are you asking me a question?

Mr. Stevens: Perhaps in due course you can answer that. I said before the break that I intended to review the situation with respect to capital punishment in other countries. As I was saying, some kind of aura has been put around this to try to show that Canada is out of step with other countries of the world, that we are one of the last retentionist countries, or will be if this bill should not pass. That, Mr. Speaker, is just not true.

I refer hon. members to various publications of the United Nations, including one that was published on February 23, 1973. In that publication there is a review of the state of the death penalty around the world, and paragraph 73 on page 21 of the report reads as follows:

> Since the intention of the General Assembly embodied in resolution 3011 is to promote abolition, it would seem that there is still much more to be done. Opinion polls made in abolitionist countries as well as retentionist countries show a majority of people favouring capital punishment. It is also evident that on a world scale, Governments are inclined to favour the maintenance of this penalty.

Mr. Allmand: How many are democratic countries?

Mr. Stevens: Paragraph 74:

> The death penalty is always used when a particular problem seems to grow out of proportion and frightens public opinion or when a political opposition has to be crushed.

The report then states that all communist countries have the death penalty—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stevens: —and it makes the point that many countries have made no progress at all towards abolition of the death penalty. Indeed, in some cases it has been used more widely, and harsher methods have been used to put the condemned to death.

As I say, that report was published in 1973. Then on February 12, 1975, an updated report was published which is really more startling. At page 6 of the report it is pointed out that only nine member states were abolitionist by law; that is, that the law does not provide for the death penalty. Since this report was published one more country has been added, making a total of 10. In other words, we would be the eleventh abolitionist nation if we approved this bill as proposed by the government.

Mr. Allmand: How many have *de facto*?

Mr. Stevens: Some 101 countries retain capital punishment for ordinary offences, the report points out. If the Solicitor General has not read this report I would recommend that he do so because it gives the number of executions carried out in Japan, for example.

Mr. Allmand: Carried out where?

Mr. Stevens: Japan. Would you like to know the number?

Mr. Allmand: Yes.

Mr. Stevens: The Solicitor General wants to know how many. In the period under review, 71 persons—69 men and two women—were executed in Japan. Does that satisfy you, Mr. Solicitor General?

● (2030)

An hon. Member: Address the Chair.

Mr. Stevens: At page 9 of this updated report of the United Nations, Item No. 48 states:

It remains extremely doubtful whether there is any progression towards the restriction of the use of the death penalty. Periods of abolition or non-use may be succeeded by widespread executions in a highly unstable political situation or by a sudden return to the death penalty as a sanction where a State feels insecure. Moreover, in a few States where serious forms of terror and violence have been experienced, the death penalty has been used increasingly as counter-terror, or deterrence.

That is an interesting new conclusion in that report, and I invite hon. members to read both reports because I believe, unlike the Solicitor General's presentation, this report is a fair presentation of the state of the death penalty at this time around the world, written incidentally by abolitionists, in the sense that the United Nations has hoped for more abolition than there is presently in the world.

I mentioned earlier that I would like to touch upon certain provisions in the legislation. I was rather surprised that the Solicitor General did not give some type of overview of the various provisions, but I realize he should not be referring to them clause by clause. I would point out to hon. members that general impression has been created, that somehow when we adopt abolition there will be tougher parole laws and tougher treatment of those people adjudged guilty, but that is not in accordance with the facts as you will see if you read this bill. There are provisions dealing, for example, with time spent in custody. Before I read the bill carefully I did not realize that the minister contemplated that when he had written in the reference to a firm 15 years or 25 years, he meant it to be clear that the time started running from the time an individual was charged and not from when he was convicted.

Let me point out that there are three individuals awaiting execution on July 15, 1976. One was first charged in October 1971, the second was first charged in February, 1973, and the third was charged in June, 1973. I would think it reasonable to anticipate that a person could spend five years, perhaps, and certainly three, going through the various judicial procedures prior to final conviction, and that that time apparently would be included as part of the time to be served in prison.

There are two provisions I find particularly interesting. The first is a provision which allows the parliament of Canada to enact, by express reference to the act we contemplate passing, a new act freeing a man who has been duly convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment. This is something I do not think the public fully understands. This bill does not just contemplate doing away with the death penalty by requiring a person to be imprisoned for life. Nobody need be imprisoned for life under this bill if he can get this parliament or a subsequent parliament to take up his case and enact a special act to spring him. For those who say that somehow or other a life imprisonment is worse even than hanging, let me point out that no one, even if he is sentenced to life, need despair because he can take up his case with the government or any member of this House who can try to secure his freedom through the passage of another act, making reference to the part I referred to in Bill C-84.

There is another clause in this bill which I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members. It states that:

Notwithstanding the Penitentiary Act and the Parole Act, in the case of any person sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole for a specified number of years pursuant to this Act, no absence without escort may be authorized under the Penitentiary Act and no day parole may be granted under the Parole Act—

That made me very curious. I wanted to know what was meant by "no absence without escort". Here we have a convicted murderer imprisoned supposedly for life, and yet he may absent himself from prison as long as he is escorted. I checked the Penitentiary Act and I found there were two people who could let any criminal out. First, the commissioner can let such a criminal out for an unlimited period for medical reasons and for a period not exceeding 15 days for humanitarian reasons, or to assist in the rehabilitation of the inmate. In addition, the officer in charge can allow a prisoner out for a period not exceeding 15 days for medical reasons and for a period not exceeding three days for humanitarian reasons, or to assist in the rehabilitation of the inmate. Mr. Speaker even if you are not a retentionist, how can this House support such soft treatment for a convicted murderer? I believe it is important—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the hon. member would be given unanimous consent to continue.

An hon. Member: Go ahead.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: Why did you say no?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The Chair heard somebody say "no", so the hon. member for Peace River has the floor.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I accept the keenness of your hearing, Mr. Speaker. I would not disagree with the Chair's right to hear, as that is one of the few benefits that accrue to distinguished people like yourself who occupy that office.

Before I begin some of my comments I want to touch for a minute on some of the things said by other hon. members, including the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the hon. member who has just taken his seat. Before doing that I want to say simply and categorically that I intend to vote for the bill. I say that immediately to make it easier for those who do not want to stay and listen to my reasons, but who may wish to depart.

Having regard to the very valid suggestion by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), I believe we should consider very seriously the necessity of assuring that this bill receives second reading. Apart from some of the major issues in respect of which we may differ, the

parliamentary practice at the present time leads us to the conclusion that third reading is the stage at which we can best deal with a bill of this kind, that is, when we see it in its finished form.

There are those who feel some improvements ought to be made, and there are those who feel, as did the Minister of Justice, that if the people come to the conclusion that capital punishment is a suitable penalty for certain types of offences, they should have the right to attempt to obtain the approval of their colleagues in this House during the free vote, and that hon. members should have the right to move the kind of amendments that are available under our rules in an attempt to reach a consensus.

I say it once that I will vote for the bill as it stands. I like the bill as it stands, and I have been a constant opponent of capital punishment for well over 40 years. I would prefer to see the bill passed in its present from. However, if it were the will of this House, expressed by a majority that there be some exclusions, and I were driven very hard to it, I would sorrowfully and regretfully vote for such an amended bill. I hope it will not come to that. I hope we will have the chance to hear all of the proposals which might lead to amendments, deal with them in this House and in the committee, as we should, with the net result that the bill will come back in its present form for third reading.

● (2040)

On the question of a referendum I would refer hon. members to a very considerable speech made in the 1973 debate by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), who dealt very extensively with this issue. He made quite plain in his speech that members of this House had a duty which was not consistent with a system of referenda. I will come to this again.

If we are to abdicate our responsibility I can see a situation in which we would watch carefully the statistics which come out from Statistics Canada. Members of this House would set their sights at objectives which Statistics Canada, or the polls taken by an institute of polling, would suggest indicated the course of conduct which at that particular time the people of Canada would prefer the government to adopt. What kind of consistency of approach in respect of government would we have under those circumstances? My experience, Sir, over a very long period of time as a practitioner of law, as a soldier, and as a member of this House is that people do change their approach to a number of the problems they face.

Twenty-five or 30 years ago, I think a majority of the people in this country were opposed to capital punishment, for reasons with which I will deal briefly. The pendulum has swung since then. Now I think the majority of people for certain reasons favour the return of capital punishment. But there is nothing to suggest that 25 or 30 years from now the pendulum will not swing the other way. From my experience and my knowledge I suspect very strongly that this will be the case. Therefore while it is essential that any member of parliament or any person elected to office should have a very serious responsibility to consult with his constituents, to make shift and to understand their thinking, and to speak to and to listen to them—any elected member who does not recognize that responsibility is a fool and does not deserve to hold elected office—I do not think this should mean that such a man may not exercise his judgment and discretion or be free to yield readily from time to time to the changing ideas, trends, and whims of a number of people in his constituency, or in the country.

I think in our approach to this issue we should be very careful. I made a speech in favour of the abolition of capital punishment well over 40 years ago in a church basement in a small community, where there were members from many denominations. I spoke in favour of abolition in a speech which was accepted. I never wavered in my support for the abolition of capital punishment. I have spoken on numerous occasions both in this country and elsewhere. Although it has not been a major issue in elections, certainly during the course of the 1972 election and the 1974 election I was asked on a number of platforms what was my stand with regard to capital punishment. I was able to reply simply that I stand where I have stood before, that is, that I am opposed to capital punishment. I told them I believe in abolition and if they elected me they would be electing me with that point of view. I was elected with a substantial majority in 1972 and in 1974. I feel, as I think any other member sitting in this House will feel who was asked the question and took the stand I did, that I came into this House with this format and can vote as I indicated my position at the time of the election.

Like on the other occasions on which we have discussed this momentus issue, this has been a marathon debate. I do not say this disparagingly, although I had hoped we could take a quick decision as was the case in the United Kingdom during the course of the last two debates they had. However, this is a matter of great concern. While it affects only a comparatively few people it goes to the wellsprings of our civilization, our society, our culture, and our religious beliefs. It certainly is an issue on which no one should be denied the right to speak. I have listened to some of the speeches made during the debate. I have read others.

I take my mind back to some of the debates in this House in the last 18 or 19 years by some of the great members and leaders. I spoke of the right hon. member for Prince Albert and his speech. I have heard the present and former leaders of our party make very excellent contributions, great speeches, in which they expressed their views on the subject. I have heard the leader of the New Democratic Party and its two preceding leaders on the issue. I have heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the previous Prime Minister, the late Lester Pearson, speak on this issue.

I think one of the greatest speeches was one made by Arthur Maloney, now the Ontario ombudsman, who sat at that time in what was the rump of our party when we overflowed in those glorious days on to both sides of the House, a position which we are again rapidly approaching at the present time. He rose to his feet on a private members' bill, I think one introduced by the Hon. Frank McGee, and made one of the greatest and most eloquent and articulate speeches on this particular issue. Paul Martin, who was sitting in the House, told me that his opinion it was one of the greatest speeches he had heard on this issue. It convinced people. It is interesting to note that just a few weeks ago right in this House Mr. Maloney, with Bishop Carter, chairman of the Catholic Congress of Bishops, and other eminent people in this country who had

come here for a seminar, showed that he had lost none of his eloquence or his conviction that capital punishment must be abolished, and abolished permanently.

I have noted with interest that members on both sides of this House and on both sides of this House and on both sides of this issue have quoted from Scripture. I think it comes out even. I do not think it is necessary for me to quote from the Bible. This has been done by members on both side of the issue.

As I suppose have other members, I have received a number of letters containing quotations from the Bible. I have also received submissions from members of the public which dealt with different methods of execution. Some have recommended easy and painless methods. This, I think, would be quite difficult. In any event if it should be the wish of this parliament to have state executions become part of our social system, then it would be inconsistent with this wish to attempt to soften the effect by searching diligently for nicer, neater or tidier ways of killing that would be more acceptable to the condemned person.

I have pointed out before that I, as well as other members of this House, have appeared on behalf of a number of people, well over a score, who have been charged with murder. At various times during the course of briefing myself I took it upon myself to talk to them, previous to preparation for trial, to know their motivation, to know their purpose, to know what happened and how it happened. I think it is very essential to anyone who accepts the responsibility of defending a man or a woman charged with an offence which is punishable by capital punishment to do that. To that extent I suppose I have had a little better opportunity than quite a few people to make some clinical examination of the question of motivation.

● (2050)

People who spoke to me under those conditions in prison cells had no motive to conceal from me the true facts, and no reason to try to exaggerate their feelings, their viewpoints, and their attitudes, and I say to hon. members in this House that in not one instance of all those more than a score of people I talked to did it develop that the question of what might happen if they were caught, if they were convicted and if they were executed, enter their minds at all. That does not mean that it might not with regard to some people, but my observation of the people I spoke to, the people I had to consult with professionally, and the people whom I was charged with defending in a court of law, led me to the irresistable conclusion that the question of deterrence was not an issue which was in their minds at or immediately prior to the time their offences were committed. That is the clinical study which persuades me that there has been an exaggerated attitude and an exaggerated importance given to the question of deterrence.

The question of deterrence has been raised in a number of ways. For example, I noticed in a news report some months ago that those who were in favour of retention were able to given some prominence to statements made by two convicted murderers who said that, in their opinion, 25 years was a much harsher sentence than death, and that they would prefer to be executed rather than to sit out 20 or 25 years in jail. If that is the case, surely that gives the lie to those who suggest that the death penalty is an adequate deterrent, because if in the minds of those two people, who are intimately concerned about this issue, 25 years is a greater deterrent—and 25 years is the penalty suggested in this legislation—then it speaks to me quite plainly. It says to me quite plainly that, if there is a deterrent, the deterrent is in the harsh prison sentence and not in execution by hanging.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Now I will refer to some of the comments made in the very excellent paper—I do not agree with the paper, but it was well put together—which was the submission of the police chiefs. As I read these submissions I came to the opinion that buried, but still quite apparent, in these various submissions was the attitude that these police people and those who presented briefs for them did not really believe philosophically that, in a general way, capital punishment was a deterrent. What they said about deterrence was very simple. If a man commits murder and if he is captured, tried, and executed, that is a deterrent in the sense that that man cannot commit another offence. That is the point they made from their observations, and I think they veered well away from the issue of deterrence generally. They were submissions which were full of candour, they were brief—mercifully brief—and well put together. As I say, they represented a point of view with which I very heartily disagree, but they expressed honestly and candidly the other side of the argument. I think the only conclusion one can draw from examining what they said and wrote is that capital punishment is not a deterrent generally in a philosophical sense.

Finally, Mr. Woodburn Thompson, who was engaged by the police chiefs, and whose brief was the last one to appear in their submissions, said that in his opinion, as a result of his examination, to use capital punishment as a deterrent was barbaric. That was contained in the submissions put forward by the police associations of Canada.

Now we come to another group of people, those who are generally abolitionists by nature, thought, and attitude, but who feel that it might be better to keep the punishment of hanging with respect to one or two certain specified offences. Personally I find it very difficult to follow such logic. If the fear of death is not considered to be an adequate deterrent to prevent potential murderers from committing one kind of murder, how can it be said that it would constitute a deterrent in respect of another kind of murder?

Are we to assume that human nature can be so compartmentalized that a person planning a murder for revenge, or a cold blooded killing for some monetary consideration, would not be deterred by the fear that he might ultimately be placed on a scaffold and hanged, but that a person considering killing a policeman or a prison guard, or committing treason, will stop, reflect, and tell himself, "I had better not commit this crime because, if I do, I will face the ultimate penalty"?

I just fail to reconcile the kind of logic which suggests that while I like to feel I am an abolitionist, and while I am generally opposed to the state taking life, yet it may well be necessary to leave open the right for the state to hang people for one certain type of offence. How can that be

reconciled with the belief such a person must hold that capital punishment is not a deterrent? And that person generally takes the tolerant and proper attitude that it is no more right for the state to take life than it is the right of any person to take life. I fail to follow that kind of argument. For this reason I hope that this bill will receive at least second reading, so that if there is an argument to be made by such people it will be made and presented in the normal course of events in the committee, and come back into this House so we will have the opportunity of considering it sensibly and logically.

Therefore I think this brings us down to the real nature of the argument, that is, the true character of capital punishment. Once inflicted, it has the clear and simple effect of preventing the person who will have been executed from committing another crime. There is no doubt that many people who are in favour of capital punishment are in favour of it for that reason. In my opinion it is a simple form of institutionalized state vengeance.

Let us be honest and face the fact that this sort of thing has always represented a very strong element in our social structure. I do not agree with it, I do not like it, but we have to be realistic and remember that it was only several hundred years ago when inanimate objects which accidentally brought about injury and death to people were dealt with almost as if they were criminals themselves. Those inanimate objects might have been sticks, stones or weapons. If a person met his death or injury because of some accident involving inanimate objects, these objects were put on trial. Later we had trial by ordeal, and the fact that the crime of treason was punishable by the convicted person being hanged, drawn, and quartered.

● (2100)

Five hundred years ago is a long time to us, even to some hon. members who have been in this House for some time, but it is a heartbeat in the life of a society, in the history of mankind, and the characteristics of those earlier days are not easily eliminated. Particularly is this so at the present time when we live in a state of frustration felt in a society which is badly fractured, which is fearful and annoyed by the apparent toleration and encouragement of permissiveness, by government which moves against rather than with the grain of human nature.

I feel very strongly that it is this fear, this anxiety, this frustration, this anger which in many cases constitutes the compelling reason behind what appears to be the bloodthirsty mood of the normally mild, reasonable, and moderate Canadian people. Many of the views and much of the opinion of those who favour capital punishment seem to me to be part of this anger and this frustration, and the noose has become a symbol rather than a remedy.

I think people who stand up and talk about hanging do so not because many of them want to hang people or put their hand on the hand of the hangman as he springs the trap which sends condemned people down to choke to death, but because they feel this frustration. They want the right for their families to walk the streets, they want security and stability in society, and the noose has been picked as the symbol which suggests to them some way of restoring the things they seek.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot do anything but vote for this bill on the basis of such arguments as this. There has been a sort of mythology grow up that those who are in favour of capital punishment are strong, tough, he-men, and those who are opposed to it are weak and unable to deal with the true question of human nature; that they are squeamish and soft. I disagree with that. I fought in a war; I saw death, bloodshed, carnage, savagery—all completely regrettable but which probably resulted in the winning of a war which, hopefully, permitted us to make improvements in our society. It also, of course, permitted us to make some regrettable mistakes.

I consider too that death is part of life, part of that long road of life that leads to the ultimate gate through which we all must pass. I think it is in that sense that we can approach this issue. It is not because we are adverse to the fact that people must be punished; not at all.

It seems to me that the return of capital punishment would be a retrograde step. It would have some effect in brutalizing segments of our society. I do not think there are compensatory factors which would make up for that.

On this issue as well as on others, what lies before us is the gigantic scale of decision. I suggest that if we place the weight of abolition on one side and all the evidence which we can glean from study, from speeches, and listening to other people, and if we can place on the other side the weight of those people who believe in the infliction of capital punishment, the scales would balance. If that be the case then it is not good enough for those who have come to that conclusion to simply say, "The general trend of opinion is moving toward hanging; the world is disturbed; there is more violence and, in spite of my doubt, I will go along with those who want the return of capital punishment." I believe that is wrong.

If the scales are evenly balanced it is essential to pour into the pan of abolition the invisible but heavy weight which says that society does not improve by deliberately killing anybody, and the onus must lie on those who say that one killing deserves another.

With all our sense of tragedy and sorrow for those who have been murdered, I doubt very much if they are standing in the next world demanding that we who are left here to organize our society are bound to dispatch their murderers by dropping them through a scaffold.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Toronto-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for his remarks, many of which I subscribe to.

Even before we began our debate on this bill it was apparent to all of us that this is an issue that arouses a highly emotional response, by the members of this House and by those people whom we represent. Therefore I think it is especially important that we approach this issue with as dispassionate and rational an outlook as possible—without, however, ignoring the dictates of our conscience.

Those in favour of retaining the death penalty, or extending its application, argue that to abolish capital punishment is to show weakness toward the criminal element, to somehow reduce the protection of society, and

encourage the commission of crimes. I do not believe there is any justification for this view whatsoever.

First, it should be emphasized that there has been no proposal to remove the penal sanctions for the crime of murder, as some opponents of the bill have implied. The proposal in the bill is to replace capital punishment with a mandatory 25-year prison term, with severe restrictions on parole; this "life sentence" would in fact be the mandatory punishment for a greater number of crimes than are now punishable by death. I do not think this can be properly construed as a softening of attitude toward crime.

I think it can be shown conclusively that the death penalty is not an effective deterrent to murder, and that to view it as a solution to the problem of crime is extremely simplistic.

Mr. Stevens: Let us see the figures.

Mr. Robinson: Of all the offences, murder is most often committed in times of extreme emotional stress—during domestic quarrels, or in moments of panic during the commission of another crime. The deterrent effect of any punishment in such circumstances is negligible. This limitation of the deterrent theory of capital punishment was stated in a 1966 study done by the John Howard Association in Chicago. It said:

> The kind of rationality assumed by the deterrent theory of capital punishment may be present in the minds of legislators at the time of their deliberations about crime and punishment and may even be present in the minds of most persons in their reflective moments. To attribute the qualitative thinking of a deliberative body to the participants in an emotional situation that leds to murder, however, is gross over-simplification of the psychological forces involved in homicides.

There is no more reason to assume the effectiveness of capital punishment as a deterrent to the planned and deliberate murder. These crimes are most often committed by people with psychological abnormalities, who may not, however, fall within the legal definition of insanity. This type of personality is not deterred by the threat of remote punishment, no matter how severe, for some higher risks incurred by their behaviour may even increase the attraction to the crime being considered.

This is also true of the professional criminal, who merely accepts the risk of arrest and the prospect of punishment as part of the job. He is more likely to develop sophisticated techniques to avoid detection, that to be inhibited in his criminal conduct.

Experience in a number of countries bears out the theory of the ineffectiveness of capital punishment as a deterrent. In the United States, for example, during the 15 year period from 1951 to 1966, the number of executions actually carried out in a year declined from 105 to one. During that period there was not significant change in the murder rate. When Denmark abolished the death penalty in 1933, the number of murders actually declined in the next few years.

Studies which compare American states retaining capital punishment with abolitionist states reveal that homicide rates follow the same trends in both groups; there is no difference in the number of killings that can be attributed to either the presence or the absence of the death penalty. Similarly, in states where the death penalty was reintroduced after a period of abolition, there was no significant decrease in the number of murders. As Professor Sellin states:

● (2110)

> If any conclusion can be drawn from all the above data, it is that there is no evidence that the abolition of the death penalty generally causes an increase in criminal homicides or that its reintroduction is followed by a decline. The explanation of changes in homicide rates must be sought elsewhere.

The death penalty has been shown, in numerous studies, to be no more effective than long prison terms in deterring crime; and if it is not an effective restraint then its retention cannot be justified.

It is essential that the state use no more force than is absolutely necessary to accomplish its appointed task when acting to protect the community from the commission of future crimes; when taking measures to rehabilitate criminals; or when inflicting punishment on those who have broken the law. This principle is inherent in our system of criminal justice; to depart from this principle and allow the legal system to administer excessively severe punishment is to undermine the values that the system is attempting to uphold. This view is supported by the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers in a brief submitted to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). In calling for the total abolition of capital punishment the Association notes the failure of the death penalty to deter crime; it is, moreover, a weakening influence on our ethical and moral code since it reinforces the concept of the worthlessness of human life by an officially sanctioned violent act.

I might add that 15 years ago, at the University of Toronto School of Social Work I and Arthur Martin, who then was one of the most eminent counsel in Canada and now has been elevated to the Ontario Court of Appeal, participated in a debate on capital punishment. I spoke as an abolitionist. Two eminent counsel opposed us. I have never changed my mind.

A special commission established in Massachusetts to investigate the question of capital punishment reached the same conclusion, namely:

> The existence of capital punishment tends to cheapen human life. It tends to encourage both children and adults to believe that physical violence, the ultimate form of which is putting an individual to death, is a proper method of solving social and personal conflict . . . The only moral ground on which the state could conceivably possess the right to destroy human life would be if this were indispensable for the protection or preservation of other lives. This places the burden of proof on those who believe that capital punishment exercises a deterrent effect on the potential criminal. Unless they can establish that the death penalty does, in fact, protect other lives, at the expense of one, there is no moral justification for the state to 'take life'.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the death penalty can be shown as protecting lives; I do not believe that its retention can be morally justified. We have a duty to protect society from the criminal; we must punish, and we must use all the methods within our competence to rehabilitate. But we must not seek revenge for an act already committed; revenge neither restores the victim nor expiates the crime.

Opposition to the abolition of capital punishment has been expressed by some of our police forces. While they have a legitimate concern for their own safety, I do not think the death penalty would reduce the hazards of their

job. It not only fails to deter, but also creates an added risk. The criminal facing certain execution has nothing to lose by taking advantage of any means possible either to avoid detention or escape from custody. Prison guards and police officers would therefore be in even greater danger during the inevitable lapse of time before the death penalty could be carried out. The task of law enforcement can be made less dangerous only by reducing the level of violence in our society, and imposing capital punishment has precisely the opposite effect.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the emphasis that has been placed in the course of debate on this bill on the increasing crime rate, particularly the rapid rise in recent years in the number of murders. Certainly we must not ignore the social context in which this bill has been introduced. It is imperative that the government proceed with a co-ordinated and comprehensive program to attempt to reverse this trend of increasing lawlessness. We have had an undertaking by the minister that prison facilities will be made more secure. Revisions of the Criminal Code and the abolition of all unearned remissions of sentence have already been proposed to the House. This type of effort, combined with thorough study and extensive social programs that attack the root causes of crime are, in the long run, the only means of ensuring the safety of our law-abiding citizens. The hanging of a handful of criminals will do nothing to further the attainment of that goal of security.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, more than anything else, this debate has shown how thick is the skin of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) when an abolitionist speaks and how thin it is when a retentionist speaks.

An hon. Member: Here we go again!

Mr. Allmand: Hon. members are making personal arguments. Discuss the issue, not the man.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, in many instances we rely on the information which is made available by a minister responsible for a bill. Although the minister spoke of engaging people who have looked into the matter of retention, to the best of my knowledge none of that literature has been delivered to my desk. I checked again today. Therefore if the minister's skin is somewhat thin, he has himself to blame.

I have a great deal of respect for the opinions of some individuals and am disappointed at not being able to support the position of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), for whom I have the greatest respect. As a man, he is most persuasive.

An hon. Member: And very sensible.

Mr. McCain: That is a matter of measurement. The hon. member may have prejudged, instead of keeping an open mind.

Mr. Peters: He adopted an enlightened position.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, no member takes lightly his responsibility for voting on this bill. Each member will vote only after he has given the matter a great deal of thought and consideration. After all, each one of us must decide, as democratically elected members of this House, how best we can preserve the safety of the individual in society, how best to preserve law and order so that people feel safe. If any hon. member is of the opinion that the interests of law and order are better served with the retention of capital punishment, then, no matter what his conscience may tell him in some respect, he is obligated to opt for capital punishment. That is the situation we face.

I agree that in many instances capital punishment probably will not deter a person from taking the life of a fellow citizen. For instance, I am convinced that it will not normally deter the individual who quarrels at a party or quarrels at home, and is irritated to the point of reacting in such a fashion that he takes the life of an individual. No, there is no way by which a law of man can deter such an act on the part of a fellow man. But I am convinced that we must bring law to the land.

● (2120)

As long as I knew I would probably get a concurrent sentence, as has been given in our courts too often, in the course of a robbery I would probably be quite prepared to take a life if it meant I could escape undetected and free. Any individual may be prepared to rob a bank and brandish a gun, but is he prepared to face capital punishment as a consequence of that act? At that point in time it has to deter the individual from a course of action which might bring him a consecutive sentence rather than a concurrent sentence, or which might give him capital punishment as a reward.

When an individual is incarcerated for an extended period of time, he probably has little if anything to lose if he is going to get a concurrent sentence for a further crime within the institution in which he is confined. However, I doubt very much if he will put his life on the line by taking the life of another individual while in that institution. In that instance he would at least have cause for thought, and it probably would be a deterrent to that individual.

We have come through a cycle in which law and order were preached, taught, respected and understood. The periods of time which have been cited as examples for the reason why we should abolish capital punishment are in an era in the thirties, and come forward to the forties and fifties. Let us briefly go back to that period of time and look at the type of law and order which we had.

The Queen of England and her husband visited Canada in 1939. She rode in an open touring car or convertible, with the top down when the weather would permit. When the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was Prime Minister of this country, as well as when Mr. Pearson and Mr. St. Laurent were Prime Minister, they rode in ordinary cars bought on the street which they purchased themselves. They did not have bullet proof glass or armour plate.

An hon. Member: They had it for the Queen.

Mr. McCain: They did not have it for the Queen on either of the two visits I mentioned. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has two automobiles, both of which are armour-plated and both of which have bullet proof glass. That is very symbolic of the level to which law

and order have sunk. It is time we began to appraise when a man has lost his right to live in the society of his fellowmen. We have to think of that in terms of the good of all society.

I could not possibly vote for this bill for the same reason that the right hon. member for Prince Albert could not vote for it. In an act of treason, an individual or group of individuals who commit that act are not necessarily acting against the life of an individual. They are acting against a multitude, which is the state, and they are prepared to endanger that multitude regardless of what may be the consequence to the perpetrator of the deed. That is a heinous crime indeed. It should and must remain on the statutes of Canada.

Let us move to other types of crime. What about the individual who was putting bombs in mail boxes, mailing bombs through the mail, placing bombs in public places, endangering, and in some cases succeeding in taking the lives of innocent people? That man, representing his own personal position which is not the position of society as a whole, has sacrificed his right to live in society. Society will only be safe when he is no longer among us. We are responsible to society to make decisions which may be hard to come by in our consciences but which are in the best interests of the total good.

What about the individual who, for personal or philosophical reasons, chooses to try to hijack an airplane and endangers the lives of scores of people? Should that man or woman be given the right to continue life among us? I submit that society is looking for the punishment which may deter the act of such an individual. That is what society is at least hoping for.

What about the contract killer? He is present among us whether we like it or not. Whether the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice dismiss this man in any way, shape or form, he is among us in Canada. He is for hire, for the objective of the individual who hires him at a varying price which is reputed in some cases to be quite low indeed for the removal of an insignificant individual. Yet that man may have made his living for quite some time by removing people from among our numbers. A perpetrator of a deed like that who is willing to do the same deed again has sacrificed his right to live in society.

I am not one who wishes to dangle the noose nor do I associate capital punishment with the noose. I believe we can at least extend a more civilized means of extermination. I am sorry there is no better word to use. However, I do not associate it with the noose nor would I want to see the noose used if we do have capital punishment.

We have reports from those working in the psychiatric field. None of those people are prepared to give at any point in time a qualified yes or no as to whether an individual has been rehabilitated. It does not mean that because an individual has been in jail under the best of instruction, guidance, and treatment for up to 25 years, he will change his way of life. Nor does it mean that his psychology has reached the norm which can be expected and respected by the psychiatric profession.

We are dealing with something to which statistics do not apply. We are dealing with the erratic behaviour of an individual who is not normal or he would never have committed the crime about which we are talking. That is the individual over whom we have no control, or any measurement or capability of predicting his future.

I am concerned about one thing. I would appreciate it if at some point in time the Solicitor General would give us the date and the name of the individual who corrected the position he outlined in this House in respect of this bill. I am not arguing with him, but I would like to have the reference. If the government were to disrespect one last tradition, and it has disrespected many that relate to democracy as we know it, and had tradition been the guideline of government, there are cabinet ministers who would not be holding that position today. They disrespect tradition. But the Solicitor General advises us that the cabinet will have to vote with the government because the bill was introduced by a cabinet minister and is a government bill.

I submit that regardless of the rank or position of anyone in this party, there has been absolutely no pressure to vote any way as far as any Conservative has been concerned since I have been associated with this bill. The same cannot be said of those to your right, Mr. Speaker. It might be traditional that when a government bill is introduced all cabinet members vote for it, but on the basis of the past behaviour of the government this tradition should not be any problem in connection with the bill before us. I hope the vote will be free.

● (2130)

Mr. Blais: What are you speaking for, then?

Mr. McCain: Would the hon. member who is chirping over there speak up? I cannot hear him.

Mr. Blais: On a point of order, so that I can chirp louder, the point I was attempting to make was this: if the hon. member is against any suasion being used, I am wondering what he is doing speaking this evening.

An hon. Member: That is not a point of order. It is a point of stupidity.

Mr. McCain: I am expressing an opinion of my own, but one which I hope is shared by others.

I have been elected only on two occasions, not for many years as have other members of the House. My position is well known in my constituency. I have answered every letter I received on this subject, whether from my constituency or from elsewhere. I have expressed my opinions as I am expressing them tonight. I have expressed them to church organizations which favour abolition, I have expressed them to individuals who favour retention.

I have said to public meetings in my constituency that I favour the retention of capital punishment, though not clear down the line, as used to be the situation 20, 30 or 50 years ago. I do favour it for those crimes of murder which symbolize to society that citizens are not as safe as they should be, and for crimes which involve the lives of more than one person. Society deserves this protection from the House, and it is our responsibility to provide it.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, this bill has been hanging around the House for a long time now.

Everyone who has spoken, everyone I have heard, has been sincere in his comments and has given reasons for being prepared to vote one way or the other.

We have heard all kinds of statistics. One thing we learned from that, if nothing else, is that you can always find statistics to prove whatever point you wish to make. The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), a friend of mine for whom I have a great deal of respect, quoted statistics which clearly show that the murder rate in countries where abolition is in force is lower than it is in countries where retention is the law. I have some other figures. They come from a book which was prepared for the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) himself, at his request, and they show the opposite. They compare France, a retentionist country, with three other countries. I wanted to put these figures on the record because it seems logical to balance the information given.

In France, the murder rate is 3.28 per hundred thousand compared with the rate in Germany of 4 per hundred thousand. The rate in Austria, an abolitionist country, is a little lower. A similar rate prevails in Norway. But in the case of Germany, an abolitionist country, the murder rate is indeed higher. What this proves is that it is impossible for us, in the context of our own country, to use figures from other countries around the world to determine what effect either abolition or retention might have on the murder rate here.

We have conflicting reports regarding the efficacy of capital punishment in reducing murder rates. In the case of our own country, virtual abolition has resulted in a substantially higher rate. Look at the figures from 1940 to 1959. The murder rate was almost constant at about 1.2 per 100,000. Since 1959 it has risen to 2.4. we also know that the last hanging which took place in this country was in the early sixties and that since then there has been an increase in the murder rate amounting to 150 per cent. I do not believe any statistician will argue that this is not a significant increase.

I want to suggest something new. One of the criticisms made by members on the government side who want this debate to end quickly is that little which is new has been said—that no new proposals are being made. The proposal I wish to make is not new in terms of being an original idea, but it is new in terms of this bill. At least I have not heard it expressed in the debate so far.

If we are research-oriented and believe that through scientific research we can come up with the best answers to problems facing our country, we should be thinking of another five-year period of research. We have gone through eight years of abolition by law and a lot more than that, perhaps 15 years, of *de facto* abolition by commutation. The result has been a 150 per cent increase in the murder rate. We must now decide whether to abolish capital punishment or to retain it. The best thing to do, I suggest, is to try another five-year period of enforcement of the death penalty. It seems to me that if we do this, and if the murder rate goes down, it can be taken as evidence that capital punishment is indeed a deterrent to murder. But if the murder rate continues to go up we would know there is not necessarily any kind of relationship.

To some this might appear to be a strange suggestion. But I do not think it is possible to determine the effect of capital punishment in our own national context in any other way, for example, by comparing the situation here with the situation in European countries or in Africa or anywhere else in the world. I do not think their figures are necessarily significant in this context since other countries are different in many ways. Their social conditions, laws, attitudes, religion, culture, way of life and their problems are different, so I suggest we cannot really compare ourselves with other countries because it is something like comparing apples and oranges. Even social conditions in Canada change from one year to the next, but if we could find the closest possible similarity in some kind of experimental setting then I would think it would be worth considering. Perhaps an amendment of this kind could be made to the bill, which I suggest would make it a little simpler to deal with.

[Mr. Yewchuk.]

● (2140)

One of the most compelling arguments against capital punishment, I think, is the possibility that an innocent person might be hanged. I do not think anyone would argue against that possibility. Nevertheless we must consider the other side of the coin, which is the possibility that a convicted murderer might kill again. According to the figures that I have been able to obtain from the best source available to me—indeed I obtained this information more by rumour—there has been one innocent person who was hanged in this country, and this took place some 30 or 40 years ago. On the other hand, figures from Statistics Canada show that since 1963 there have been seven repeat murders. Seven other innocent victims have been murdered by people who had been found guilty of murder and then paroled or released from prison having served their sentence. Or perhaps the second murder took place while they were still in custody. That is another statistic that should be considered. Weighing the possibility of a repeat murder occurring against that of hanging an innocent person, the chance of a repeat murder occurring is seven times greater. I think that figure speaks in favour of capital punishment for convicted murderers.

Some people have suggested that capital punishment might be used for other than the traditionally accepted reason. I am thinking here of people who are involved in the illicit drug trade, such as heroin suppliers and distributors. We often hear of heroin addicts dying from an overdose of heroin and I wonder how often these overdoses are accidental. It seems to me that if someone involved in the importation or distribution of heroin thinks that a user could report him to the police, there would be no simpler way of disposing of that user than by supplying him with a much stronger dose which the user would inject and thus kill himself. Perhaps the bill should be broadened to include such possibilities as this.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the real issue here is not necessarily whether capital punishment is a deterrent or is not a deterrent. Rather the real issue revolves around our responsibility as the elected representatives of the people. As all hon. members will admit, we have a responsibility in this House to speak on behalf of those who sent us here. This is why we have representative government. Our whole democratic system is based on the principle that we are elected to this place for the prime purpose of speaking out on behalf of those who sent us here.

According to surveys that have been made, about 80 per cent of the people of this country feel that capital punishment should be retained at this time. If members of parliament choose to ignore this supposed will of the people, then we have to ask ourselves whether representative government, or democracy, is indeed functioning at all. If we take it upon ourselves to go against the will of the people, we being the representatives of the people, then we are behaving in no better fashion than as an autocratic dictator imposing our will upon the people, telling them what is good for them rather than reflecting their views in this House.

I am not trying to belittle the importance of the conscience of an individual member; that is a most important consideration as well. On the other hand we must keep in mind our responsibility to those who elected us. A lot of people in Canada feel that revenge is not necessarily all bad, that the principle of an eye for an eye is not necessarily all bad. As a matter of fact a lot of people think it is a good idea. I am not expressing my own personal view, but it is something that must be kept in mind.

Much has been said about rehabilitation of murderers. I am informed by my statistical source that the rate of rehabilitation has been rather good; that less than one per cent of homicidal offenders who were paroled in the U.S. have been returned to prison because they committed another murder. However, a larger percentage is returned for other reasons. Even though we know that some murderers cannot be rehabilitated, the figures point to the fact that most of them do not murder again.

There have also been comments about the cost of keeping men in prison for 25 years. This bill proposes to keep people convicted of murder in prison for 25 years. I am informed that the cost of keeping a person incarcerated is approximately $18,000 a year. Multiplied by 25, that works out at about half a million dollars per prisoner, in terms of 1976 constant dollars. We must ask ourselves whether a taxpayer who has already suffered because someone close to him or someone he may have known—an innocent person—has been murdered, should be asked on top of that to spend another $500,000 to keep the convicted murderer in jail for 25 years. It seems to me that that is a rather expensive proposition.

I was interested in the comment the other day of the whip on the other side. The governing party takes the position when talking in public that there is going to be a free vote on this bill, although we know that there is not really going to be a free vote at all. The other day the government whip stood up in the House and proudly announced that he was a retentionist. Then in the very next breath, the next sentence, he said, "Let's hurry up and get this bill passed". I wonder just how much of a retentionist he can be when he wants to pass a bill to abolish capital punishment. That is the kind of consistency we have seen from him ever since he has been a member of parliament.

● (2150)

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I did use the expression "passed quickly" I really meant I would like to see this particular matter dealt with. I will rectify the wording, if I may, and say that I would like to see the vote taken soon, getting the matter over with as soon as possible.

Mr. Paproski: One way or the other.

Mr. Yewchuk: I am glad to hear the whip clarify his position, because he still looks fuzzy in his position over there, and I am afraid that does not help clarify how he really feels about it. I only have a few minutes left until ten o'clock and I am not sure what time I started, but I do want to put on the record some other reasons why capital punishment is perhaps a good idea, and these are some of the reasons accepted by the United Nations.

One reason is that capital punishment represents a political necessity for the protection not merely of society but of the social order itself. Another is that if the state is to be denied the right to take the life of one of its members, then by the same token it should be denied the right to deprive that member in perpetuity of his liberty. In other words, if the state does not have the right to hang somebody, does the state have the right to put him in jail for 25 years? That is a question I have not heard answered in this place.

I think the key argument that should be stressed here is that capital punishment is a just and appropriate one in so far as murder is concerned. Perhaps above all other punishments it marks society's detestation and abhorrence of the taking of life and its revulsion against the crime of crimes. Capital punishment is required in the case of a subsequent murder in prison or in the course of escape by a convicted murderer, because if this existing deterrent were removed, apprehension would exist concerning the safety of the prison staff and the general public from prisoners for whom, because they are already serving life sentences, a further sentence of imprisonment could have no deterrent effect. In other words, if a man were serving a life sentence for murder and he knew he could not be hanged for another murder, why not murder again in an attempt to get away? This is a fairly compelling argument in favour of capital punishment.

There is also the argument that capital punishment is a painless and more humane form of treatment for a murderer than life imprisonment. Life imprisonment, it is argued, is more cruel, but that is a matter of opinion, of course.

The punishment inflicted for a grave crime should adequately reflect the revulsion felt by the great majority of citizens, and the ultimate justification of any punishment is not that it is a deterrent but that it is the emphatic denunciation by the community of a crime, and from this point of view there are some murders which demand the most emphatic denunciation of all, namely, the death penalty.

It is reasonable to suppose that the deterrent force of capital punishment operates not only by affecting the conscious thoughts of individuals tempted to commit murder, but also by building up in the community over a long period of time a deep feeling of peculiar abhorrence for the crime of murder.

Where murder is premeditated it is only common sense to assume that not only the chances of detection but also the consequences in the vent of detection are ordinarily taken into consideration. The death penalty may be the

only effective deterrent against a life prisoner making a murderous assault on a fellow prisoner or member of the prison staff.

Statistics, which ordinarily fail to demonstrate the deterrent effect of capital punishment, are for the most part assembled by those who wish to abolish the death penalty. In other words, such statistics are not compiled on the way to reaching a conclusion but, rather to support a conclusion already reached morally, philosophically or intuitively. Statistics are susceptible to different interpretations, and are unreliable and misleading. It is almost impossible to draw valid comparisons between different countries owing to differences in the legal definition of crimes, the practice of the prosecuting authorities and the courts, methods of compiling criminal statistics, moral standards, customary behaviour, and political, social, and economical conditions.

Upon the view that the deterrent effect of capital punishment resides primarily in its long-term effect on the attitude of society to murder, it is not to be expected that variations in the number of executions from year to year would be directly reflected in a rise or fall in the murder rate. A negative conclusion to be drawn from statistics does not imply a conclusion that the deterrent effect of the death penalty is not greater than that of any other punishment. It means only that the figures afford no reliable evidence one way or the other. It would be equally difficult to show statistically a direct relationship between the severity of any other punishment and the incidence of the crime to which it relates.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for those who are in the habit of pointing out the countries where the murder rate has dropped after the death penalty has been abolished, those statistics do not in any way imply that the murder rate would not have dropped even more had it been retained.

There are many ways that we must look at these statistics to be sure we do not get fooled by them because, as I said at the beginning of my comments, anyone can find statistics to prove the conclusion he has already reached. We have seen many examples of that in this debate, rather than looking at the statistics and trying to conclude something from them. Mr. Speaker, may I now call it ten o'clock and conclude my remarks on another occasion?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

IMMIGRATION—MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF IMMIGRANTS—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO ENSURE ADEQUACY

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I am again referring to a question I asked the minister on May 19 as recorded at page 13663 of *Hansard*. This relates to a comparatively new exotic disease in Canada, and the question was asked with that in mind. I want to use the city of Toronto as an example to lay the groundwork for this matter.

It has been estimated there are about 10,000 in that area living underground, sharing living quarters with people who conceal their presence from officials. This, of course, causes a drain in taxes to the legitimate taxpayer in the area. These people living thus are denied the basic social services and even the protection of the law. They are vulnerable to unscrupulous employers and are paid below the minimum wage. Their fear of being exposed makes them more vulnerable, leaving them open to further exploitation.

These people can become a public health problem as many of them are harbouring parasites common in their country of origin and they have had no adequate treatment. In the field of pediatrics it is becoming more and more apparent that, due to the multiracial society in which we live, and this is very true in a city like Toronto, we are developing a considerable range of tropical and sub-tropical diseases. These diseases are imported not only by immigrants but even by travellers who have visited tropical countries.

● (2200)

Many times doctors who look at them have had no experience in the treatment of tropical medicine. Therefore a doctor often misses the diagnosis, forgetting even the geographic area from which the patients came. The question for the tourist is, where have you been and when?

This incidence in the increase of such diseases is particularly true in the city of Toronto where over half the old downtown area is composed of immigrants, many of whom cannot speak English. Certainly the majority of their children of pre-school age cannot do so. These people often have been let into the country with a health certificate which states that they have been examined in their own country. Such an examination could have been carried out six months before the person left the country and such a person could have become infected in the meantime. The possibilities are there. In any event the measure of capability of these countries to find and pick up infection is not of the same high standard as practised in the western world. In other words, patients can get a certificate stating that they are free of parasites only to find here in Canada that they are infested with parasites.

We need immigrants in Canada; there is no question about that. We are all immigrants. Certainly immigrants have done work Canadians would not do, and they have done it willingly. However, an added strain is placed on the immigrant when he is accused of harbouring tropical diseases such as intestinal parasites.

I should like to congratulate the minister for the proposals he announced today of a new control mechanism for the issuance of social insurance numbers. I think this is a good move. Visitors to Canada who wish to obtain work will have a distinctive number nine as the first digit in their social insurance card. I suggest that the minister should provide that these people be given another number to go with the new social insurance number, with which they would be able to go to a clinic, be examined, and be declared free of intestinal parasites. This would save thou-

sands and thousands of dollars and would spare the immigrant and his family the humiliation of harbouring parasitic disease. This, I feel, is how the problem could be solved.

It would be ideal of course if this work could be done in the country of origin just before the immigrant comes to Canada, especially if it were done in such a way that we could depend on the validity of the certificate which would be rendered stating that the person is free of infection. But as I have stated before, this is almost an impossibility.

All these people should be insured under our medicare plan. This also includes foreign students. Often these people are afraid to go to a doctor and tell him of their illness because of the fear of going to hospital and having their illness exposed. Certainly is is up to the Department of Immigration to see that these people, upon application for a social insurance number, also are required to have an examination and that the information is indicated on the card stating that they have been examined and are free of disease. If there is parasitic disease, this then could be followed up by physicians who are trained in the treatment of these infections.

Because of large scale immigration from tropical and sub-tropical countries, where standards of sanitation are much lower or non-existent, we have been flooded with infestation rarely seen before. Only recently has the Department of Immigration made it mandatory to have stool cultures done on applicants from certain countries. Anyone infested is a potential carrier and contaminator of others such as family, friends, and so on. Worms and parasites are passed on due to poor hygiene. Most parasites are found all over the world, and the precentage of any population harbouring them is determined by public health standards, living conditions, and so on.

Toronto's main parasitology clinic is at the Toronto General Hospital. It is certainly one of the biggest in Canada. But the clinic is able to treat only about 1,500 cases a year. It is inadequately funded, and its waiting lists are far too long. More personnel must be recruited and trained in tropical medicine so that cases can be seen, speedily treated, and handled. That would save a lot of money. Sufficient funding is needed to do this necessary work. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish as we are at the present time. I suggest to the minister that he can now take a little more glory for himself for putting the number nine on isurance cards. Let him put another number on to be sure that this work I have mentioned is fully carried out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Arthur Portelance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) raised the matter regarding the medical examination of immigrants the minister gave a brief account of the situation and pointed out that other efforts were being made in this area.

Any immigrant seeking admission to Canada must undergo a medical examination pursuant to the provisions of the Immigration Act, and before he leaves his native country he is judged on the basis of the universal standards as set by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Because of the number of non-immigrants, some 40 million, who enter Canada each year it is impossible, considering the expenses that practice would entail, and inappropriate, considering our desire to facilitate the admission of visitors, to have everyone of them undergo medical examination. So our policy is to have a medical examination for people most likely to present a risk to public health. It is estimated that the degree of risk increases with the duration of the stay and the nature of the activities of that person while he on she remains in Canada. All non-immigrants who plan on staying a year or more must undergo a medical examination and so do people who intend to take up a job in certain fields such as food preparation, the hotel business, hospital care, and so on. In addition, in cooperation with the Department of National Health and Welfare the department for which he is responsible intends to have other groups of non-immigrants undergo a medical examination when they are likely to present a risk to public health.

In addition, an increasing number of Canadians take holidays or a job for a prolonged period in certain countries where certain diseases exist. When they return to Canada they are granted admission as of right and they do not have to take a medical examination. That explains at least in part the emergence of certain diseases in Canada.

I would like to reassure the hon. member that the department of which the minister is in charge, in cooperation with the Department of National Health and Welfare, is doing its best to ensure that the Canadian public is not exposed to parasitic or other diseases.

[*English*]

INDUSTRY—PROPOSED CLOSING OF RCA LABORATORIES IN MONTREAL—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PREVENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, On May 28 I asked the following question of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson):

Is the minister yet in a position to report to the House as to whether the government has been able to prevent the RCA research laboratories in Montreal from closing at the direction of the RCA head office in the United States? Inasmuch as such a closing would clash directly with the principles of international business conduct which when tabled in the House last July were stated as reflecting government policy, could the minister tell us whether the government will take steps to make a reasonable degree of compliance with these principles mandatory and to fully monitor the extent of such compliance on the part of all foreign-controlled enterprises in Canada, the firms to which the government has said these principles apply?

The minister replied in part:

What action we may be able to take in law or what kind of enforcement measures we may be able to undertake are questions I am considering at the present time. But I am at present carrying on talks with the RCA company in an effort to see whether they can be persuaded to change the policy. The second part of the question was somewhat more complex than I could follow, since it was related to the RCA issue. Perhaps my hon. friend would wish to ask a supplementary.

Since it is evident to hon. members that government members are rarely, if ever, recognized during the question period to ask supplementary questions, I asked that this question be set down for the adjournment debate to give the minister a chance to respond to the second part of my question.

● (2210)

As I pointed out, last July 18, 1975, the then minister of industry, trade and commerce tabled in this House a new set of guiding principles for good corporate behaviour. In the statement he made at that time he said in part:

> Like the earlier set of "Guiding Principles of Good Corporate Behaviour", the new set of principles reflects broad government policy regarding the activities and responsibilities of foreign-controlled business enterprises in Canada. They thus provide an added indication of the sort of benefits the government looks for in assessing investment proposals under the Foreign Investment Review Act. But they are directed toward all foreign controlled enterprises doing business in Canada, whether they are involved with the Foreign Investment Review Act or not.

It seems to me that the recent decision of the head office of RCA in the United States to close its Canadian research laboratories in Montreal clearly clashes with these principles. Let me point to three of them in particular. Principle one says that foreign-controlled firms in Canada should:

> Pursue a high degree of autonomy in the exercise of decision-making and risk-taking functions, including innovative activity and the marketing of any resulting new products.

Principle two says that foreign-controlled firms in Canada should:

> Develop as an integral part of the Canadian operation an autonomous capability for technological innovation, including research, development, engineering, industrial design and preproduction activities; and for production, marketing, purchasing and accounting.

Principle four states that foreign-controlled firms in Canada should:

> Strive for a full international mandate for innovation and market development, when it will enable the Canadian company to improve its efficiency by specialization of productive operations.

At this laboratory a team had been built up of some 62 highly-qualified research scientists and engineers. The press has reported that the closing of this laboratory will mean that only 16 of this group will be found other jobs in RCA plants in Canada. The other 42, according to the press report may—not necessarily will but may—be found jobs not in Canada but in plants or laboratories in the United States operated by the U.S. parent company.

This Canadian research facility is being closed not because the Canadian company is in difficulty, not because the laboratory is not productive. It is being done because of the management difficulties of the world-wide RCA interests and the resulting efforts of the new head office management of RCA to deal with the situation created during the term of its predecessor.

It is time to ask again what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce has been able to achieve in his discussions with RCA to get that company to change its decision to close the laboratory, on a voluntary basis. If this decision has not been reversed—and for that matter even if it has been—this situation shows the importance of making these guidelines mandatory in the sense I outlined in my question.

The company claims it is adhering to the guidelines but I say what it is doing appears to clash with the definite words of the guidelines. I challenge the president of the company to show how it will meet the guidelines if the laboratory is closed and research work, to whatever extent it is carried on, is continued only in divisions of the company in Canada. The guidelines are government policy, but the government has no way of ensuring that foreign-controlled companies comply with them. The company claims it does not need the laboratory because the climate is not right due to the government's increasing intervention in the economic system.

RCA did not class it as excessive intervention when it accepted $20 million from the government—then it was not excessive or undue interference.

Industrial research and development in Canada are not increasing. They have declined as a percentage of the Gross National Product. The government needs new programs to stimulate this, and part of its efforts must be to deal with the situation created where decisions are made by foreign-controlled firms with the head office following world-wide priorities which clash with Canadian priorities in spite of the viability and economic strength of the Canadian operations in question.

To conclude, the government must act promptly not only to correct the RCA case but also to ensure that it is not the first of similar, unwarranted decisions taken by other foreign controlled firms in this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the hon. member for having raised this situation which is the subject of much discussion and concern on the part of some hon. members, especially those from the Montreal area.

It is true that the company has recently announced in a brief press release its reorganization plan in Canada. The minister discussed this with the chairman and the chief executive of the company and particularly tried to find out how this project would affect the present research activities of the company. We have learned that this decision would be reflected in fact by reductions of the research and development expenses of RCA in Canada and that this must be considered in the following context: First, the major part of the yearly sales of the company come from two main sources, that is the manufacture of television sets, including picture tubes, and the division of electronic systems for the government and private companies, that I shall simply call the space division. This division manufactures microwave material, transponders for satellites and satellite ground stations. The research and development work for the manufacture of television sets has never been pushed very much in Canada. Most of the research of RCA Limited has always been aimed at its space division.

In 1974, the work accomplished until that time in the various commercial divisions was regrouped in a single research laboratory. This laboratory continued to serve commercial divisions, but it also got involved in more and more projects bearing no relation with the industrial activities of RCA. The result of the recent decision to centralize research facilities will be that all research for commercial divisions will be done in each division. Only the research elements having no relation with the industrial activities of the company will be relinquished.

The company has assured the minister that this will not affect at all its present production commitments, which insurance seems to us particularly important for the space

division. This division is the only one to produce for the parent company transponders that go into the manufacture of all the commercial satellites that it sells in the United States and elsewhere. The division also holds sales rights throughout the world for all the products that it manufactures and it has in fact sold abroad much of its telecommunication and satellite ground station material. It is therefore inaccurate to say that RCA will stop its research activities. But it is true that it will pursue in the future only those which can meet the needs of its various divisions.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to make a few remarks on some of the government legislation designed to ensure respect for international principles in matters of trade ethics, namely that the problem of obtaining reports based on those guiding principles are now being actively studied in the more general context of trade relations. The government is concerned about reducing as much as possible the burden of reports the Canadian businesses have to fill out. On the other hand, we must see to it that enough pertinent data is placed at the disposal of the government and the private sector to allow for formulation of a reasonable and realist policy. It is very difficult to conciliate those most desirable objectives, but I trust it will be possible to lighten the present burden of reports while, at the same time, obtaining enough information to allow control over the type of conduct mentioned by my hon. colleague.

[*English*]

PUBLICATIONS—POSSIBILITY OF ACTION TO CONTROL DISTRIBUTION OF MAGAZINES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, on June 1 as reported at page 14027 of *Hansard*, I asked the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) the following question:

> ... The minister has frequently expressed concern about foreign domination of the film distribution industry in Canada and has in fact encouraged provincial departments to initiate legislation in this area. I would like to ask the minister whether he has worked with the same intensity to bring magazine distribution under domestic control and in a way which would limit exploitation of sex and the almost unabated flow of pornography into this country.

The Minister replied:

> No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I would approach that with the same degree of zest.

I would applaud any effort on the part of the minister to repatriate Canadian dollars which would otherwise flow to another country. If he can also do something of benefit for the film distribution industry in that regard, I would applaud him for that action too. But I am discouraged. Although the minister takes initiatives to help the domestic part of the film distribution industry, which is outside his jurisdiction and, essentially, under provincial jurdisdiction, he does not show the same concern for the distribution of magazines in our country.

It is good to promote independence, Mr. Speaker. But that kind of independence he is promoting is lopsided. On one hand he will eliminate *Time* magazine because he thinks it is a shame that any of our Canadian dollars should go south of the border to United States. I again underscore the fact that I would like to see those dollars remain in Canada.

● (2220)

He is making a very dismal choice. He is encouraging the decline and the demise of *Time* magainze. At the same time he is not doing anything to discourage the inflow of magazines such as *Penthouse*, *Playboy*, *Hustler* and other pornography. The minister says he does not have the same kind of zest for stemming the flow of that kind of product into the country.

It seems a little bit inconsistent that we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on caps for medicine bottles so that children cannot open them and destroy themselves. We spend thousands of dollars advertising on behalf of household safety with regard to medicines, fire, and swimming pools. However, here we have a major pollutant which destroys the perception and expectations of children, and which is much more readily available than patent medicines. In its own way it is just as destructive, yet the minister says he does not have the same zest for steaming that tide.

This self-appointed, self-proclaimed prophet of Canadian culture, the Secretary of State, becomes very concerned when Canadian dollars go south into the bank account of Time Incorporated. However, he does not mind if by way of American distribution companies Canadian dollars flow south into the bank accounts of gangster organizations.

I have before me a page from the Toronto *Star*, dated Saturday, May 22. The headline reads: "Maclean's Brass Charged Over Skin Magazines". I remember when we were dealing with Bill C-58, the chairman of the board and the president of *Maclean's* magazine appeared before the committee. Oh, the saccharine piety those two men spewed out about the great Canadian culture that we have. They referred to Birks, Hudson's Bay, and all the other great symbols of Canadian culture—and all the time they were promoting a distribution company in the city of Toronto of which the main profit was derived from the distribution of pornography. What kind of hypocrisy is that?

The minister, the self-proclaimed self-appointed cultural czar of Canada, was really up tight to make sure that *Time* got out of Canada. He also wanted to get rid of *Reader's Digest*. However, he says he does not have the same kind of zest for getting rid of pornographic magazines.

You can go to any magazine shop in the country. The display of magazines will be somewhat in this order. On the very top shelf, almost out of reach of even adults, are magazines like *Field and Stream*, *Better Homes and Gardens*, and other such magazines. On the bottom shelf, six inches off the floor where all the little kids can get at them, you find *Oui*, *Penthouse*, *Playboy*, *Hustler* and all those other magazines. However, the minister says he does not have the same kind of zest for stemming the flow of that kind of literature into Canada.

It is discouraging when a minister of the Crown has a great concern about a few tax dollars going south of the border, but no concern about the mental, spiritual, and emotional health of kids when they read this kind of pornography. This minister should re-evaluate and reorder his priorities and perspective to be sure he serves the Canadian people well by preserving the mental and spiritual health of our young people.

Adjournment Debate

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I rise in response to the hon. member on behalf of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Miss Campbell), who is absent on official duty.

With respect to the question raised by the hon. member I should like to emphasize that there are now 16 distributors in Canada operating on a national scale. Of these, four are wholly Canadian-owned, 25 per cent. Rather than contemplating the restriction of the activities of the foreign-owned operators, the government is focusing on a more positive approach, namely, the improvement of the promotional and distribution capabilities of Canadian-owned publishers and distributors. The Canada Council administers a $1.5 million program annually to this end.

There is no intention to curtail the entry into Canada of foreign magazines above and beyond certain tariff regulations. For instance, item 99221 restricts the entry into Canada of periodicals, postcards, inserts or coupons printed outside Canada and containing 5 per cent or more advertising aimed at the domestic Canadian market.

On a second point, it should be noted that tariff item 99201/1 already prohibits the entry into Canada of "books, printed paper, drawings, paintings, prints, photographs or representations—of a treasonable or seditious or of an immoral or indecent character." The application of the Criminal Code to the dissemination of such material falls within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 15, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed from Monday, June 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to conclude my remarks which I began last evening.

I had indicated that during the past number of years, approximately since 1962 which is about the time capital punishment was abolished in this country in fact if not in law, there has been an increase in the murder rate in Canada of some 150 per cent. I think those who argue that this is not significant do so on the basis that there has been an increase of a similar proportion in other violent crimes. It seems to me, however, that we have a situation in which the general application of law in this country has been of an excessively permissive nature. We have a peculiar situation where the federal government takes the position that it does not want to enforce its own laws.

When the present Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) piloted the last bill through this House some three years ago, he quite plainly indicated during that debate that he was retaining capital punishment for murderers of policemen and prison guards simply as a conciliatory move toward policemen and prison guards while indicating at the same time that he did not have the slightest intention of applying that law. I think the result of that kind of attitude on the part of a solicitor general is that it sets a bad example. It indicates that he does not have the desire or the backbone to apply the law as it stands, that he is chicken and, finally, I think the most drastic result is that it creates a situation in which there develops a disrespect for the law. People do not believe that the law will be applied and ask why they should pay attention to it, particularly when they consider the position taken by the Solicitor General.

Three or four years ago I had the interesting experience of visiting the Isle of Man and talking to the attorney general there. You may recall, sir, that the Isle of Man is one of the few places in the world that retains corporal punishment as well. Perhaps to come to grips with the argument that even though the number of murders has increased the number of other violent crimes has increased as well, it might be useful to try to correlate that with the abolition of corporal punishment. In conversations, the attorney general of the Isle of Man suggested to me that because they still use corporal punishment for violent crimes such as assaults, rapes and things of that nature, the incidence of those kinds of crime is substantially less on that island than it is any place where corporal punishment was abandoned a long time ago. Perhaps there is reason to give consideration to the whole question or permissiveness and the reapplication of some of those former methods of dealing with various types of crime.

I think it has been shown during the course of this debate that statistics concerning whether capital punishment is a deterrent or not, are not very helpful. Those who speak in favour of abolition provide backup statistics showing that the murder rate in abolitionist countries is no higher and possibly even is less than that in countries where capital punishment is retained. Those who favour the retention of capital punishment have provided statistics showing that the murder rate is lower in countries where capital punishment is retained. The statistics therefore are not very helpful in that people select statistics which are useful to substantiate their position. Unfortunately, statistics for other countries do not apply to Canada. One cannot determine if capital punishment alone affects the murder rate in a country; one must consider a host of other cultural and economic factors as well. Perhaps we can draw important conclusions from an examination of statistics applying to other countries, but only an examination of relevant Canadian statistics will allow us to come to valid conclusions about conditions in Canada. As I said, the present murder rate is 2.4 per cent per 100,000 of population; before 1960 it was 1.2 per cent. One could argue that the partial abolition of the death sentence has brought about a 150 per cent increase in the murder rate.

● (1110)

To determine if capital punishment is a deterrent, I suggest we should reinstate capital punishment for a five-year period, with a view to studying if the murder rate comes down again. If such a study were carried out under scientific conditions in one country, it would, perhaps, give us the most accurate reading of the effects of capital punishment. I also wish to call attention to the cost of incarcerating a man. We are told that it costs about $18,000 per year to keep one person in prison; therefore, keeping someone in prison for 25 years would cost about $.5 million. The question is, should the taxpayer shoulder that kind of burden?

Another point to which I referred last evening has to do with the hanging of an innocent person. According to statistics I have seen, there has been only one such case in this country in recent memory; on the other hand, there

have been seven repeat murders, that is to say, murders committed by convicted murderers who have been released for some reason or who were out on parole. Therefore, the ratio of deaths inflicted on innocent people to deaths inflicted by repeat murderers is seven to one. From cold statistics it is clear that fewer innocent people will die if murderers are hanged that if they are not hanged.

I am about to make a suggestion which will make judges and juries shudder. The law requires juries to be certain beyond any reasonable doubt about the guilt of the accused before convicting. I suggest that judges and juries should be given some added responsibility in cases where a mistake is made and an innocent person hangs. Perhaps we should devise methods for making judges and juries accountable for their decisions. Such provision, perhaps, would lessen further the possibility of innocent persons being hanged.

We must consider the question of the responsibility of members of parliament to their constituents. Without question, the primary responsibility of the member is to represent in this House those who elected him. The member of parliament is the spokesman for, perhaps, 100,000 constituents; he speaks on their behalf in this House. I do not wish to belittle those hon. members who say that they will vote on any issues in accordance with their consciences, but I say that while it is the member's responsibility to exercise his judgment, at the same time he must keep in mind the stated desires of his constituents if it is possible to determine those desires clearly. I suggest that with regard to the particular issue we are debating at present, the desires of constituents are clearly known.

As I said, I suggest that we should introduce again for a five-year trial period. Capital punishment for capital murder. Only that way can we determine accurately the effects of capital punishment and see whether, in the context of our social and economic conditions, it is a deterrent in Canada. We might consider allowing the prisoner to choose whether he will be in prison for 25 years or executed. Since we live in a democracy, we might consider such an idea. It might require amending the legislation, to give the prisoner that choice. I say this as many feel that a 25-year prison term is more cruel than capital punishment. I do not think anyone should make the decisions for another person. Only the convicted murderer should be allowed to make that choice. Such provision would require an amendment to the legislation now before the House.

We must also consider whether people feel the law provides enough protection. Some feel that if murderers were hanged for capital murder society would be more effectively protected. Surely, the imposition of capital punishment shows emphatically that society abhors murder. Capital punishment emphasizes society's total rejection, total abhorrence of the cold-blooded, calculated killing of another person, without just cause.

Finally, I conclude by suggesting that this debate, at best, will only provide an interim solution to the problem of how we are to treat murderers. In the final analysis we must consider ways of prevention. Neither imprisonment for 25 years nor hanging will stop murders being committed. We must dedicate ourselves to undertaking intensive research programs to determine why people commit murder. What factors shape personalities; what personality traits lead to the commission of murder? Once we know why certain people tend to commit murder, we may be in a position to bring in ultimate solutions which will prevent the occurrence of murder. In the long run that must be the aim. In my view this bill, at best, will deal with the problem only in the short term.

[Mr. Yewchuk.]

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, for those who believe that human life is a value in itself, that in the most literal sense it is a precondition for all other value systems, it must be obvious that the issue of capital punishment is, from a moral perspective, probably the most important issue on which a politician is asked to make a judgment.

By this I mean that before one can debate the morality of any social or political system, liberalism, socialism or conservatism, one must assume at the outset that all mankind has a preceding moral right to exist, that all men have an equal claim at the outset, once they are born, to continue to exist. It is for this reason that I believe most seriously that those who favour capital punishment have upon themselves the moral onus to prove that this form of killing by the state is justified. It may turn out that their case can be persuasive, but it cannot be denied that it is up to them to establish their case. That is the crucial moral consideration, because what is involved in the debate on capital punishment is the right of the state to kill. It has to be put as bluntly as that. Those who are arguing for capital punishment have to present to us a moral argument for the right to kill a human being.

● (1120)

I believe that based on this fundamental assumption, the deliberate taking of a human life is warranted in only two kinds of situations, both of which rest on a common assumption. The first is self defence by an individual. If a man, woman or child is attacked by another human being, in my view that person has the right, in order to protect his or her life, to kill, if necessary, the attacker. The second circumstance in which I believe it is morally appropriate for killing to take place is when one nation or state declares war or, even without declaration, invades another state with the purpose of imposing upon that second state their rule by force, violence and killing. Under those circumstances also I believe it is right and morally justified, horrible as it is, to kill. That is collectively those members of a state have the right to defend themselves against others.

The two points, as I say, really are identical in principle. One is the right of an individual to protect his or her life from a violent threat upon it. The other is the collective right of a state or collection of individuals to do the same.

I have not been persuaded that there is any other situation which justifies the killing of another human being. In short, I am not persuaded that capital punishment can be supported by reason or moral argument. I have not, of course, been here for the full debate that has taken place in this House, but I have consulted the arguments put forward by both sides of this issue by all members.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I am not questioning the integrity of those who have reached a decision that is different from my own. I am questioning

the reasoning, the moral reasoning in particular, which has led to the conclusion reached by those who favour capital punishment.

What are the arguments that have been put forward by the retentionists in favour of capital punishment? I repeat, morally it is up to the retentionists to prove their case for the right of the state to kill another human being. There are three arguments that have been presented and I would like to discuss them.

The first argument comes in two forms. It is that the majority of Canadians want capital punishment. Another variant of the same argument is "the majority of my constituents want capital punishment". Many members have argued that they have an obligation to vote for capital punishment because a Gallup poll survey of the nation indicates that most Canadians or most of their constituents favour capital punishment.

The acceptance of this argument largely depends, in fact entirely depends, on the acceptance of the view that democratic government rests simply on the notion of head counting. In my opinion, this view is erroneous both as a general theory of democracy and as one which holds in particular for representative democracy. The great democrats in the whole history of democratic government from Pericles in ancient Greece to John Stuart Mill, the great democrat of the nineteenth century, have always argued that discussion based on reason and evidence is an essential aspect of democratic decision making. When the community is small enough, it is possible for everyone who is affected by a law to actually make the law. That was possible in the model of the traditional Greek city state or in the early communities established in North America. In little villages, it was possible for all those affected by the laws of those communities to take part in open debate, to listen to the pros and cons, the evidence for or against a particular motion. They could be present for the debate. The argument makes sense in that context.

However, rational discussion in which all the citizens can hear the arguments and consider the evidence is impossible in a large democratic state like Canada. This is why in the last century representative democracy came into being for the first time. In this instance, the instance of representative democracy, it is those who are elected by the people who have the obligation to consider basic principles, listen to each other in debate and consult the evidence that is to be found both within their own country and abroad. Our constituents do not have the time to weigh the evidence and consider the arguments. They are preoccupied on a day-to-day basis with earning their livelihood. That is their serious, immediate and pressing concern. They do not have the opportunity that we in this chamber have to look at the evidence and listen to each other in order to formulate a final opinion. We, therefore, must make the decision. As elected members of parliament, we must take the consequences, not only on capital punishment, but on all other issues.

The point I am making does not merely hold for capital punishment. It holds for all law-making in a democratic society. This is so fundamental to the notion of representative democracy that, frankly, I have been somewhat amazed by a number of members of parliament arguing the contrary case, namely that you can simply go to your constituency and count heads or get a public opinion poll survey from the country as a whole. In my view, the argument that a member of parliament must simply respond in a direct way in opinion surveys or head counts is not merely wrong; it is anti-democratic. It denies that other crucial element in democracy, namely that decisions are to be reached after reasonable discussion, hours of persuasion and the thorough consideration of evidence. All of these must have their day.

Mr. Yewchuk: Do you not think the constituents have the ability to do that?

Mr. Broadbent: The hon. member did not listen to my argument. I said that they do not have the time to consider the evidence and weigh all the factors which we have a prime obligation to do. Therefore I conclude that any member of parliament, whether he is for, or against capital punishment, has a crucial democratic responsibility to make the decision himself.

● (1130)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: If that is the case, I want to consider the two arguments which have been put forward to justify capital punishment and which could be used to influence members on either side who are prepared to exercise their responsibility to reach a decision. The first argument goes as follows: the punishment must fit the crime, and the supreme crime merits the supreme punishment. From the point of view of criminology I accept the principle involved—the more severe the crime, the more severe the punishment. I think that is proper. I think that is just. The idea embodied in this principle is to be found in the very bill we are considering: there is a distinction made between first degree and second degree murder; there is a distinction made in the length of sentence imposed; there is also a distinction between the severity of sentencing a man or a woman for murder and sentencing a person for a lesser crime. So I accept the principle that the punishment must correspond in some sense to the severity of the crime, and repeat that it is embodied in the bill which is before the House. That is not the issue, however.

The issue for those who argue in favour of capital punishment demands a positive answer to the following question: does murder by an individual require murder by the state? Is that the conclusion one must reach after accepting the general principle that punishment must correspond with the crime in degree of severity? I conclude that those who say that murder requires capital punishment as a form of justice are erroneous in their reasoning and I should like to make the case in the following way.

If a group of men or women are involved in a brawl and some of them are severely injured in that brawl, perhaps permanently maimed, we do not under our judicial system in the middle of the 20th Century say that the state must set about imposing a similar kind of physical violence on those who perpetrated the wrongdoing. If a man breaks another man's leg, deliberately and callously, the state does not say that the guilty person must be taken to jail and have his leg broken in a corresponding fashion. It is essential we recognize this to be the case. Those who are arguing in favour of capital punishment make the same

kind of serious mistake in their moral reasoning when they conclude that a murder by an individual calls for a corresponding murder by the state. I am sure they would not argue that if a man breaks another man's leg the state has an obligation to break his leg. To my mind, the same idea is involved in the two instances. So, if it is acknowledged that severe punishment is required, this does not lead to the conclusion that a heinous murder must in justice require an equally violent death imposed by the state or the person who committed the first act.

Now, I turn to what is, at least for me, the only serious argument which could be advanced in favour of capital punishment if it were well-founded on evidence, that is, the argument that execution is a deterrent. If those who have argued for capital punishment could bring before the House, either in terms of the Canadian experience or the experience abroad, substantial evidence that capital punishment, horrible as it is to my mind, is a significant deterrent to murder I would be prepared to give the matter serious consideration.

But what is the evidence? I shall not trot out the statistics; they have already been presented by members of all parties and, in particular, by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). I want to pay tribute to the Solicitor General for the outstanding job he has done in presenting the moral issue. The Solicitor General and others have shown that the evidence—and I shall not put it stronger than this—is simply not persuasive. One can look at other countries—I am thinking particularly of the United States—and reach conflicting conclusions. Some of the evidence would lead to the conclusion that capital punishment is, indeed, effective as a deterrent. But this is only so long as one does not look at the position in a neighbouring state in the United States, for instance, or in a country in western Europe, at which point one finds that the removal of capital punishment has not led to more cases of capital crime. In my judgment, the evidence is, on balance, more strongly on the side that capital punishment is not a deterrent, though I am prepared to concede to those who argue in favour of capital punishment that it is not absolutely clear whether it is a deterrent or not.

Now I come back to my first comments. If it is not clear that it is a deterrent, and if we are by no means certain that the brutal killing of a human being can be justified on moral grounds, how else can we reasonably reach the conclusion that capital punishment is permissible? After all, capital punishment is undeniably brutal; we put a noose around a person's neck and let him drop, and hang, and die. The issue has to be seen as seriously and as intensely as that. If the evidence is not overwhelmingly persuasive that we are likely to head off murders, what moral justification do we have as human beings to kill another human being? I say we have no such justification and therefore I conclude that the deterrent argument, in the face of this moral reasoning, is not an acceptable one.

I draw a further conclusion, Mr. Speaker. If we do not accept capital punishment as a form of primitive justice, and if we do not accept it as a deterrent, then how can we accept it? To those who approve the reasoning on those two points and still insist on capital punishment I would say, as did the great French author and playwright, Albert Camus, that the only justification which is left, the only psychological motive which is left, is the latent, emotional hangover of vengeance. We cannot base any law in Canada on the notion of vengeance.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

● (1140)

This bill does recognize the seriousness of murder. Those of us who argue against capital punishment would also argue with the same degree of seriousness and concern against any act of murder. Sometimes those who take a contrary position suggest that those of us who are abolitionists are somehow soft on crime or indifferent to human cruelty. I think just the contrary is the case: those of us who are determined abolitionists I suggest are equally determined in our opposition to violence in society as a whole, quite apart from the issue of capital punishment. We have concern for the victims of crime, very much so. What we want is to change society as much as we possibly can to remove the causes of murder and other forms of violence. I for one do not claim to have all the answers to violent murder. But this is where the real effort must be made in the years ahead.

Recognizing the moral wrongness of murder, we support the view that there has to be severe punishment to make it clear that our society does not condone that kind of behaviour. I suggest that the distinction in this bill between first degree and second degree murder does precisely that. It makes a distinction between the motive for and cause of the different kinds of murder. In my view, the punishment imposed for either degree of murder is sufficient to deter anyone in the land from contemplating in a cold-blooded way an act of murder, if that person is the kind who will be deterred at all. We do not need capital punishment as a further deterrent.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of this House in particular to reject what I regard as the terribly irresponsible argument that in a democracy we are required simply to count heads, whether in the nation or in our constituencies. That surely cannot be justification for voting either for or against capital punishment. I ask all members to consider very carefully whether we want to have a system that perpetuates the doctrine of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth and have the state indulge in cold-blooded violence as a reciprocal act against any man or woman who has murdered someone else in society—an argument that I reject.

Alternatively, Mr. Speaker, I ask them to consider dispassionately and with reason the evidence on the question of deterrence. I suggest to those members who are still wavering, particularly on the deterrence argument—because I think that is crucial—to consider this, that if the evidence at best is ambiguous, if at best it is not clear or totally persuasive, then they have a moral obligation in this debate to come down on the side of life, on the side of those who oppose capital punishment.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House it is my intention to take a few moments to express my point of view on this very important matter. I do so not with the expectation that anything I say will change one iota the view of any other member. The length of this debate alone has indicated the importance that members attach to it. After all, there is a very heavy responsibility on all of us to try to come up with

what is the most logical and sound decision on this legislation. I feel, too, that I have a responsibility to the people I represent; they should know not only how I vote on a matter such as this, but why I do so.

I say at once that the sincerity of no member can be questioned, regardless how he votes on this bill or what his views may be. This is a subject on which all members of the House have done a great deal of soul searching. We have, in a sense, held in the balance at the present time the lives of certain people, not only those on death row but those of our citizens who may commit murder in the future. As far as those on death row at the moment are concerned, I think there might be justification for making them exempt from the provisions of this bill. That fact might sway some members from voting as they otherwise might do.

I want to say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to vote against this bill. We are, of course, concerned, regardless which side of the argument we are on, with the sanctity of human life. I think that our differences stem not from that but from the way we interpret it. The leader of the New Democratic Party who spoke a few moments ago I think debased the language by equating capital punishment with murder. I think that the two things are entirely different. The end result is the same in that a life is terminated, but under entirely different circumstances.

Murder results when someone, who may be the best citizen possible, who walks uprightly in the eyes of his fellow citizens and in the eyes of God, has his life taken away by another person under conditions over which he has no direct control. No person in this country need ever be hanged, regardless what the law provides; all he need do is not murder anybody. Our law takes every precaution to see that no one in this country is ever unjustly accused or convicted, but after the due process of law is carried out I find it difficult to understand why people cannot bring themselves to approve of capital punishment because they claim to have a reverence for life. Yet large numbers of those same people in many cases have approved abortion on demand. To me that is a much worse act on the part of society. In the one case you are taking the life of an individual who has had his chance and who could have lived his life in a way that society would approve rather than have to condemn. On the other hand, you are taking a life which has never had a chance, a life entirely before the individual. I find this a contradictory kind of thinking.

● (1150)

Much has been said as to whether capital punishment or the lack of it is a deterrent to crime. I think it is not an immediate deterrent either way. A potential murderer does not suddenly change his mind at that very instant and commit a murder. Therefore, even if we can devise a law that is a real deterrent it will have little or no deterrent effect on the hardened criminal or on the person who is so callous toward the right of other people to life that he does not hesitate to take someone's life if that is convenient. Any deterrent effect will not become evident for a generation at least, because the important point in life when our character's are formulated is when we are very young. I believe that as a twig is bent, so is the tree inclined. I get a little tired of people trying to reform hardened criminals. Once they have become hardened and have been through the legal process and are in a penitentiary for years, in some cases, then in most cases it is already far too late.

What society has to do is impress on the people in the days of their youth and their childhood that there are certain things society will not allow and will not tolerate. It is our belief as civilized people that each one of us has the inalienable right to life, and if someone takes it upon himself to take away that right unjustly society will not accept that kind of behaviour. It is abhorrent to society. We must impress upon all our people that there are certain things which are just not tolerable by society, and one of them is cold-blooded, planned and deliberate murder. This is something society will not accept. Therefore, to make society's attitude with regard to that kind of behaviour abundantly clear society should in my judgment decide that anyone who plans in cold blood to take someone else's life should forfeit his own.

In addition there are other categories of behaviour which deserve and warrant capital punishment. Treason under certain circumstances is one. We should not eliminate the possibility of capital punishment for treason. Mass killing, such as putting bombs on aircraft in order to collect the insurance on someone, or for some other equally abhorrent reason, is such callous and outrageous behaviours that anyone who contemplates that kind of conduct should know in advance that if he carries it out he will pay the supreme penalty of capital punishment.

Those are some of the reasons I feel capital punishment should not be completely eliminated. I am not entirely satisfied with the interim law, the life of which is five years and which will not expire for another year and a half, but I think it is better law than the law represented in this bill. Therefore, I will vote against this bill.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that very few if any of us consciously contemplated, when we decided to run for public office, that we would find ourselves playing a decisive role in the resolution of a question as awesome as that of life or death. Yet, here we are, with all our individual limitations, required by the office we hold to make a decision on as profoundly an important issue as has ever divided responsible Canadians.

It is not open to anyone among us to take refuge in the comforting illusion that we are debating nothing more than an abstract theory of criminal justice, and that it will be the Cabinet's sole responsibility to decide the actual fate of individual murderers if this bill is defeated. I want to make it very clear that, if a majority of hon. members vote against abolition, some people are going to be hanged. Their death would be a direct consequence of the negative decision made by this House on this bill.

[*Translation*]

I say that, Mr. Speaker, not from any desire to be morbid or melodramatic, nor from any desire to try to absolve the cabinet, in advance, of its share of responsibility for the taking of human life in the future, if this bill is defeated. I say it in order to impress upon the House as strongly as I can that what we will actually be deciding, when we vote on this bill, is not merely how the law of the land will be written, but also whether some human beings will live or die.

At this moment, eleven men are being held in Canadian prisons under sentence of death for the murder of policemen or prison officials. Some have exhausted their rights of appeal. Others have not. Therefore, while it is impossible to pre-judge how cabinet will treat any individual case when the time comes to decide whether to invoke the royal prerogative of mercy and commute a death sentence to life imprisonment, it is inevitable that the defeat of this bill would eventually place the hangman's noose around some person's neck. To make that quite clear: if this bill is defeated, some people will certainly hang. While members are free to vote as they wish, those who vote against the bill, for whatever reason, cannot escape their personal share of responsibility for the hangings which will take place if the bill is defeated.

It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to place my remarks on the issue before us. Any discussion of capital punishment must begin with the identification of its intended purpose, which is clearly the security of society, the protection of innocent people against the ultimate criminal violence. It is not that goal which divides us. It is a goal we all share. What divides us is the question of the appropriateness of state execution of murderers as a means of achieving that goal.

● (1200)

It is clear that the protection of innocent people against assaults on their lives and liberty is one of the highest duties of the state. It is equally clear that this duty requires the aggressive and effective prevention, prosecution and punishment of criminal violence. It is essential that people have confidence in the law, essential that they have confidence in the ability of the legal process to protect them against the lawless. Reinforcing that vital sense of confidence and security is the primary aim of Bill C-83, the companion piece to the bill we are now debating.

Longer mandatory sentence and the tightening of parole regulations in relation to convicted murderers will give society the assurance it needs that those who have unlawfully taken the life of another will be removed from our midst for a very long time. Other provisions are designed to restrict the availability of guns, the most common murder weapons, and to strenghten the ability of our police forces to prevent and solve crimes.

There is every reason to believe that such measures will effectively inhibit criminal activity, whereas capital punishment offers no such assurance. That is why the time has come for Parliament to decide whether we should remove capital punishment from the Criminal Code. The crux of the question before us is whether execution is an effective and therefore justifiable weapon for the state to use in order to deter potential murderers.

There are those who sincerely believe that no man or group of men ever have the right to end a human life. They believe that life is a divine gift which only God has the right to take away. I am not one of those who share that belief. Our law, from its earliest beginnings, has always recognized the rights of an individual to kill another when there exist reasonable grounds for believing that killing an aggressor is necessary to the protection of one's own life or that of another. Moral philosophers and theologians have recognized for many centuries the right of a country to defend itself in a just war, even when such defence involves the killing of enemies.

[*English*]

So the question before us is not whether execution by the state is justifiable per se, in itself. The question is whether state execution is an effective deterrent to murder, and therefore a justifiable act of collective self-defence.

The deterrent effect of capital punishment is at the very core of the issue, and since one's moral view of the justification of capital punishment is entirely determined by one's judgment of its deterrent effect, the proper focus of this debate is factual data and logical induction, not moral philosophy. In that sense, the issue before us must be resolved by a practical rather than a moral judgment.

I repeat my argumentation. Unless you are of a certain sect, or if you are a conscientious objector, in a moral sense the act of killing can be permissible in certain circumstances, like self-defence. Therefore, you have to make the practical judgment if, in a precise case, you are actually engaged in self-defence or vengeance. That, I think, is a practical judgment. Is it a good way for society to defend itself to hang people? I know there are those who say execution is justified because it prevents a murderer from ever again committing the same crime. It certainly does. If you hang a man, he will not go and shoot anyone else. But if you rely on that kind of reasoning, you are killing a man, not because his death may deter others from following in his footsteps but because of what he might possibly do at some future time. To justify such a preventive execution there would have to be some reasonable grounds for believing that a convicted murderer, if released into society—and, as we are seeking in Bill C-83, after a very long period of time—would murder again. In fact, the probability lies strongly in the other direction.

We know of only four people who have been found guilty of murder by a Canadian court, and convicted of murder a second time. In order to be absolutely sure that no murderer would murder again, we would have to take the lives of all persons convicted of either first or second degree murder, even though the probability is that an infinitesimal percentage of them would ever commit murder again if allowed to live. To me, that is an unacceptably high price to pay in human lives for a sense of security insignificantly greater than we have now. I might ask those who would execute a person to prevent a future murder how they could logically avoid advocating the execution of mentally-ill people who are found to have homicidal tendencies? You may say, "Let's execute the murderer for the crime he has committed. Let's take a life for a life. Let's remove a savage animal from the human race." I do not deny that society has the right to punish a criminal and the right to make the punishment fit the crime, but to kill a man for punishment alone is an act of revenge—nothing else. Some would prefer to call it retribution because that word has a nicer sound. But the meaning is the same.

Are we, as a society, so lacking in respect for ourselves, so lacking in hope for human betterment, so socially bankrupt that we are ready to accept state vengeance as our penal philosophy? Mr. Speaker, I think I have some understanding of the feelings here because I have received correspondence from relatives or friends of murdered people. I

understand individuals who fight back at the murderer of a loved one and kill him in a frenzy of passionate grief. I understand that they sometimes have been excused by the courts because they were thought to have temporarily lost control of their reason. I repeat that I have received letters and telegrams from relatives or friends of murdered people. I have been deeply moved by them and am deeply sympathetic to the suffering of those who endured such a tragedy and cruel loss of a loved one.

But the state cannot claim the excuse of blind grief or unreasoning passion. Long after the provocative act, long after calm and deliberate consideration, long after time for assessment and time to cool off and assemble its reason, the state cannot claim that justification when it kills a man. It should be understood that my primary concern here is not compassion for the murderer. My concern is for the society which adopts vengeance as an acceptable motive for its collective behaviour. If we make that choice, we will snuff out some of that boundless hope and confidence in ourselves and other people which has marked our maturing as a free people.

● (1210)

We will have chosen violence as a weapon against the violence we profess to abhor. Who is so confident that he knows for sure that such an official endorsement of violence will not harden the society we were elected to improve, will not pervade gradually many different relationships in our society? Who is so confident that he knows for sure that acceptance of state violence will not lead to the greater social acceptance of lesser forms of violence among our people? Vengeance and violence damage and destroy those who adopt them, and lessen respect for the dignity and rights of others among those who condone them.

There is only one other possible justification for capital punishment—the one we started with—the belief that execution of murderers will protect society by acting as a deterrent to the commission of murder by other people. There are some who adopt an experimental approach to the question of deterrence, like a scientist experimenting with different combinations of chemicals in the search for a new healing drug. "Let us try it," they say, "and see if it works. If it does, we will keep it. If it does not, we can always stop using it. Let us not slam the door, "they say," on a possibly effective weapon against murder," on some specious philosophical grounds." There are innocent lives at stake. If capital punishment prevents just one murder," they say, "it will be adequately justified."

That is compelling rhetoric, but it contains a fatal flaw, namely, that we would be experimenting with human lives. Respect for human life is absolutely vital to the rights and freedom we all enjoy. Even the life of the most hardened criminal must be accorded some degree of respect in a free society. If we take that life without proven purpose, without proven necessity, then we weaken dangerously one of the fundamental principles which allow us to live together in peace, harmony and mutual respect.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: That is why free peoples have always insisted that the onus is on the person who would interfere with another's life or liberty to prove that such interference is necessary for the common good. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is not up to me, as an abolitionist, to prove that the execution of murderers will not prevent other murders. It is up to the advocates of capital punishment to prove that it will. If they cannot, their case must fail.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Otherwise, this debate turns into a guessing game and the lives of human beings become so many chips on the poker table. That is not good enough. I do not want to hear your guesses about the deterrent value of capital punishment. I do not want to hear about gut feelings. I want proof. Not absolute proof. Not even proof beyond a reasonable doubt. A preponderance of evidence will do. A preponderance of available evidence showing that executions are likely to deter other murders would serve as an adequate justification for the act, an adequate guarantee that a human life was not being taken capriciously.

Show me the evidence that capital punishment anywhere, at any time, has deterred other people from committing murder. My own reading of the speeches made here on this issue since the first week of May, together with the Solicitor General's (Mr. Allmand) daily monitoring of the debate, have indicated that no such evidence has been placed before the House. The evidence does not exist, either in the Canadian experience or in the experience of any other jurisdiction. At best—and I realize that statistics have been put forward on both sides—the statistics are inconclusive. They prove nothing. They prove there is doubt. There is no evidence proving that the use or non-use of capital punishment has had any effect whatsoever on murder rates anywhere in the world.

I must confess I cannot understand why anyone would agree to kill a man without the least shred of assurance that his death would accomplish any worth-while social purpose. If penalties applied by the state against lawbreakers cannot be justified for their rehabilitative, punitive or deterrent value, they cannot be justified at all—not in a civilized society. Capital punishment fails on all three counts. To retain it in the Criminal Code of Canada would be to abandon reason in favour of vengeance; to abandon hope and confidence in favour of a despairing acceptance of our inability to cope with violent crime except with violence.

It is because I have an enduring confidence in mankind, and confidence in society's ability to protect itself without taking human life, that I am eager to support this bill and vote for the abolition of capital punishment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words in the debate on Bill C-84 to abolish capital punishment in Canada. There have been many speakers on both sides of this question. There have been speakers who have quoted the scriptures, logic, philosophers, learned judges, statistics, psychiatrists, historians and sociologists to support their particular point of view. I do not intend to use those disciplines in any depth

in the comments which I wish to make today. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in his remarks made reference to letters which he had received from the families of victims who have been murdered. That is the particular point that I want to talk about today. He said he had a great deal of feeling, compassion and understanding for them. I suppose each of us who takes part in this debate is to some extent ruled and governed by, and our logic is oriented around, the experiences we have had in life. I want to speak from the point of view of the family and close friends of the victims of murder, for they are equally victims with the persons who lost their lives because of a crime of violence.

I know, personally, people who have lost a member of their family to a murderer. In the main, the family and the friends are lost to society, sometimes forever. There is no society, group, agency or government which really cares for those who have lost a member of their family to a murderer. Many of these people never make it back into the mainstream of society. They are lost, empty and sad. There is a sadness about them that many of us cannot comprehend. Some become bitter and withdraw from society because in their view there is no justice. The accused is tried, found guilty and sentenced to death, then has his sentence commuted to life, and in a few short years is back on the streets.

● (1220)

In my riding, like some other large urban ridings, there have been murders. I held in my arms a man who lost his wife and an 18-month old son to a murderer. Not only the family and friends of the murdered victim are lost, but many witnesses who gave testimony at the trial live in fear of their lives as well. They fear for their safety because they know that the accused will possibly be out on a weekend pass or on parole in a few years. The date of parole really becomes a focal point in their lives.

I have a neighbour who lives just around the corner from me who regularly writes to me, and I, in turn, write to the Solicitor General, about a murderer who took his daughter's life. This man also murdered three other women and received ten years imprisonment for each murder, the sentences to run concurrently. What can I answer to this constituent? He knows that the man who murdered the four women is going to be out—I believe 1978 is the last date I was told. How do you answer these people? How do you console them? How can they pick up their lives and start anew? What possible help can we give them? How can we allay their fears when they express their concern about a murderer who is about to be released on parole? "Has he fulfilled his debt to society," they ask? "How do you know he will not do it again?"

It has been suggested that some of the money used to keep prisoners in jail should be used to rehabilitate the family. I think this suggestion is worthy of consideration. Some who have spoken for the abolition of capital punishment have said that if you ever saw a man hang, you would not vote to retain capital punishment. To them I can only say, "If you ever saw a person murdered, you would never vote for abolition; or if you had ever looked into the hopeless faces and hopeless lives of the family of the victim, you would never vote for abolition."

I do not suppose that anything I am going to say here today is going to convince anyone one way or the other, but I should like to say a few words on terrorism. We used to think it could never happen here, that those terrible crimes happened elsewhere, that terrorism could not happen in this country. But in the last few years we have seen that terrorism knows no boundaries, respects no nationality or person. Terrorists kill indiscriminately for money or a cause they believe in. If some innocent victim happens to be passing by, this is his tough luck.

I do not know whether any member of this House has been involved in an incident of terrorism. A few years ago I was travelling on business from Madrid, Spain, to London, England. It was a regular British European Airways' flight. We boarded the plane, and it was held up for a few minutes. At the last moment, several high dignitaries from Spanish Morocco were ushered in and seated in the first-class section. The aircraft taxied out for take-off, and we stopped short of the main runway. Then we were herded off the aircraft and taken some distance away. After a wait of about an hour, the luggage was removed and we were required to look through a heavy steel plate to identify our luggage. There were three pieces of luggage unclaimed, which were removed.

Later, we learned that these three pieces of luggage contained explosives. Someone had called airport officials and warned them that there might possibly be a bomb attack. Along with 75 other innocent people, I might have been the victim of those bombs. Some political or religious group was out to murder the high officials from Spanish Morocco. It was an urgent business trip, and throwing caution to the wind I reboarded the plane and proceeded to London, England. Once we were in the air, those of us who went on wondered whether all the explosives had been removed from the aircraft. Fortunately, they were; but it really was a frightening experience.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this bill. I think I have read more on this subject than any other member since coming to parliament. My mail reflects the concern of the people in my riding. I do not want to deal with the statistics of murder. I agree with the Prime Minister that the statistics are generally inconclusive. I have a healthy suspicion of statistics most times, anyway; they can be twisted and turned to support whatever position you wish. But I think one point is missed by those who like to quote them, and that is that the definition of capital murder has been changed several times in the past few years. It differs from country to country and from state to state. The very basis for the statistics, I believe, is faulty to begin with. I am not convinced that a person who commits a premeditated murder can ever be rehabilitated. I am not convinced that he or she can ever become part of society again, as we know it.

As we know, surveys have been taken in the country, and I think that generally speaking they support the position that we should retain capital punishment in Canada. A referendum was taken in California about five years ago which was signed by seven million people; the outcome was a request to restore capital punishment. I believe most of the people in Canada are saying to us that we should retain capital punishment. In a package of documents that we received from the Solicitor General, which accom-

panied the bill, he stated in one place that capital punishment was not a deterrent. Yet, Mr. Speaker, when he was interviewed on CTV he stated that he did not feel capital punishment was any greater deterrent than a 25-year sentence. He confused the issue, as he has done so many times. I am not criticizing him for this, Mr. Speaker, but I think he is a bit mixed up. First, he says it is not a deterrent; then he says it is no greater deterrent than a 25-year sentence.

I think it is evident that most Canadians want capital punishment restored because they are recoiling from what they regard as the loose administration of justice which they have had from this government. They have had enough of kidnappers being released after a few years of confinement. They have had enough of police officers being shot down and their murderers escaping the penalty they deserve. They have had enough of giving priority to the criminal, and neglecting the victim. They have had enough of easy parole and leaves, when they find that many parolees become criminals again and leaves of absence become a door of escape. They have had enough of easy bail, when they find freedom given to thugs, hoodlums and addicts who use it to pillage, assault, molest, and murder. They have had enough of all this and are saying to parliament, "Change this and give us some protection under the laws, the kind of protection that Canadian citizens want and used to be confident of receiving."

No one who speaks for the retention of capital punishment has ever suggested that it will prevent all murders. Surely we would not expect that, any more than we would expect that not having capital punishment would prevent all murders. There has never yet been a penalty devised that would restrain everyone. To dismiss the death penalty because it does not eliminate murder should, logically, mean we should abolish prison sentences because they do not eliminate bank robberies. The point is that the threat of capital punishment does deter some people from murder, just as the threat of imprisonment deters some from robbery.

To say that when you have capital punishment you also have some murders is really offering no more evidence than to say that when you have long jail sentences you also have some robberies. We know that. Although the imposition of the prison sentence does not deter some from robbing, pillaging and assaulting, we have reason to believe that the imposition of the supreme sentence, the death penalty, deters some from the act of murder. That is partly why the average man supports the restoration of the death penalty. One can quote all manner of statistics and draw all sorts of graphs to back one's argument, but still find that the common sense, average Canadian thinks the death penalty deters. He knows it deters him and knows it deters others.

● (1230)

I know others want to participate in this debate and I shall not prolong my remarks. I have, as have all my colleagues, received a great deal of correspondence on this subject from constituents. I have heard from high school students, clergymen, learned judges, and lawyers. The correspondence runs 90 to 10 in favour of the retention of capital punishment. I was particularly touched when I received a series of essays on the subject of capital punishment, written as an assignment by a group of students in Dundas, Ontario. I was amazed to see, after the positions pro and con had been plotted on a graph, that 86.3 per cent of those high school students between 15 and 18 years of age favoured the retention of capital punishment.

I have discussed this subject with my constituents at meetings in my office, in my constituency and in my home. Overwhelmingly, they urged me to support the retention of capital punishment. I made it known, since I was first elected, that I was in favour of retaining capital punishment. I have said I will keep an open mind, and if someone can convince me that I should take the contrary position, I will consider such arguments. Since the debate of 1973, the capital punishment file in my office has grown larger than all other files. I have read every bit of information I can lay my hands on dealing with both sides of the question. Having read this material, I am not convinced that we should abolish capital punishment. Therefore, when the vote is called I intend to vote against passage of this bill.

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, capital punishment is a difficult subject with which members of parliament must deal because of the high emotions it generates and the wide and deep variations of opinions among constituents. All wisdom does not reside on one side or other of the question. Those in favour of abolition are sincere, honest and entitled to their opinions. Those who feel that the state should not surrender its right to impose the ultimate sanction in cases of capital murder are also honest and entitled to their opinions. Outside these groups there is an army of sociologists, penal and rehabilitation experts, prison guards, psychiatrists, police officers, all of whom have a right to be heard. There are those who have gone outside the law and who have opinions on this question. There are also the victims and their families and relatives: the still, quiet voices of the victimized, too often not heard in the land.

Those who are opposed to capital punishment may be divided into the following categories: those who oppose on religious or moral grounds, it is wrong to take a life; those who oppose largely on the pragmatic ground that capital punishment is not a deterrent—this includes some newspaper editors—and those who oppose on the ground of miscarriage of justice, which includes many criminal lawyers.

The proponents of capital punishment include, first, those who, on religious or moral grounds, believe in adequate retribution—an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. On that ground, no dentist would be safe. Second, those who believe capital punishment is a deterrent. Third, those who on economic grounds feel it is too expensive to build special prisons to constrain a growing army of killers. Fourth, those who feel that capital punishment remains society's ultimate line of defence against lawlessness, that it is a matter of protection of the individual and that it should not be surrendered. In this group are police officers and a growing number of citizens disturbed about increasing crimes of violence and murder.

Capital punishment is reserved for the capital crime of murder. In our society it has now become applicable only to those who kill police officers and prison guards and, in practical terms, not even to them. Quite a few police officers and guards have been killed and their killers have not been subjected to the ultimate sanction.

There are many kinds of murder, and perhaps it is useful to look at some of them. Murder, essentially, is the deliberate and cold-blooded taking of a human life. Some people believe that abortion comes within this definition. Curiously enough, some who shudder at taking the life of a person who has deliberately killed another are in favour of removing life from an urborn child. This indicates the contradictions inherent in questions of morality and ethics. The taking of life is not the issue here, because lives are taken every day in hospitals and rarely are there complaints. Doctors stick knives in people, remove their vital organs and place substitute parts in their bodies. This is accepted because the intent is to preserve life, although it is not always successful.

The intent of murder is to deprive a person of the right to live. A question arising out of this is whether one who deliberately takes the life of another person can continue to assert his own right to live. There has been a great deal of talk about crimes of passion, crimes committed in the heat of a moment's aberration, crimes committed to defend or to punish another person. These are regarded as one-shot crimes. The assumption is that a person who has once lost his or her head will not do so again. It is hard to see why this should be the case. The reverse would seem equally logical, and in fact is borne out too often by experience.

When one has gone through all the crimes of passion, crimes committed in the heat of the moment, crimes under emotional stress, and so on, there remains a solid body of criminal activity, including murder, undertaken coldly and deliberately for personal gain or personal advantage. There are people who murder for profit. An example was George Joseph Smith, in England, who drowned half a dozen women in the bath for their insurance. In this category are poisoners, of whom the records of criminality are eloquent. They are seldom caught with the first victim. Sometimes they are never caught.

● (1240)

There are many cases on record of people killing for mean or petty objectives, insurance benefits and similar questions of personal gain. This applies over the entire field of criminality, not merely murder. Arson, robbery, embezzlement, fraud and kidnapping are crimes in which the objective is the personal advantage of the criminal. Such criminals sometimes resort to violence, including murder. Many of those who claim that capital punishment is not a deterrent to murder nevertheless would not want to do away with jail terms for breaking and entering, robbery with violence and similar crimes. They feel that while capital punishment is not a deterrent, a prison term is.

There is a new kind of crime. In recent years we have seen the emergence of a new type of crime—syndicated crime. This has led to a new type of capital crime, syndicated murder or, as it was once described, "murder incorporated." In this category murder is undertaken for a variety of reasons, largely mercenary, or to remove someone in the way of organized crime. Most people take a broad view of this kind of thing and believe that its proper place is on the TV screen or between book covers. Nevertheless, it happens.

[Mr. Paproski.]

With the spread of crime syndicate activities in the field of labour and industry, syndicated murder has made its appearance in those areas. We have also seen the emergence of a particularly evil type of crime once thought to belong to the dark ages, political assassination—not the kind with which we are familiar in this chamber, but with guns and bullets. One need only mention Martin Luther King, the Kennedys, to recall the vileness of this particular type of development. In Canada we had a case in October, 1970.

There has also been a resurgence of the crime of kidnapping, once punishable by death. Some kidnappings, like the Hearst kidnapping, are politically motivated, some motivated by gain, some both. Political motivation is also behind underground guerrilla activities and aircraft hijackings on an international scale. These activities have caused the loss of innocent lives. This kind of international guerrilla violence appears to be beyond control except through the administration of capital punishment. At least, the effect would be to discourage recruiting for movements of international violence.

Whether capital punishment or the threat of capital punishment is a deterrent, or not, I leave to others to resolve. In the context of protecting the rights of individual citizens, this becomes irrelevant. Nor do I intend to embark on statistics to show the rise in crimes of violence of a peculiarly sadistic character, including molestation of the young and helpless. All of these things may be symbols of a sickness in our society. Perhaps Judy LaMarsh can get to the bottom of that phenomenon. What I think can be taken for granted is that there has been, in the past decade, a notable increase in crimes of violence of the kind described above and this may account for the uneasiness of Canadians and their reluctance to surrender the ultimate protection which society affords.

There seems to be an idea abroad that our kind of society, a free society, has no right to defend itself. This is a fatal misapprehension. For many people, the issue is further complicated by a statement from Roman Catholic bishops urging that the state—that is, society—surrender its right to apply the ultimate penalty. The bishops, like others, are within their rights.

This is not, however, a question of faith or morals, and therefore others are equally within their right in disagreeing with the proposal. I know that in the constituency which I represent there is a great deal of uneasiness, in view of the rise in crimes of violence, about any proposal which appears to lessen society's ability to afford protection to its citizens. To many Canadians aware of the various facets of this proposal, the issue resolves itself into a few major considerations: first, the knowledge that there are in society certain classes of criminals who murder coldly and deliberately for personal gain or in line with the objectives of criminal groups or organizations.

In summary, then, many Canadians feel, and will continue to feel, regardless of what this House decides, that they have a right to resort to ultimate action to defend their lives, homes and families. The final consideration arises when an individual is found guilty, after due process of law, of having deliberately and wilfully taken the life of another person or persons. The state has a responsibility to see that society is protected from such a person. The

application of a fixed 25-year sentence does not provide the security that citizens feel they must have. Such a sentence will certainly be subjected to immense pressure toward a reduction, and governments which play politics with capital punishment cannot be relied upon not to bow to pressure to reduce the 25-year sentence. Can a 25-year sentence deter, if hanging does not?

The question of the moral responsibility of the state is one which concerns a number of people. There have been suggestions that the state has no right to take life. Let us look at self-defence. Any person has the right to defend his life. Individuals surrender this right to the state, as they surrender the right to make war and collect taxes for public purposes. This does not mean that an indivudal no longer has the right to defend himself. The individual in our society looks to the state to protect him in his daily activities to keep the streets, playgrounds and schoolyards safe. When the state is no longer able to guarantee protection of the individual and his rights, then the individual will resort to other methods.

Most people will feel that inability by the state to guarantee protection of property and person represents a betrayal of the fundamental rights of individuals in a free society. Such rights as protection of property and the person, and defence against aggression, are fundamental in any society, and the state which cannot fulfil these basic duties is inviting a collapse of public confidence.

The assertion of the state's right to exact the ultimate penalty necessary for the protection of the individual in society is not a question of hanging every person found guilty of murder; nor should the issue be placed on that basis. There is no question of that, nor has there been for at least a decade. Is the ultimate sanction necessary? The question is whether society, faced with an increase in crimes of violence and the emergence of new kinds of organized criminal activities, can preserve and guarantee the rights of its members without retaining the ultimate sanction. This does not involve, in any way, the automatic application of capital punishment in all cases. This determination should be taken out of the hands of cabinets and returned to juries, where it belongs.

The effect of placing the question of clemency in the hands of the government has made clemency a political issue of the most blatant kind. Clemency should not be a political football. Clemency should be a matter for juries to recommend on the basis of common sense and a knowledge of the facts. Faced with this issue, cabinets invariably take the road of least resistance, which in political terms means that the law is simply left in abeyance as it has been for several years. This has been a factor undermining the confidence of Canadians in the application of justice. The ultimate sanction should be applied only when there is no recommendation for clemency by a jury. On that basis, very few people in this country will face the penalty of hanging. Society should not be left without the protection which most Canadians feel they are entitled to as a way of safeguarding their lives and the lives of their families.

● (1250)

Finally, the artificial distinction between official protectors of the public peace and the general public should be discarded. A householder beaten to death in his own home—and there have been many such cases—or patrons of a public place overtaken by a gang feud are as much entitled to the full protection of the law as are policemen and prison guards. Again, this is a matter which should revert to the collective wisdom of juries, and where there is no recommendation for clemency, the law should run its course. In this way, justice would be satisfied and at the same time the confidence of Canadians in their system of justice would be restored.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the matter would be discussed from the standpoint of the government's duty to protect society, rather than "hawkish" appeals to jailhouse sentimentality. There is very little emotionally appealing about someone who deliberately sets out to take away the life of an innocent person for reasons of personal gain, malice or self-aggrandisement. In summary, the question is this: Are we justified in depriving the citizen of his right to protection by the state?

There have been cases in recent months of persons committing murder while already having been convicted of a previous murder. We have granted bail to persons charged with murder. We have even released killers on weekend passes. The result is that citizens are uneasy and feel they are not being protected in the way in which they are entitled. Certainly, a bill which deprives the state of its power to act in protecting citizens from the ultimate crime of murder is not a good bill.

Most people will feel that the threat of 25 years imprisonment is not a good guarantee of protection in the case of a criminal who may already have killed once and may be fleeing from the scene of a crime while heavily armed and dangerous. If the threat of hanging is not a deterrent, why should the threat of 25 years in jail be a deterrent? If hanging is not a deterrent, nothing is. If hanging is not a deterrent, then it is silly to talk of putting criminals behind bars for armed robbery, rape and other crimes of violence. The ultimate conclusion is that nothing is a deterrent and you may as well let them all roam free, which is very nearly the situation at the present time.

A person who coldly and deliberately commits murder—and there are some in that category—forfeits his claim to life. A person found guilty of deliberate murder, under due process of law, certainly cannot claim the right to life, a right of which he has already deprived his victim and, in some cases, more than one victim. It is my contention that only a jury is in a position, having heard the evidence, to make a reasoned judgment on the question of capital punishment. Where a jury does not see fit to recommend mercy, then the government should not put itself in the position of going beyond the intentions of the jury. Under the circumstances, the law should be carried out.

Society must be protected against hijackers, urban guerrillas, professional killers and criminal syndicates part of whose stock-in-trade is murder. Recently, the editor of the Guiness Book of Records in Britain was callously, ruthlessly and deliberately executed for having dared to advocate capital punishment for terrorist killings. A society which cannot protect its own citizens against professional assassins is a society on the way out. It is issuing an invitation to anarchy. Far too many killers are murdering for a second or third time, encouraged by the loopholes and laxity of our laws and our system of criminal administra-

tion and bail requirements. Perhaps these are reasons surveys show that the majority of Canadians feel that for the sake of the protection they are entitled to have from society, the state should not give up the right to impose the ultimate sanction when it is necessary to do so.

That, Mr. Speaker, ends my contribution to this debate. I believe there are other members who would like to say a few more words.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East-Hants): I could make my speech in about six minutes, Mr. Speaker, if members were willing to ignore the clock, but there may be one or two more who would wish to speak after me.

May I call it one o'clock?

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO BUSINESS ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the Prime Minister's recently expressed concerns on the topic of conflict of interest, in view of the fact that the chairman of the anti-dumping tribunal has been actively promoting his private business interests in a large scale manner while holding a senior position in the employ of the government of Canada, and in view of the fact that these activities include lobbying of our military, including the chief of the defence staff, General J. Dextraze, and extolling the apparently dubious—according to our military tests—virtues of a Swedish rifle sight called "Aimpoint", for which he and his associates have been actively seeking exclusive marketing rights, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn):

That the activities of the chairman of the anti-dumping tribunal as they relate to his own private affairs, vis-à-vis his official duties, be investigated under the Inquiries Act, also that his activities with respect to contacting our chief of the defence staff, General J. Dextraze, as well as his relationship with financiers such as Mr. Jens Moe of Montreal, form part of the terms of reference for the inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Paproski.]

AIR CANADA

SUGGESTED APPEARANCE OF COMPANY AUDITORS BEFORE COMMITTEE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In light of conflicting reports in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of Saturday, June 12, concerning the financial problems of Air Canada in which an Air Canada public relations officer denied that problems existed because, according to him, Air Canada is subject to continuous external audit procedures, and since this is in direct conflict with the Estey report and known cases of financial mismanagement in the Air Canada finance branch, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

That this House instruct representatives of the Ottawa firm of Cooper and Lybrand, chartered accountants for Air Canada, to appear before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications along with the public relations officer for Air Canada to have them explain the financial fiasco in the Air Canada finance branch.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW ACT

PROPOSAL THAT GOVERNMENT ADMINISTER ACT WITH VIEW TO CURTAILING FOREIGN INVESTMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that in 1975 the outflow of funds from Canada in interest and dividend payments and service charges to foreign investors and companies reached a record $6 billion and is projected to be even higher this year, and that Canada's current account deficit will be at least $25 billion by the end of 1976, which illustrates that the Foreign Investment Review Act as it is now being administered is ineffective in controlling foreign investment, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That this House instruct the government to administer the Act with a view to curtailing rather than facilitating foreign investment in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion is proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 which requires unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

REASON GOVERNMENT FAILED TO PRESENT DETAILS OF COST-SHARING PLANS AND TO HAVE CONFERENCE DISCUSSION OPEN

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Given that the principle of the federal position on equalization had been presented to the provinces by the federal Minister of Finance in April, and that similar federal principles on cost sharing had been made available on June 8, will the Prime Minister explain why the federal government came to the June 14-15 conference unprepared to attach specific financial details in percentages, dollar terms, base years, possible options to their previous statements of principles?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. lady has been seriously misinformed. The proposal we made to the provinces yesterday was made for the first time to the provincial premiers. It is true that as a matter of courtesy to them, because it was a very complex and technical matter, we did brief their officials a week ago in order that the premiers would, indeed, understand what we were talking about. It was very complex.

An hon. Member: I'm glad you made it easy for them.

Mr. Trudeau: I think we did make it easy for them, and they thanked us for having briefed them in advance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I told them we were always disposed to do that, but there was a difficulty because the opposition is very jealous of its position and it does not like us to do that before telling them. This is the kind of dilemma I found myself in on Friday when the hon. lady asked me to table certain documents and I said they had not been given to the premiers yet, so I would prefer to wait. The upshot is that we were making this proposal for the establishment of a program of financing for the first time yesterday.

Regardless of the figures, the premiers have not been able to say with any firmness yet whether they agree to one or other of the formulae that we proposed. We have indicated that if they would take some position in principle we would, indeed, be able to give their financial officers some figures at the July meeting of Ministers of Finance. That is the situation we are in, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fraser: You just contradicted yourself.

Mr. Trudeau: What is your problem, Mr. Fraser?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I can now understand the dilemma of the provincial premiers in the last couple of days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: Does the Prime Minister not consider that secrecy is being carried to the extreme when he convenes a closed session to discuss fiscal arrangements and then refuses to place the federal fiscal position on the table and, knowing that this was going to be his method of operation, why did the Prime Minister not inform the provinces that discussions would take place only on the level of general principles so they might have agreed to hold the conference in open session, thus providing the general public with an opportunity to witness this debate on principles to which the Prime Minister attaches so much importance?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it is not that I attach importance to it, it is that we are talking about a co-operative system in respect of which we want to act with the understanding of the provinces. If, as the hon. lady suggests, we had brought in a statement of principles right away and said: Here are the amounts and this is what we are going to do whether you like it or not, I am sure the hon. lady would be full of indignation and ask why I did not ask them what they thought about the new scheme. I can understand why the hon. lady does not understand the scheme as she got the paper for the first time yesterday. The premiers have had this in their hands for a week. The lady should understand it is a basic departure from our previous practice. We are now giving the provinces what they have been asking for for years which is more fiscal room. I understand an hon. member opposite has a supplementary. Perhaps you would be good enough to recognize him, Mr. Speaker.

● (1410)

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS IN VIEW OF IMPORTANCE OF CONFERENCES

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could put forward a proposal which the Prime Minister might consider. Given that decisions involving the expenditure of billions of dollars affecting major policy areas in health, regional disparity, urban affairs and education are being made at federal-provincial conferences, the result of which has been to shift power from both federal and provincial parliaments to these conferences, thus altering significantly our federal system, would the Prime Minister—and I ask him this quite seriously—undertake to establish a special committee on federal-provincial relations so that parliamentarians would be more involved in this process and not restricted to mere ratification.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will undertake to do more than that, Mr. Speaker. I will undertake to put legislation before Parliament so that we can know what the opposition thinks about these things.

Mr. Fraser: Before or after you have made your deal?

Mr. Trudeau: One of the shared costs programs has to do with post-secondary education and the expiry date is next April. Another has been given a five-year notice which expires in 1980 I believe. There has been some discussion on an earlier expiry date if the provinces agree among themselves. So the House will have ample opportunity

right here in this chamber to say whether or not it agrees with the proposals. Surely, in respect of what is proposed in a scheme which involves the transfer of $5 billion in cash and in tax points to the provinces it is important that we inform the provinces that these present measures are coming to an end and that we have various options for renewal. We have made these options known to the provinces and the provinces at least have had the decency to give us some reaction to these proposals. I have not heard any from the hon. lady now.

Miss MacDonald: You are hearing it now. Just listen.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE FUTURE EQUALIZATION FORMULA WILL PROVIDE FOR INEQUALITIES BETWEEN PROVINCES

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Before introducing legislation perhaps he might answer a couple more questions. The government has proposed two changes in health and education funding arrangements with the provinces; one, the per capita grants would seriously affect the poorer provinces which are less capable of providing matching funds. The additional tax room, of course, would be unequal in that it depends on the provincial tax base. Can the Prime Minister give assurance that any future equalization formula will recognize these inequalities and will in fact be sufficient for all provinces to maintain the standards of service provided in, say, the two or three wealthiest provinces.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, the paper I presented to the provinces, and which was tabled in this House yesterday, answers some of the points raised by the hon. member. It indicates that our proposition would have the effect of helping in a general way the less fortunate provinces because they would not be shared-cost programs; they would not be tied to a 50 cent dollar offered to each province and therefore the poorer provinces would not be dependent on spending their 50 cents in order to get our 50 cents. What we have proposed at this time is an outright transfer either of tax points or cash or in fact a mixture of both. In this way the less fortunate provinces would receive the transfer without having to spend equivalent amounts themselves. This would be advantageous to them in the sense that in the past they have fallen behind in some of the expenditures because they could not afford to put the 50 cents into the program which drew the 50 cents from the federal government.

Now we are saying, you will have it regardless of what you spend, providing you spend our funds which we will offer you or our tax funds in the areas of health and post-secondary education. This seems an advantageous way of bringing more equity to the poor provinces and, more particularly, of not upsetting their priorities. We are not forcing them to enter into a certain field in order to qualify for federal help. They will get the help whether or not they do anything in the fields of health and education.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

I think the hon. member would support this if he studied the theory.

Miss MacDonald: It is not theories we want, it is dollars.

POSSIBILITY OF WITHDRAWAL FROM EQUALIZATION SCHEMES

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is with respect only to the theories because the Prime Minister has not been willing yet to put dollar figures to any of these schemes. Could he indicate why at the same time as these two examples, the tax room and per capita grants were being established, which will undermine the poor provinces, a suggestion was also made that any adjustment or change in the equalization formula will in effect likely be a withdrawal rather than an increase in trying to establish some form of equitable service across the country. Perhaps he could explain it to the House because the provincial premiers have failed to understand it.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I must repeat my disagreement with the preamble of the question of the hon. member. Obviously he has not listened to my earlier answer. It is not meant to hurt, it is meant to help the less fortunate provinces. I can explain it again if the House wants me to repeat it. I see Mr. Speaker shaking his head.

With regard to the second part of the question, the hon. member is misinformed again. We are not proposing a withdrawal from the equalization schemes. We think that they are very important schemes for the equality of all regions in Canada. They were brought in years ago by a Liberal government, then they were modified by a Tory government and improved again by Liberal governments. We do not intend to withdraw them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: What we have said to the provinces—there is no misunderstanding and I am convinced they did not say what the hon. member says they said—is that we were concerned with the rate of growth of the equalization payments in the past five and ten years. They have grown faster than the federal revenues out of which they have to be paid. We have told the provinces that as with our other programs we are trying to moderate the rate of growth of federal expenditure and that we are trying to do that also with these programs. I hope that when the opposition understand this, we will have their support.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I wonder if the Prime Minister can indicate—because he has referred directly to the growth of equalization payments over the last four or five years—whether he expressed the opinion to the premiers of the several provinces in receipt of equalization funds that they have spent too much on basic public services. In addition, why has the federal government taken such strong opposition to the possibility of different federal tax rates which might off-set some of the other proposals we discussed a moment or two ago?

Mr. Trudeau: I fail to understand the suggestion on federal tax rates. If the hon. member wants to repeat it, I might be able to deal with it.

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT ABANDONING CO-OPERATIVE FEDERALISM

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, the premiers who broke up and left the meeting at 11 o'clock this morning will, I am sure, see through the sophistry in which the Prime Minister has been indulging this afternoon. Would the Prime Minister agree that the new position taken by the federal government in the discussions that have just ended amounts to a complete abandonment of the approach taken by former Prime Minister Pearson on the question of co-operative federalism, and specifically does not the position taken now by the Prime Minister stop the federal government from showing leadership in a number of social areas of spending that his predecessor exercised and which were so instrumental as one means of establishing conditions of equality from coast to coast in Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member suggests sophistry on my part but he gives no proof of that. I suggest that what he is saying is absolute rubbish and if he gives me time, I will prove it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1420)

REQUEST FOR ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT ON PROVINCIAL REVENUES OF FEDERAL PROPOSALS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will have his chance to prove his case. I should like to ask the Prime Minister if his government has done an assessment on the effects on the revenues going to the provinces which would accrue to the provinces five years from now or would have accrued to the provinces five years past if the principle that his government has been putting forward on cost-sharing in the negotiations with the provinces in the last two days had been accepted in the past and would be accepted five years from now, specifically the proposal that the federal government offer a mixture of cash grants and increased tax revenues to the provinces? Have you got the figures and will you present them to the House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is confusing two questions, the established program item on the agenda and the equalization one. On the first part of his question, which I take it deals with equalization, the Minister of Finance gave some figures this morning which indicate quite clearly that equalization payments over the past five years have been growing at a rate of 20 per cent, whereas federal revenues have been growing at a rate of 16 per cent. We are not saying we are going to cut equalization back to zero. We are saying, and I hope we have the support of the House, that expenditures cannot continue growing faster than revenues without something happening to the economy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: We are not proposing a withdrawal, I repeat, from these expenditures. The Minister of Finance indicated this morning that there were three approaches—a global approach, a representative tax approach and a mixture of both. We asked the provinces for their reactions to these various options and we got some reactions this morning. I expect we will get further reactions. We told them that when they knew which approach they prefer—and I know they will look at figures for themselves, since Quebec already had a presentation which indicated they had made some calculations as to what these approaches mean—we will discuss these various approaches with them. What we are saying is that we will continue to have equalization programs which are of utmost importance for our brand of federalism—which was also Mr. Pearson's brand of federalism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: Who are you kidding?

Mr. Trudeau: They will not and should not, from the point of view of this side of the House, continue to grow at a rate which is faster than our revenues.

Mr. Paproski: O'Hagan is doing a good job.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, that was sophistry No. 2. As the Prime Minister knows, the minister of finance of Manitoba pointed out that his revenues have been going down simply because they cut taxes. If you want more revenue you raise your taxes.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: My question to the Prime Minister, the one I asked him a minute ago, had nothing to do with equalization but had everything to do with cost sharing. I should like to repeat it. Does his government have estimates as to what the financial effects will be for the provinces five years from now in terms of their revenue position, in terms of payments from the federal government, if the federal government proposals are accepted? If he has those estimates would he provide them for members of the House because he did not provide them to the provincial premiers?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I think the provincial premiers can work on our proposals. We also indicated that we thought the cash portion of the federal grants should grow at a rate roughly proportionate to the rate of growth of the gross national product.

Mr. Broadbent: Why? What is the connection?

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member asks why, what is the connection.

Mr. Hogan: You are freezing social services.

Mr. Broadbent: What is the connection?

Mr. Trudeau: I will explain the connection for the hon. member, if he does not get too excited and is prepared to listen for a moment. These are long established programs; that is the nature of them. That is why we are prepared to give grants which are not tied grants, not conditional grants and not 50-50 grants. We are telling the provinces that, these programs having been established, we propose, for starters that they should grow at a rate roughly equal to the rate at which Canada is growing. If that is not an obvious connection—

An hon. Member: It is not.

Mr. Trudeau: We also indicated—

An hon. Member: It is the status quo.

Mr. Trudeau: We also indicated to the provinces that if they have other views, they can tell us that, no, they think health expenditures should continue growing faster than the Canadian economy is growing.

Mr. Fraser: That is not the issue. What are the provinces going to get?

Mr. Trudeau: Maybe they should—

An hon. Member: Another couple of steps and you'll reach the Mace.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, maybe they should. We are now in this position: the two official opposition parties want expenditures for health, expenditures for hospitals, expenditures for medicare and, now, expenditures for equalization to grow faster than the country is growing.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: That is not true.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: There is also the proposition before—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker—Oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

PROPOSED USE OF BANK OF CANADA TO REMEDY FINANCIAL SITUATION

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

As the provinces have naturally said they are dissatisfied with the financial proposals and fiscal arrangements put forward during this conference, and as the Prime Minister and the government may also be tired of constantly being asked to transfer to the provinces the fiscal fields that are rightly theirs, do the Prime Minister and government not consider it important to restore the financial situation in Canada by using the Bank of Canada and in so doing reducing federal expenditures? We are now spending almost $5 billion a year on debt servicing. That would enable the federal government to reduce its expenditures while giving the provinces a better tax base and financial system.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must say, first of all, that we have told the provinces that we are responding to the request they have been making for a long time, namely that their tax base be broadened by the transfer of tax points. That is what we are suggesting. So, it is not fair to say that the provinces did not react favourably to that suggestion. They are in the process of figuring out how much those points are worth in taxes, and so on and so forth. But as far as the principle goes, I am absolutely convinced that the province the hon. member has in mind certainly agrees with it.

As for the Bank of Canada and the suggestions of the hon. member, he may be right in making them. But I must say that no province made those suggestions, not even the Social Credit province of British Columbia.

Mr. Rondeau: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. No doubt the Prime Minister is aware that such provinces as Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia have made those requests a few years ago, and I think this government is perhaps slow to understand the monetary policy of the Bank of Canada. Is the Prime Minister, in 1976, in view of the financial dead end the provinces and the federal government are stuck in, not prepared to consider at least a little this way of holding the provinces without any prejudice to the federal government?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying the provinces are not considering it nor working towards it, I do not know. I am simply saying that the provinces did not make this proposal to us, not this morning nor yesterday. And I am saying that even the so-called Social Credit province of British Columbia did not make it. So perhaps the hon. member could talk with his colleagues from out there to make sure whether his ideas are good in their opinion.

* * *

● (1430)

[*English*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

ALLEGED COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister of which I believe the government House leader has given him some notice. Is it the position of the Prime Minister that the chairman of the anti-dumping tribunal, during his tenure of office, ought to devote his full time and attention to his official position and refrain from commercial activities of a private and personal nature either for his own benefit or the benefit of associates? I ask this question with particular

reference to Section 21, subsection 7 of the Anti-Dumping Act?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): If I may reply, Mr. Speaker. I received notice that the hon. member intended to ask the question. The chairman of the tribunal is absent from the city today. I was not able to reach him before the House met. I will take note of the Standing Order 43 and also this question. I hope to be able to report to the House further on this tomorrow.

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Finance for his answer. I now ask him this: Is it the position of this government that activities of the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal which seem to involve extensive and long-term efforts to secure marketing rights for various military and para-military products as well as other commodities, and his related activities in supplying information about bond market and interest rates in Canada for commercial ventures, and in lobbying such diverse organizations as the Canadian armed forces, and foreign military powers like Morocco, Egypt and Turkey, and reporting on tests by various armed forces for a rifle sight manufactured in Sweden for which the chairman of the anti-dumping tribunal sought and obtained exclusive marketing rights for North America, constitute acceptable behaviour?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making quite an attack on a public servant.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I can only say this. The hon. member has set out what amounts to a very detailed criticism of the activities of the chairman. This is all the more reason why I should have an opportunity of talking to the chairman in order to respond properly.

KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER OF FINANCE OF ALLEGED COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance as the minister to whom Mr. Gauthier reports. Can the minister indicate if in the drawing up of the anti-dumping tribunal estimates or in any other conversations with Mr. Gauthier or others he was informed of the various dealings Mr. Gauthier has been having in countries around the world; not only Mr. Gauthier, but Mr. Bissonnette, another member of that tribunal?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have heard of these particular dealings. I should say that Mr. Gauthier retired as chairman of the anti-dumping tribunal in December last with the intention of taking on a new career. At the request of the government, he remained on contract on an acting basis to the end of this month. He did indicate to me that he would be undertaking another career which would not be in conflict with his present responsibilities, but that he would discharge his responsibilities as chairman of the anti-dumping tribunal until the end of this month.

Mr. Stevens: Is the Minister of Finance willing to conduct an investigation forthwith to determine to what extent the lavish anti-dumping tribunal offices in Place Bell Canada have been used for private business purposes and to what extent foreign trips in the name of the tribunal, paid for by the taxpayers of Canada, have in fact been made, at least in part, for private business reasons?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, in my last answer I believe I referred to the anti-inflation tribunal rather than the anti-dumping tribunal. I wish to correct that. I undertook to make inquiries of the department on behalf of the hon. member for Central Nova. I will take into account the further allegations made by the hon. member for York-Simcoe.

* * *

AIR CANADA

REQUEST FOR AUDITOR GENERAL TO CONDUCT AUDIT OF COMPANY—DATE OF APPEARANCE OF OFFICIALS BEFORE COMMITTEE

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, I will direct my question to the Prime Minister. For the first four months of this year, Air Canada shows a deficit of $14½ million, $2 million more than the total deficit of $12½ million for last year. Financial analysis for Touche Ross and Company have stated that if Air Canada had realistic accounting applied to it, its loss last year would have been around $100 million. This is in addition to the charges of financial mismanagement laid by the Canadian Airline Employees Association. Will the Prime Minister now reconsider and direct the Auditor General to conduct an immediate audit into the Air Canada finance branch in Winnipeg?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made allegations before in this House. As has been indicated, the financial management of Air Canada was investigated not very long ago by a commission of inquiry. The report of that inquiry is before parliament. The minister has indicated on a number of occasions that in due course legislation will be coming forward in consequence of that. The minister also mentioned, and this has been the subject of discussion in the subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, that Air Canada will in due course in the context of that legislation be called before the standing committee for its usual appearance. With those assurances, the hon. member will have adequate opportunity to put the questions which he has to the proper people, namely, the management of Air Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McKenzie: Will the parliamentary secretary give a firm date as to when the Air Canada officials will be appearing before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications as charges are being laid daily by the news media and the national—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. McKenzie: Can the parliamentary secretary give a firm commitment as to when the officials of Air Canada will be asked to appear before the committee?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, that is a subject to be determined in the proper course by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. In particular, it has already been the subject of discussion in the steering committee. I presume those discussions will go forward and an appropriate date will be arranged.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR MORE HUMANITARIAN INTERPRETATION OF ACT IN CASE OF MR. VALDEZ

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, but in view of his absence, I shall direct it to his parliamentary secretary.

Following the question I asked the minister last week concerning the Valdez family and the telephone call I received from his department, for which I want to thank the minister, and also the month of delay he gave that family, given the excellent reputation it enjoys and the fact that it could not be held responsible for the illegal entry of the husband in Canada, and in view of the humanitarian sentiments of the Valdez family, does the minister not think that time has come to interpret immigration regulations more humanely?

Mr. Arthur Portelance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there is nothing I can add at this moment. The minister is aware of the question raised by the hon. member, and I think that within a few days he will be able to give him an answer.

* * *

[*English*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT PUTTING CEILING ON SHARED-COST PROGRAMS

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Prime Minister. It is in the same area as the question put by my leader about the substantial change.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You will have to do better.

Mr. Saltsman: I am sure that members opposite will be quite anxious to hear their Prime Minister respond to my question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: My question is with regard to the cost-shared programs and the departure of the government in terms of the open-endedness of those programs. The Prime Minister insists this is not a departure from traditional policy. However, it seems to be a very important departure from traditional policy. The Prime Minister says the negotiations are open and that he has offered options to the provincial governments. It is the sort of option of whether they want to be shot, hanged or garroted. He said there is a ceiling or cap being put on.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Saltsman: Will the Prime Minister level with the House of Commons and indicate whether this is a sharp departure from past government policy and if he intends to put a cap on expenditures of the provincial governments in these cost-shared programs?

● (1440)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): It is, indeed, a sharp departure in one sense. It is acceding to what the provinces have been requesting for a long time, namely, that they should be allowed more flexibility in the spending of federal funds, that they would not be obliged to match dollar for dollar everything we spend in these areas of health and education. It is acceding to their request that they should have greater flexibility in the spending of these funds. Then again, the proposals would do away with the necessity for complicated accounting procedure to enable the federal government to see what the provinces are spending in their hospital insurance scheme, and so on. It is a concession to the provinces in another sense: they have been asking for more tax room and this proposal gives them more tax room.

What the hon. member is suggesting is that we are seeking not to make it open-ended. I must concede that he is right in his conception. We are saying we must be able to plan in the future, to know what our costs are likely to be; that they should not be automatically tied to any level of spending by provinces no matter how improvident or fanciful it might be; it has to be predictable so that we can budget properly. It is for this reason we are suggesting a rate of escalation roughly corresponding to the increase in the gross national product. I said to his leader that formula is debatable—we could hear representations with regard to that—but we are suggesting it should not be completely open-ended as was the case, perhaps, in the past.

We have brought before the House measures to cap some of these programs as the bill in the name of the Minister of Finance, presently before parliament, is doing. It is a question of whether we should set growth arbitrarily at a rate of 15 per cent, for instance, or whether we should say the growth ought to be held at a rate equivalent to the growth of the gross national product. A choice can be made. The hon. member who asked this question is a very responsible member and critic on financial matters and he will certainly understand that it is reasonable for the federal government and, indeed, for the provincial governments, to be able to plan future expenditures with some certainty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: I appreciate the right hon. gentleman's estimation of myself as reasonable and I will therefore ask him a reasonable question. I agree with him that governments have to be able to plan and that they should know

what their expenditures are likely to be. But that is not the point of the argument. What we are asking is this: why should something as important as health services or education be geared to the percentage growth of the gross national product any more than he would restrict, say, the growth of ESSO to the expansion in the GNP? I ask him whether he is prepared to find a formula which, while it might cap expenditures, would allow the growth of these important public services to be in excess of the increase in the GNP or of historic standards.

Mr. Trudeau: I am certainly prepared to consider that proposition if it is put forward by the provinces. To my recollection, and I see the Minister of Finance is agreeing with me—at least, I think he is—the provinces have not made such a proposal. They, too, want to plan their future growth. Hon. members ask: why tie it to the gross national product? The premiers asked, as did hon. members opposite: why tie it to the gross national product? We said: why not? It is a reasonable basis and I explained the basis of that answer to the leader of the New Democratic Party. These are established programs. Health delivery services in Canada are among the best in the world—certainly they are among the most generous, and the arrangements for post-secondary education are very generously financed. It may perhaps be reasonable to say that they should not continue to grow at a rate of 15 per cent or 18 per cent when the economy is growing at a rate of 5 per cent or 10 per cent. That is the proposal we have put forward and which the provinces will consider.

Let me say, also, that this applies to the cash part of the grants. As far as the tax transfer is concerned it is, of course, not tied to anything but the rate of growth of the economy of the province which has the tax point.

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Trudeau: We estimate that the rate of growth will be slightly in excess of that.

* * *

ENERGY

BASIS OF MINISTER'S VIEWS ON PROVISION OF ELECTRICITY FOR ATLANTIC PROVINCES—POSSIBILITY OF STUDY OF PROBLEM

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): If the Prime Minister were sincere about wishing to hear the views of the opposition he might have made a statement on motions instead of these rambling discourses.

I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources arising from the position he has taken with respect to power rates in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces.

Mr. Muir: He said "To hell with Nova Scotia"; that is what he said.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister tell me whether his views about the way in which power should be integrated in the maritime provinces and savings thus produced are based upon a detailed analysis which he is prepared to make public or whether they are based upon certain general approaches which he is advised are correct?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): They are based on information which all informed people understand—that is, if we are to be able to secure for the people in the maritime region sufficient electrical power for their future needs at a reasonable cost, let us say the lowest cost, we shall have to plan the electric power generation of the whole region. The time has come to forget planning on a provincial boundary basis. The time has come for a wider approach. My proposal to the premiers was that we should undertake a study which the federal government is prepared to fund completely. I went on to invite the maritime premiers to participate with us. I might say I have already received an acceptance in principle from one of the premiers on that aspect.

Mr. Stanfield: I take it that to date the minister's views are based upon general considerations and approaches he believes to be valid rather than on detailed studies. In view of the confusion which has been created by his statement of his position and the counter-charges which have come, for example, from Nova Scotia, I want to ask him whether the Government of Canada is prepared to have such a study made objectively in such a way that informed people can examine the data and reach an opinion, both here and in the maritimes, as to the best way in which to solve this horrendous difficulty facing the people of Nova Scotia in terms of power. Is the minister prepared to have such a study conducted in an open way?

● (1450)

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I have a very open mind on this question. I want to make it quite clear that I think the way to approach this is not to make a unilateral declaration that it will be done this way and that way and these are the parameters. It is very important that the federal government and the premiers of the maritime provinces agree on the best method of going about this very important task. I shall seek their advice as to how they feel the most informed kind of report can be put together.

Mr. Stanfield: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry but this is a very important matter, and I am pursuing the issue because I should like to get to the bottom of it. I am asking the minister a very simple question. Quite apart from the views of the government of Nova Scotia or the government of any maritime province, is the minister prepared to have the study made openly and in public so that the public can be informed? If the minister wants a political attack he will get it, but I am trying to get to the bottom of this. As far as he is concerned, even though it may turn out that the provinces object to this kind of approach, is he prepared to have an open and public examination of this problem?

Mr. Gillespie: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would welcome a full, comprehensive, open and informed discussion. This may involve taking evidence in public, but quite clearly at some

point the experts will have to put their heads together and a report will be written. When that report is written, I would expect it to be made public to the people of Atlantic Canada as well as to the members of this House.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

POSSIBILITY OF PATRIATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bernard Loiselle (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Given the co-operative attitude of the federal government towards the provincial governments, has the Prime Minister been able to detect among his colleagues a more obvious willingness to patriate the Constitution, a move which would meet the wishes of the Canadian people?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Chambly for this important question. Indeed this problem has been discussed at some length by all the first ministers, and I think the most we can say at this stage is that the provinces asked me once again to wait for their August conference in Edmonton, where they will try to come to a consensus, to a better understanding of this problem. They are committed to report to me after this conference. Meanwhile, it would be premature for the federal government or Parliament to act without waiting to know what their attitude will be.

* * *

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

OBJECTION OF PILOTS AND TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS TO USE OF FRENCH—REQUEST FOR COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE SAFETY ASPECT

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Inasmuch as both the air traffic controllers and the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association are concerned about the introduction of French into their working environment to the extent that both groups are prepared to strike, would the Prime Minister appoint a royal commission to look into the matter in an endeavour to assess the potential danger to the safety of passengers, air crews and aircraft?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, the air traffic controllers and the airline pilots are right to be concerned about this matter, as the opposition and the government are also concerned. The Minister of Transport and his parliamentary secretary have said repeatedly that safety is the first and most important factor in this area. What we are asking all concerned—the workers, members of the opposition and indeed members on the government side—is to have an open mind on and objective approach to, this question. The hon. member knows that the former minister of transport and the present one have tried to study the results of applying bilingualism, first in visual flights and then more latterly in simulated and instrument flights. We have no preconceptions, Mr. Speaker. We are deeply committed to bilingualism, but of course bilingualism would have to be shown to be compatible with the safety of passengers. All we are asking from the air traffic controllers and the pilots and everybody concerned is to have an open mind on this and not to decide the question by strike or otherwise before it is properly resolved.

[Mr. Gillespie.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. Inasmuch as the French airline pilots association has petitioned the government of France to declare that English be the only language of use at Charles de Gaulle, Orly and Le Bourget airports for controlling aircraft, and inasmuch as the French airline pilots have told our Air Canada and CP Air captains that, in their view, it would be the height of folly to use two languages in Canada for controlling aircraft, would the Prime Minister consider these facts and opinions and agree that international safety as well as domestic safety of air passengers, air crews and aircraft must be the first consideration and appoint a royal commission to bring out all the various factors?

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Kempling: It is true.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, without at all accepting the argument that has just been put before the House, the hon. member knows very well that the Minister of Transport has already indicated his intention to appoint a commission of inquiry to investigate this very area. Work is going forward on that particular commission. The minister is seeking a suitable replacement for the gentleman who resigned earlier from the commission and work will go forward on this important matter as quickly as it can.

INQUIRY AS TO NAMES OF POTENTIAL COMMISSIONERS SUBMITTED BY AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the parliamentary secretary following along the question he has just answered. Has CATCA submitted any potential names to the Minister of Transport in response to the minister's request? If so, when was that done and what has been the minister's response to any submissions that were made in terms of potential commissioners?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that a submission was in fact received. I am afraid I cannot give the precise details that the hon. gentleman requests, but I can assure him that the minister and his officials are conducting a very broad search to try to find the very best possible people who can be found to do this very important job of inquiry.

CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MEMBERS IN EVENT OF STRIKE BY AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I put a further supplementary question to the President of the Privy Council. I think all of us have to admit that this is a volatile situation. I wonder whether the government has in place any contingency plans to ensure that members of parliament from all across the country get here in their places in the event of a strike in order to vote on Bill C-84? Have such contingency plans been made and could we have some advice from the President of the Privy Council in regard to this matter?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I think it is one situation if there is a legal strike but it is a different situation if it is an illegal strike, and I certainly would not want to do anything that would encourage anyone in this country to go on strike illegally.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

MILLHAVEN—DATE OF PUBLICATION OF HANSEN REPORT ON BEATINGS—POSSIBILITY OF CRIMINAL CHARGES

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General. In answer to a question of mine on May 31 the Solicitor General told the House that he was receiving the following day the Hansen report on the Millhaven gassings and beatings. In view of the fact that a considerable period of time has now elapsed, is the Solicitor General now able to say whether he has received the report, and will he undertake to table it in the House in its full and unabridged form?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I did meet with Miss Hansen the day following the question put by the hon. member and I discussed the report with her. While she had completed the writing of the report it was not yet ready for publication. She said it had to be proof read and other technical things had to be completed, but she promised to have it in my hands for tabling and publication before parliament adjourns; that is, before July 1.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Solicitor General would inform the House whether or not, on the basis of the report and investigation, it is contemplated that any criminal charges will be laid respecting the incident that took place in Millhaven in November of last year.

● (1500)

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be more appropriate for me to make the report public before I made any statement such as requested by the hon. member. On the other hand, I should point out that any criminal charges would be laid by the government of Ontario through the Attorney General, not through the federal government.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA

Mr. Speaker: I know hon. members would wish to join me in calling attention to the presence in the gallery of a most distinguished visitor in the person of His Excellency Seretse Khama, President of the Republic of Botswana.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

DRESS PERMISSIBLE IN CHAMBER

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday, the hon. member for Palliser, supported by the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys, raised a point of order concerning dress in the chamber. Investigation reveals that while there may not be technical rules that are easily interpreted in precise terms, the standard which has been adhered to is that which has been enforced in the discretion of the Chair. Reference was made to the presence in the chamber yesterday of an hon. member who was not wearing a necktie in the ordinary sense of the word as we know it.

Representations have been received from other members, by correspondence, and it would seem appropriate—and I will take the first opportunity that ought to present itself the day after tommorrow—to discuss this matter with the House leaders in order to determine whether some expression of definition on this matter might be forthcoming from members, perhaps from the Committee on Procedure and Organization or the Committee on Management and Members' Services. In the meantime, I would propose that until such expression comes forward from either of the committees, or as otherwise suggested by the House leaders on Thursday, I will continue to rigidly enforce, and expect co-operation from all hon. members, the rules in respect of dress and decorum which have prevailed in this House since, so far as I am aware, its inception, one of which is that male hon. members of this House shall wear a shirt, a tie and a jacket, as has ordinarily been accepted up to this time.

I would indicate that if there is a feeling to the contrary, I would expect all hon. members in the interim to abide by and respect this rule, at least úntil such time as suggestions are made to the contrary and those suggestions are taken up by the House as a whole.

* * *

TEXTILE AND CLOTHING BOARD

TABLING OF REPORT ON LEATHER OUTERWEAR

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table, in both official languages, a report on an inquiry respecting leather outerwear from the Textile and Clothing Board. I hope that this outerwear is satisfactory for wearing in the House!

Order Paper Questions

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Senate have passed certain bills.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the following communication has been received:

Government House
Ottawa

June 15, 1976

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Jean Beetz, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 15th day of June at 9.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière,
Administrative Secretary
to the Governor General.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,520, 3,640, 4,427, 4,619, 5,120, 5,129, 5,141, 5,175, 5,234, 5,247, 5,424, 5,443, 5,465 and 5,535.

[*Text*]

CTV NETWORK

Question No. 3,520—Mr. Cossitt:

Did any person from the Prime Minister's Office communicate with the CTV Network on or about November 4, 1975 advising that a decision had been made not to allow any television cameras to take photographs of furnishings and equipment in the offices of members of the Cabinet and, if so (a) what is his name (b) who gave instructions for him to make such communication (c) for what reason was such decision made (d) had some members of the Cabinet already agreed to permit such photography to be taken on or about November 5, 1975 and who communicated with the Cabinet Ministers advising them that such permission would be out of order?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No. The only call to the CTV network which came from the PMO originated with the Press Office and was to deny the network's request to film the furnishings of the office of the Prime Minister.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIPS

Question No. 3,640—Mr. Cossitt:

What has been the entire cost to the taxpayer of all trips made outside Ottawa by the Prime Minister or any members of his family between the dates set out in Part 1 of Question No. 69?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): A number of questions have been asked concerning specific trips during that period to which replies have been given. See the following questions answered during the First Session of the 30th Parliament: 25, 32, 1,158, 1,225, 1,226, 1,521, 2,333, 2,679, 2,708, 3,085, 3,120, 3,267, 3,900, 4,110, 5,121, 5,122, 5,123, 5,124, 5,125, 5,126, 5,127, 5,139, 5,140, 5,144 and 5,339. See also House of Commons Debates for February 3, 1976 in which it is stated in reply to question 69 that Members of the Prime Minister's family do not travel at public expense unless accompanying the Prime Minister by MOT or DND aircraft or by car.

ROCKWOOD INSTITUTION—LIVING UNIT OFFICERS

Question No. 4,427—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

1. For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of living unit-officers at Rockwood Institution?

2. Was their education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12 (c) some college (d) beyond a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

INCOME TAX COLLECTED FROM UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND OLD AGE PENSION INCOME, 1973

Question No. 4,619—Mr. Caccia:

Does the 1975 edition of *Revenue Canada's Taxation Statistics* report that in the 1973 taxation year, 1,880,911 income tax returns listed income from unemployment insurance benefits and 1,068,902 returns listed old age pension income and, if so, what was the amount of income tax collected by the government (a) on its own behalf (b) on behalf of the provinces from (i) unemployment insurance benefits (ii) old age pension income for the 1973 taxation year?

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): The numbers stated in the question for tax filers reporting Unemployment Insurance benefits and Old Age Security benefits are correct. Since under the Canadian income tax system the tax is levied on the sum total of income from all sources and not on individual components, it is not possible to provide accurate estimates of tax collected in respect of a given individual item.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIPS

Question No. 5,120—Mr. Cossitt:

1. How many trips outside Ottawa have been made subsequent to those listed in the answer to Question No. 69, namely, since September 22, 1974, by the Prime Minister or any members of his family, in whole or in part, at public expense?

2. In each case (a) by whom was the trip made (b) what places were visited (c) what was the purpose of the trip (d) what was the specific means of transportation (e) what was the total cost to the taxpayer (f) in all cases where applicable, was the trip made for private, holiday or political purposes?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): 1 and 2. The information requested does not warrant a question on the Order Paper since, as stated in paragraph 4 of the reply to question 69 in the House of Commons Debates for February 3, 1976, information about trips of the Prime Minister is communicated to the media as a matter of course. The information sought is therefore already available from public sources accessible to the Honourable Member. See also paragraph 1 of reply to question 69 in which it is stated that members of the Prime Minister's family do not travel at public expense unless accompanying the Prime Minister by MOT or DND aircraft or by car. See also in the House of Commons Debates replies to questions about individual trips made since that date.

Question No. 5,129—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Since June 1, 1975, has the Prime Minister on any occasion used commercial aircraft for trips made to points outside Ottawa and, if so, in each case (a) on what dates (b) to what destinations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The information requested does not warrant a question on the Order Paper since, as stated in paragraph 4 of the reply to question 69 in the House of Commons Debates for February 3, 1976, information about trips of the Prime Minister is communicated to the media as a matter of course. The information sought is therefore already available from public sources accessible to the Honourable Member.

MONITORING OF WATTS LINE CALLS

Question No. 5,141—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Has the Department of Communications given instructions to Bell Canada government telephone operators to listen in, check or otherwise monitor in any way, government Watts line calls at certain intervals to determine if there is conversation on the line and, if so (a) at intervals of how many seconds does such a procedure take place (b) what are the reasons justifying such instructions (c) are calls of Members of Parliament included in those checked?

2. Have steps been taken to prevent the content of phone conversations being noted and (a) if so, what are such steps (b) if not (i) for what reason (ii) on what date will such steps be taken?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): 1. Yes. (a) The checks which do not exceed two seconds are carried out to ensure that lines are disconnected by the attendant on completion of a call. These checks are conducted on approximately 50 per cent of the operator handled calls, at the Ottawa switchboard complex, and the interval between checks depends on the volume of traffic being handled by the operator; (b) This practice is necessary because an automatic indication whether these lines are in use is not available with the switchboard equipment currently in use. Means to alleviate this situation have been incorporated in current plans to modify and improve the intercity voice network; (c) Calls arrive at random and as a consequence all are treated in the same manner regardless of the point of origination.

2. All operating staff engaged in the Government of Canada switchboard complex are governed by Bell Canada policy regarding secrecy of communications, and it is understood by all such employees that the disclosure of any confidential information could result in the laying of criminal charges. This policy is enforced by supervisory staff during all hours of operation, and, once a year, relevant sections of the Criminal Code are reviewed and discussed with employees individually to remind them of their responsibilities.

AUTOMATIC FIRE ALARM SYSTEMS

Question No. 5,175—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. How many buildings in the National Capital Region are owned or leased by the government?

2. (a) How many have automatic fire alarm systems (b) how many are connected with a central station?

3. Do plans exist to improve the situation of automatic fire alarm systems being connected to a central station and, if so, what are they?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Department of Public Works manages 683 federally owned buildings and 253 leased buildings in the National Capital Region.

2. (a) Automatic fire alarm systems are installed in 135 federally owned buildings and in 17 of the leased properties; (b) Eighty-three of the federally owned buildings and 10 of the leased buildings are connected to a central station system.

3. There are no plans, at this time, to extend central station connections to buildings other than those recommended for such service by the Dominion Fire Commissioner. However, due to the installation charges and high recurring annual costs for testing and maintenance, a feasibility study is being made on the cost effectiveness of operating a federally owned central alarm receiving station.

SELECTION OF CENSUS COMMISSIONERS

Question No. 5,234—**Mr. Reynolds:**

What are the criteria used in the selection of Census Commissioners and what is the (a) length of appointment (b) renumeration?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: Men or women may be considered for the position of Census Commissioner. The candidate must possess the following qualities: Personal: be in good physical condition; be mature, responsible, energetic, and conscientious; be a resident of the Census Commissioner District in which the duties are to be performed; be bilingual in those Census Commissioner Districts designated as bilingual; have the use of an automobile; be prepared to work in the evenings, on Saturdays and, at times, long hours. Administrative: be able to pass the Personnel Selection Test demonstrating an ability to understand written instructions and read maps; be able to organize efficiently and carry out given assignments; exercise good judgement in selecting suitable Census Representatives qualified to do the job; be able to train, direct, and supervise the work of others; show, through work history, an aptitude to undertake such functions. Candidates for Census Commissioner Positions are required to take a Personnel Selection Test and as well, they are required to undergo a personal interview conducted by staff from Statistics Canada. A Census Commissioner must not be connected in any way with the levying or collection of municipal or other taxes. Remuneration: Census Commissioners will receive $3,000

for their duties in the 1976 Census, in three instalments: $500 on or about April 30, $500 on or about May 31, and the balance less the applicable deductions when the enumeration of the Census Commissioners District is completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Statistician. If authorized, mileage and other expenses as per Government Travel Regulations will be paid periodically as travel claims are submitted according to a predetermined schedule. Length of Appointment: Census Commissioners will receive training in three stages, in March, April and June covering all aspects of census work and are expected to begin work on the 1976 Census of Canada immediately following their first stage of training in March. It is expected that they will be involved in the Census part-time in March, full-time during April, May and June, and again part-time until completion of duties in mid-July.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD—ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 5,247—**Mr. Marshall:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 4,070, has the Anti-Inflation Board determined as yet its policy on establishing additional regional offices and what is now the position with regard to a request by the Government of Newfoundland to establish an office in the Province?

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): In principle, the offices of the Anti-Inflation Board were established to serve the Regional Members of the Board in Halifax, Quebec City, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver. For example, the Halifax Member of the Board and Office serve the whole of the Atlantic Provinces. The Anti-Inflation Board is not considering the establishment of additional regional offices at this time.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP—APRIL 24, 1976

Question No. 5,424—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did the Prime Minister travel from Toronto to Ottawa on Air Canada on or about Saturday, April 24, 1976 and, if so (a) what was the flight number, time of departure from Toronto, and time of arrival in Ottawa (b) what are the names of all persons accompanying him and what are their job designations (c) what are all the reasons that the Prime Minister travelled on a regularly scheduled commercial flight (d) how is this consistent with the Prime Minister's frequently expressed reason for using government aircraft for pleasure and political purposes on the grounds that flights on regularly scheduled commercial aircraft do not meet with the approval of the RCMP and would be against their advice (e) has the RCMP changed its advice to the Prime Minister and, if so, on what date (f) has the Prime Minister changed his previous policy in that he will now travel on trips of a political or holiday nature on regularly scheduled commercial airlines (g) was there any cost to the taxpayer for this travel by the Prime Minister or any others accompanying him and, if so, what was the amount (h) while in Toronto, did the Prime Minister attend the annual meeting of the Ontario Liberal Party and, if so, did the Prime Minister or the Ontario Liberal Party, pay the cost of transportation from Toronto to Ottawa and, if not, will either one of them be billed for such costs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See replies to questions 69, *Hansard* 237, page 10579, dated 3 February 1976; 5339, *Hansard* 294, page 13153, dated 4 May 1976; and 5129 answered this day.

[Mr. Roy (Laval).]

IDENTIFICATION OF GUEST INCLUDED ON PASSENGER LIST

Question No. 5,443—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,120, which stated in part that the $11,640 public cost of the Prime Minister's 1975 summer recess holiday trip to the Northwest Territories by DOT Jet Star had the Prime Minister's son and one guest on board, what is the name and the address and any other identifying details of the guest involved?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fourth Edition, Citation 171 (d) and (r).

Question No. 5,465—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 5,144, which stated in part that the passenger list on the aircraft used at public expense by the Prime Minister from Quebec City to Ottawa on June 7, 1975, included a "guest", what is the name, address and any other identifying details of the "guest"?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fourth Edition, Citation 171 (d) and (r).

GASOLINE CONSUMPTION REVIEW

Question No. 5,535—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Is the government monitoring the effect of the 10¢ excise tax imposed upon gasoline in the June 23, 1975 Budget upon the conservation of gasoline, particularly as it applies to the private passenger car and, if so, what device is employed to do so?

2. (a) Has there been a significant reduction and, if so, by how much (b) are there any comparative statistics available for pre-tax consumption?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. Yes, by carefully reviewing motor gasoline consumption data against previous expectations.

2. (a) and (b) In the first half of 1975, gasoline consumption in Canada increased by 4.8 per cent over the corresponding period in 1974. In the second half of 1975, after the imposition of the excise tax, the rate of growth from 1974 declined to 3.5 per cent. It would be premature to try to measure the contribution that the excise tax might have made to the moderation in the rate of growth but it undoubtedly had an effect. Furthermore, the government also anticipates that the excise tax will have a longer term effect on gasoline consumption to the extent that consumers shift to alternative means of transportation and purchase more efficient automobiles.

[*English*]

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, this is the second time I have had to rise in this House to bring attention to question No. 4040 which I placed on the order paper on February 6. About a month ago I asked whether an answer might not be provided. I still have not yet received the answer, even though I have had some assurance from the parliamentary secretary. I would dearly love to have the answer.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, on that point I join the hon. member in the concern he has expressed. There remain some 950 questions on the order paper which have not been replied to. We are endeavouring to have all those replies forthcoming before the end of this session. I fully recog-

nize that I indicated to the hon. member that I thought the question would be answered forthwith, and that was my understanding at the time. However, there are sometimes breakdowns in communication and perhaps the House is not as able to control the number of questions answered as it ought to be.

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

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—HEALTH RESEARCH FUNDING

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca) moved:

That this House views with great alarm the ill-considered and illogical decisions of the government which fail to give adequate priority to health research funding.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the third time in the past twelve months I have risen in this House to make a major address on the subject of medical research in this country, and this is because I think it is one of the most important subjects this House could deal with in terms of the effect it has on the ills and the life of Canadians everywhere. I do not think anyone would argue with the fact that medical research is an integral part of the health education system and, indeed, that it is as important as any other aspect of the health care delivery system.

I should like to look at some of the complaints we have heard from around the country resulting from the ill-considered policy the government has been following in regard to medical research and, indeed, in regard to research in general. We heard the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) before the committee not too long ago indicate that he supports slow growth and expansion of research in general and medical research in particular. If we examine the record of performance, we see there has been a slow but steady erosion of the research dollar on a pretty well continual basis since 1971. Indeed, this year there has been a freeze which has resulted in a substantial cut in research funds and research projects that have been under way for a long time the cut being necessary because of the uncontrolled inflation which still rages in this country.

We have a situation in which the priorities of this government fall under serious question and must be reassessed very carefully. The minister has told us that some 60 researchers left the country in the past year, while 100 have come in from the U.S. I think that if we look at the loss to our country in relation to the size of our population, and the loss to the United States in relation to the size of its population, we can see very clearly that our loss is much greater in terms of time and the cost of training of the people who have been leaving.

● (1510)

We note from the history of two months ago that some 40 per cent of ongoing research projects in this country have been terminated and that of the new applications which number in the vicinity of 400, only 10 per cent were accepted for funding as of April this year. I have here a letter which I want to read, because I think it indicates fairly clearly a story which has been repeated over and over in this country in recent months. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is not here. I realize that he has been involved with the federal-provincial conference, but I understand it is now over and it cannot be used as an excuse for his not being here. I am also very sorry that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) is not here, because he is the individual who has a good deal to say about the kind of funding which takes place.

I think the absence of these two ministers indicates very clearly the attitude of the government toward research in general and medical research in particular. This is a shameful situation. Those ministers, who should be here and are not, should be thoroughly scolded by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I will now refer to this letter which comes from a researcher in Ontario, a man involved in the area of eye research. It reads as follows:

At the First International Congress of Eye Research in 1974, of several hundred delegates attending from around the world, I was the only Canadian present. As far as I know, our group is the only one in Canada at present, funded by the Medical Research Council of Canada, which is performing biochemical research on lens differentiation and cataract.

I am sure everyone knows what a cataract is. It is a disorder of the lens of the eye. It "turns the pupil grey" and makes it impossible for the possessor of such an eye to see very clearly. Later, when it becomes worse, the person cannot see at all. The letter continues:

Beginning in 1967, in my laboratory at the University of Western Ontario, we have carefully nurtured a program in research on the development of the eye lens. Studying the regular growth and differentiation of such normal cells may enable us to compare these normal processes to the abnormal ones in cancer cells. With this knowledge we may be better able to define what makes a tumour cell different.

We hope that our program will eventually result in information about the lens protein changes which appear to be the root cause of cataract formation. Such information would be invaluable in preventing certain types of cataract, especially senile cataract.

That refers to a cataract in an old person.

We have developed special techniques for growing cells of the lens outside the body on microscope slides, and in sterile bottles. Using these techniques we hope to be able to test different drugs for their effects in preventing the aggregation of the lens proteins which causes the lens to become milky in cataract. This milkiness may arise in much the same way that an egg white changes from clear to milky white when it is cooked. When scientists find drugs which will prevent this "milkiness" from appearing, or cause it to disappear, we may be able to treat many cataracts by eye drops.

At the present time the only possible treatment for cataracts is surgery. Because of this cataracts remain the leading cause of hospital admissions for eye operations in North America. In addition, approximately 15 per cent of all individuals in the United States who are considered legally blind have cataracts as the underlying cause.

I think the statistics indicate that the disease of cataract of the eye, which represents a leading cost in respect of hospital admissions in North America, could be resolved, with a saving of millions of dollars in respect of surgical

and other associated expenses. It is a clear indication that this is the kind of investment which indeed would be an investment rather than an expenditure. The letter continues:

> Cataract surgery often is possible only after a long period of waiting for the cataract to ripen. While the cataract ripens, the afflicted person, who is often elderly, must endure a state of near-blindness and restricted activity. Both of these are bad for his attitude and over-all health.
>
> Until this year, the main support for this research has been obtained from the Medical Research Council of Canada, and we have painstakingly built up a small team of research workers in my laboratory whose salaries and whose experiments are funded by an annual grant from the Medical Research Council.
>
> The latest government funding increase to the Medical Research Council has limited its total budget to $48 million instead of the $55 million requested. My grant has been terminated. This means that I am to be granted only enough funds to keep my laboratory running until the end of November. Before then the team will be broken up, as some workers in the laboratory seek other employment. So even if the project were to be reinstated then, when the Medical Research Council meets again, much valuable time would be lost. If no last minute reprieve comes, Canada will have lost perhaps its only biochemical research group on lens development and cataract.

This gentleman touches pretty well on the key points with which we are concerned. I am sorry to see that the former minister who was recently evicted from the cabinet is scoffing at this whole business and seems to think it is funny that medical research is being cut, with the result that hundreds of projects are being disbanded and research teams are being disbanded and asked to undertake other work. If he thinks this is funny, I hope he will have the courage to get up in this House and explain this to the research people and to the citizens of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I do not know the name of the riding of the hon. member who just interjected, but perhaps that is a good thing. He is from Toronto, in any event, and he seems to exemplify the attitude other members on that side have taken. When a group known as Canadians for Health Research came to Ottawa on May 20 of this year and were receivd by members of the government party, rather than listen to the proposals and the brief presented by the group known as Canadians for Health Research, the Liberals at that time decided to assault the group for blackmailing the government because they expressed their views publicly.

Instead of taking a serious look at the problem, the Liberals took the position that the researchers were simply blackmailing the government for some kind of political motive. I think nothing could be further from the truth. The President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of National Health and Welfare have indicated that the freeze on medical research is necessary because we are in a period of restraint, and that somehow this kind of freeze will save Canadians millions of dollars. Because of that statement I want to point out the kind of savings successful research has produced for Canada and for the world.

● (1520)

First, I want to look at the field which is known as immunology. I have here a report from the United States which indicates that expenditures in research are very minor in nature in comparison with the savings which a country achieves in terms of hospital and medical costs. I am referring to a brief which was sent to our committee by a researcher from the University of Manitoba. I should like to quote from it.

The brief suggests that the eradication of polio, which was dependent on basic Canadian research leading to the development of the Salk vaccine, is saving the U.S. treasury $2 billion a year. The discovery of the measles vaccine is saving about $180 million a year. Basic research alone on the eradication of Rh hemalytic disease in the newborn, by Dr. Bruce Chown of the University of Manitoba, is saving $60 million a year. The identification of the transfusion hepatitis virus is saving $100 million a year. Organ transplant immunology and replacement of dialysis is saving another $100 million a year.

Considering this very restricted area of research, namely, immunology, the conclusion was that based on the annual immunology research budget of $33 million, the annual cost benefit was $3.3 billion. In other words, the saving in hospital and other costs required to treat these diseases which were formerly not preventable was about 100 to 1, or for every $1 invested in research in immunology there has been a saving of $100 in the long run. I think that quite clearly shows that if the minister feels he is saving money for Canadians by cutting the health research budget, he is indeed misinformed and doing Canada a great disservice.

We have also heard members of the cabinet suggest that we do not really have to do research in this country because we can simply read the health journals and get without cost the finds of research done in other countries. I think that is a most irresponsible position to take. As a matter of fact, the minister who proudly lays claim to that view, the minister of science and technology, is in the House, and I am glad to see him here because I want him to know that this party disapproves vigorously of such an approach. Indeed, as a Canadian I am ashamed that a minister of our government would talk like that. That attitude can only bring us losses.

One of the factors we must consider is that if we have no well developed researchers, no well developed and well trained scientists in a given field, essentially what we have is no one accurately to interpret the research which is being done in other countries. Secondly, we know from past experience that if we have a well developed research centre located in our country at one of the universities, that centre attracts some of the best research people in the field, the result is that we have the best research people available in the world to teach our physicians, and thus we wind up with the best educated physicians possible.

So I do not think that we can accept the statement of the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Drury) that we do not have to spend money on research ourselves, that we can simply act as parasites and take it from other countries and be as well off in the long run. That is another fallacy which I want to dispel.

If you look at our expenditures on health research in comparison with that of other countries—and I think the best country with which to compare ourselves is the United States—you will find that we are behind them. They are spending in the vicinity of four or five times the amount that we are spending, on a per capita basis. The result is that researchers who are not being funded adequately here often go south of the border where funds

seem to be much more easily available. What we have in this country is a government which claims to be committed to medical research but its actions have proven otherwise. We have had a "stop and go" policy in funding, making it virtually impossible to develop a feeling of stability and security in the research community.

I want to make some suggestions in the course of my remarks, in the hope that someone will take note of them. What we need is long-term planning incorporating a policy of long-term stability in the research field. There are several reasons for that, one of them being that it takes some 12 years to train a medical researcher at considerable cost, and it takes a number of years to assemble a research team, laboratory technicians and other workers, and to get a project under way. It seems almost criminal to decide, for no particular reason, to dismember such a team and to create a situation where the head of the team must either leave the country if he wants to continue research, or go into some other field of work. None of these reasons make good, logical sense.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare announced recently that there was to be a $2 million addition to the Medical Research Council funding for this year. That happens to be about 30 per cent of the amount required to bring research in this country up to last year's level. I suggest that what must be done immediately is a further $4.6 million allocation in order to allow the researchers to continue at last year's level. We, as a party, want to put forward a long-term policy, and I think a good suggestion that we should aim for is to not only stay at last year's level of activity in Canada but over the next five years catch up with the United States, West Germany, Sweden and other countries which so far have been ahead of us in terms of funding of medical research. This is an objective which this party has accepted as party policy.

The other things which we must consider are to accept once and for all that medical research is part and parcel of the health care delivery system and must be given adequate attention at all times to ensure that it survives and flourishes in this country. We must also consider giving sufficient funding and sufficient commitment to research to ensure that there is an adequate research base for education in the health field, to make sure that there is an expansion of scientific and technical knowledge as a basis for health care. We must improve the application of scientific principles to health care; we must support adequate training of research investigators in the health field and, finally, we must support research contributions to new knowledge in the health field.

Even though it may have been somewhat clumsily expressed, I have just outlined what I think would be an excellent long-term policy with the long-term objective of bringing Canada up to par with other developed countries in the world in the area of medical research. We recognize that we cannot be best in all fields. We agree, perhaps, that we should be doing more research in the areas in which we are particularly capable. At the same time, we must ensure that we have adequately trained people in a wide variety of fields. Perhaps we can work in some aspect of every field, although not in all aspects of every field. Only in this way can we expect that in the long term Canadians will be the beneficiaries of the best health care system in the world. In the long run this is also the only way we can expect to improve the health care delivery system as far as keeping costs down and providing proper education for individuals who are providing our medical services.

● (1530)

The item I read at the beginning of my comments which dealt with an eye research project was of particular significance because the funding the researcher asked for was in the vicinity of $22,000 for this year to keep his project going. I want to point out very dramatically the kind of priorities this government decides upon when it cuts research into the development of cataracts on the eye. The Ottawa *Citizen* of March 23 ran a picture of an office, with the caption in big, black letters:

SPLENDOUR

Urban affairs minister Barney Danson's office in the restored La Salle Academy on Sussex Drive, was enhanced by $37,400 worth of restoration work to return it to its original 19th century splendour.

I wonder whether there is something wrong with the priorities of the government, when it spends $37,400 on an office to bring it to its nineteenth century splendour but does not have $22,000 to fund a project on cataract research.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: I think the fact that it was nineteenth century splendour reflects the thinking of this government which is perhaps even earlier than that century.

An hon. Member: Seventeenth century.

Mr. Yewchuk: The middle ages, or dark ages. I think that is where we are going if this government remains for very much longer.

I am glad to see the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) in the chamber. He is also guilty of the misuse of funds. A satellite was launched last fall, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you received a great, glossy brochure with pictures and beautiful drawings, the total cost of which was $17,000. I should like the minister to stand in this House and tell us why that brochure was necessary. What did it do to help the satellite perform its function? Was it really necessary? Could he not simply have written a letter and had his secretary type it to explain that a satellite was going up in the sky? That would not have cost anything. But to pay for the brochure, a research project somewhere in this country had to be cancelled. I have an example of such a project right here, Mr. Speaker.

Here is a letter from a researcher at the University of Manitoba who was trying to develop a method of treating cancer using the concept of immunology. This project was initiated in 1972-73 as a result of a pioneering observation that if particular drug-induced tumours of guinea pigs are infiltrated with certain kinds of cells they are able to kill rapidly-growing tumour cells in a test-tube. After an encouraging initial funding by the Medical Research Council for the next two years, an increase barely equivalent to the inflation rate was given, which was followed by a serious cut and a terminal grant this year. The project is

now being terminated—and all that was needed for this year was $18,000.

If the Secretary of State had not spent $17,000 on that fancy brochure, this cancer research project could have survived and may have found a cure for cancer. I hope the Secretary of State who is sitting there scratching his beard, feels very guilty about that gross abuse and misuse of public funds. There is a gross mix-up in what the priorities of this country should be. It seems to me that the only solution to overcome all the serious problems is to replace a government that has so little concern for the health of Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: I should like the ministers to whom I have referred to look around this chamber and tell me which of their colleagues they would not mind dropping from a heart attack in the next year, or which one of their colleagues. I see the Minister of State for Science and Technology pointing at me, Mr. Speaker. That is very unkind of him, and I am sure he does not mean it. I should like him to look around on his own side and see which of his colleagues he would not mind dropping of cancer in the next five years or so.

That is exactly what is happening, with research. Instead of facing the problem and realizing the importance of it and funding it, we have an expenditure of $1.5 billion on Petro-Canada, a totally unnecessary structure. I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on the Canada Development Corporation for no reason except political expediency. There is no way anybody can point to a need in this country for the Canada Development Corporation, yet it is using up hundreds of millions of dollars. Nobody can say that medical research is not useful or is not needed, yet it is being totally ignored. I cannot understand that. I have some other suggestions to make, Mr. Speaker. The average amount of money requested for many of the research projects which have been cancelled—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratitude to hon. members. I thought they on the other side were asleep, and perhaps that is the only reason they allowed me to carry on. But because of their curtesy I shall try to wind up very quickly.

The Prime Minister's swimming pool could have funded ten research projects—$250,000 divided by 25, and you have ten research projects. Then there is the Canada Development Corporation, which you can figure out for yourself. If we abandoned Petro-Canada and put that money into medical research, there would be no need to seek money elsewhere, not only to match medical research in the United States but to surpass it. It seems to me that if the members of cabinet, who control spending in this country, gave the matter some thought, they could only come to the conclusion that their priorities must be re-examined, changed and placed in the proper order so that Canadians could receive what they expect from their government. They should have the kind of funding for medical research to which people residing in a well developed, industrialized, western nation are entitled. Until this is done, I am afraid there is no way that I can support this government in anything it does.

[Mr. Yewchuk.]

● (1540)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk), criticizing, as it does, the failure of the government to give adequate priority to health research funding, is timely. Not only is it timely in a general sense; it is significant in that it is being debated this very day when the federal government has taken a stand with the provinces in which it has produced a total package of which changes with respect to health research funding is a significant part. We want to indicate our full support of the criticism implied in this motion. If I may say so without calling for too many retorts from my friends of the Progressive Conservative party, I think we support this motion more strongly than they do.

Mr. Alexander: I do not understand.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I was hoping an hon. member would interject so that I could explain what I have in mind. The motion being debated in the House today has been moved by a Progressive Conservative member and it has the support of that party. At the same time, Progressive Conservative premiers, such as Premier Lougheed and Premier Davis, are saying they are satisfied with the fiscal rearrangements the federal government is proposing.

Mr. Grafftey: That is a *non sequitur*.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The two positions are completely and totally unrelated. When any provinces, especially wealthy provinces, agree to a rearrangement of the fiscal priorities of this country so that less wealthy provinces have to work that much harder for health and education, it means that the federal government will feel it can cut back on medical research funding or, at least, not keep such funding in line with the cost requirements of that research. I hope that my hon. friends to my right who have taken an important and significant stand in the House on this matter today, as they have on other occasions, will have some heart-to-heart talks with the conservative premiers of the wealthy provinces.

If Canada is to be one country from coast to coast, a country in which Canadians across this land have an equal opportunity to participate in important and essential services, I suggest that we must make a better deal for our people than the sort of deal which has resulted from the last two days of federal-provincial conference. As I say, that conference dealt generally with post-secondary education and health in all its aspects, but the question of medical research and funding for such research is part of the whole package. If the government, with the blessing of Premier Lougheed and Premier Davis, gets away with providing less money to the provinces for health services,

it will also get away with providing less money for medical research. In our view, this situation is most serious. All that has been highlighted by what happened yesterday and today, and it is of great importance to Canada.

I agree with my friends of the official opposition about the particular importance of funding for medical research. Answering questions today, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) seemed to have a great deal to say about a particular cliché, namely, that we should not spend at a rate faster than the growth of the gross national product. Actually, I have seldom seen the Prime Minister as excited as he was today. He walked out into the aisle farther than I have ever seen him walk since he became Prime Minister. On two occasions he turned round and addressed himself to members of the Liberal party. That was his only way of getting applause.

Mr. Grafftey: That was one of our finer parliamentary moments.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That cliché sounds plausible. The proposition that one's expenditures should not increase by more than the growth of the gross national product certainly should apply to total expenditures, whether one is speaking of a state or a person. But it is also true that a person or state can rearrange spending priorities. Although our total expenditures may not increase beyond the increase in revenues, or the increase in the gross national product, it is still desirable and possible to cut down on some other things to make sure that we can adequately and properly fund health delivery services and health research. We contend, therefore, that the government's policies are shortsighted and unfair to the Canadian people, both of this generation and of future generations, in that they do not provide for the maintenance of adequate funding for medical research.

I presume we shall be given figures today to show that more dollars will be spent this year than were spent last year, and perhaps more dollars will be spent next year than this year on medical research. But everyone in this House knows that we are concerned not just about the number of dollars but about the value of those dollars. Unless the number of dollars spent in this area increases in proportion to today's costs, it means that a cap has been put on expenditures, or funding for medical research has been frozen. The result will be that persons engaged in medical research will have to give up their projects, go elsewhere, or what have you, and Canadians both of this and future generations will suffer thereby. With all these considerations in mind, we welcome the present opportunity to speak on this subject today. We regret that the rules of the House do not allow us to vote on this motion. If we could vote, we would support the motion.

I know that we all get letters when an issue of any importance comes up. Perhaps reading from letters is not the most hard working way to make a speech. When I looked at my file today, I found many letters on this subject. I confess I was impressed by the number of letters I received from doctors and professors of medicine across the country, particularly from my own city of Winnipeg. The hon. member for Athabasca spoke of some researchers in my city. I do not intend to read at length from letters, but I do wish to indicate the kinds of persons from whom I have received letters on this subject. Many of them have also written to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), or the Prime Minister. Copies of those letters were sent to me.

I was sent a letter by Dr. J. C. Haworth, professor of paediatrics, director of clinical investigation and research at the Children's Health Sciences Centre in Winnipeg. Another letter came from Professor Alec Sehon, director of the medical research council group for allergy research of the faculty of medicine, University of Manitoba. Another letter came from Professor Frank S. LaBelle, department of pharmacology and therapeutics, faculty of medicine, University of Manitoba, in Winnipeg. Next, one came from Professor Roma Z. Hawirko, department of microbiology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg. Then there is a letter from Dr. Victor Chernick, of the department of paediatrics, University of Manitoba. Actually, he is paediatrician in chief at the children's centre. Then I got a letter from Sister Ruth C. Hickey, who is vice-president of St. Boniface General Hospital in Winnipeg. There is also a letter from Professor Peter E. Dresel of the department of pharmacology and therapeutics, faculty of medicine, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

Professional people of that calibre and standing in the community, busy as they are, do not take time to write letters to the government or members of parliament unless the issue about which they write is of deep concern. As I say, most of the letters I have had are letters which have also been sent to various responsible ministers. All the letters make the same point strongly: this cutback is a case of false economy. By cutting back on funding for health research, or limiting funding in such a way that health research cannot be carried on, we are betraying Canadians of this and future generations. I mentioned a number of letters that I received, all of them from Winnipeg. I would like to mention one letter that came from somewhere else in the country because I want to quote briefly from it. It is from Dr. H. Arnold Steinberg, chairman, Canadians for Health Research, whose address is Westmount, Quebec.

● (1550)

Mr. Drury: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I thought I would get a response from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) on that. The Minister of Public Works is also the Minister of State for Science and Technology, and I gather that is the capacity in which he will be dealing with this matter. It is always good to have him on these subjects, although I had hoped the Minister of National Health and Welfare might have been here as well. At any rate, I want to read a couple of paragraphs from Dr. Steinberg's letter because I think it sums up what most of these letters have said. I quote:

> The quantity and quality of medical research affects every Canadian in two principal ways: 1. It is the only practical answer to reducing health care costs by finding cures to those diseases which randomly strike thousands of people necessitating government expenditures now in excess of $7 billion annually.

That point in itself should be enough to move this government to reconsider its position. One sure way to decrease the cost of medical care is to do something about

medical research. I quote the second point set out in Dr. Steinberg's letter:

2. Most outstanding physicians and surgeons are attracted to those teaching hospitals that carry on active research programs, a majority of which are funded by the Medical Research Council. While allowing a 16 per cent increase in overall expeditures, the government has frozen the MRC budget at last year's level. This has caused a major cutback in medical research activity. Leading investigators are being forced to move elsewhere to conduct their research work. This will have a profound impact on the quality of hospital care and on the quality of teaching of medicine across the country.

We are dealing with something that is extremely serious. As I have already said, the decisions made, or at least handed down, by the federal government at the conference centre over the past day or two have been very serious for the future of this country. I suggest the most serious of all is what is being done in the field of health.

There is one other quotation I should like to read from one of my many letters from doctors. This comes from Dr. Peter E. Dresel of Winnipeg, to whom I have already referred. I quote this because I think it makes the point very clear.

Because the budget of this council—

The reference is to the Medical Research Council.

—is already so small, because it has not kept pace with inflation in the costs of research for some years, and because it supports a very high percentage of all medical research in Canada, the budget freeze will cause inordinate damage to Canadian medicine. Medical research is a prerequisite to good medical teaching and is basic to medical practice and the delivery of health care. The development of young teacher-scientists and of clinicians with skill in investigative medicine must remain a high priority for a government interested in the future welfare of the Canadian people.

Canadian researchers are in general agreement that government spending must be controlled.

That, of course, fits in with the line of thinking of the government. Although a copy of this letter was sent to me, the original was sent to the Minister of Finance.

They do not ask for special treatment, but only that the guidelines of limited increases be applied to extramural research as they are to all government efforts.

In my view, the fact that so many professors and doctors, experts in the health field, are expressing this kind of concern underlines the seriousness of this issue. I hope the government can be persuaded by this day's debate. It is in addition to other days we have had on this subject to review the position with respect to the way it is treating the Medical Research Council and, in turn, medical research in this country.

I have referred to various letters from professionals in the health field, doctors and professors. I have another letter I should like to read. It does not come from the medical field itself, but from one of the societies that is concerned about a particular disease, the ravages of which hit a great many Canadians. I shall read from the spring, 1976, publication of the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada. On one page of this report there is an open letter signed by Peter J. Lowry, the president of that society. It is headed "Tell your MP", and reads as follows:

I'm mad. And you should be too. Our federal government is sticking its head so far into the sand on the question of medical research funding that the only part of the legislators' anatomy still above ground is that part which offers the right amount of flesh for a good kick.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Sure, I believe in restraint in government spending. But not when the end result could be the further weakening of our ability to do medical research in this country. The federal government has restricted the growth of Medical Research Council funds to the point that we are in danger of losing many of our best researchers. This is not just short-sighted or stupid; it's a crime against future generations of Canadians.

It has been said that some members of the federal cabinet believe that Canada can just import medical research because it is too expensive for Canada to make a contribution. Obviously that kind of thinking was not around when Canada gave insulin to the world. Wiser Parliaments in the past have given Canada a strong and vital medical research capability and the momentum has to be maintained.

We are working too hard in this Society to raise funds for research to see the ground cut out from under us by federal penny-pinching. The basic funding has to be done by the government. Funds for MS research cannot be spent on the facilities or administration of research centres—our funds are for work on solving the mystery of MS. Even the funds from the Cancer Society and the Heart Foundation are inadequate to fill the gap being left by the federal government.

So, tell your MP. Tell you friends to tell their MP. If you don't and your friends don't, then your MP will continue to think that nobody cares about medical research. Tell your MP that you care. Write him or her a friendly letter saying you care. Don't send an unfriendly letter—they are probably getting too many of those; or just send this editorial—they'll get the message. You don't need to put a stamp on it if you mail it to your MP at the House of Commons, Ottawa.

I have brought two types of quotations before the House. One is the professional opinion of doctors and professors in our medical schools. But I have read Mr. Lowry's letter because it represents the view of one society that is working in a particular disease area, trying to help the people who suffer from it. I suspect that represents the thinking of the lay people who work in all kinds of societies that are concerned with health problems. This is a very serious situation. It is enough to make some people angry, as Mr. Lowry says in his letter. I hope the government will seriously consider the message that this House is trying to give to it today; that it is false economy and a betrayal of Canadians, both now and in the future, not to provide adequate funding for medical research in Canada.

● (1600)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the mover, the hon. member for Athabaska (M. Yewchuk), who is giving us an opportunity today to deal with a subject on which I feel very strongly since the last budget was introduced because this government does not give health research financing the importance it should have.

Every time I had an opportunity to do so I constantly drew the attention of the government to those deficiencies, and asked it to review its policy on medical research, particularly at the university level. I am happy to hear today what the first two parties of the opposition that preceeded me had to say so the whole opposition could rise to protest the government's policy on research and be the spokesmen for the entire medical corps, all students, all research technicians across Canada who blame and particularly urge this government to come back on its position in the area of research.

On March 29, 1976, dealing with that famous Anti-Inflation Act I pointed out to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) that he was imposing a freeze in priority areas such as assistance to university research while at the same time increasing budgets like national defence or construc-

tion of federal buildings. Later on, as reported in issue No. 54 of April 12, 1976, I asked the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Drury) at a sitting of the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, as follows:

Mr. Minister, I was listening to you a while ago, I do not have a copy of your statement, but you mentioned increases, mainly concerning cost-sharing programs with the industry for industrial research. Is it the intention of your government in the future to go for these cost-sharing programs and to progressively abandon the research made by the universities?

Here is what the minister replied:

Mr. Chairman, as I said a while ago, the researches made by the universities are at a high level comparatively to other western countries and Japan.

Always that comparison with other countries without wondering about the needs of this country.

But the need for industrial research is more urgent; this is more evident in the industry and mostly in the private industry, which we are trying to upgrade as much as possible, through all of our assistance programs, which are cost shared programs, as you mentioned a while ago.

We want to keep on doing that, but at the same time, I think we should not neglect anything and permit a small increase for the research in the universities which is also very important for the graduates.

Coming back to this matter, I suggest this is moderate in my view, being a 4 per cent reduction only as compared to other areas. Don't you believe that such restraint may be responsible for the loss of many scientific researchers? The minister answered, and I quote:

I think there will be loss, not as much of our scientists than of the technicians, whose salaries increase every year. That is good as far as the industry is concerned; if they quit the university to go to the industry where they are needed, that is not a bad thing. But if they quit their research to do something else, then, that is a total loss. Unfortunately, this year, there will be a decrease in the number of laboratory technicians in the universities due to the salary increase of the technicians and there will be no comparable increase of money supplied in the budgets of the universities.

This means, Mr. Speaker, the minister was aware of our losses of technicians and university research scientists.

I put another question to the minister:

Looking through the past years, I notice, unfortunately that our research people, you say you would be happy if they went to Canadian industry, but unfortunately they leave the country. Going to the States, I was surprised to meet many Canadians whose studies we have financed and who are down there because they cannot live in Canada.

They cannot find work in Canada and use their knowledge to serve their country. I talked with those people and it is not because they want to live out there, it is because they could not live here.

Do you think that danger will grow by decreasing the reasearch budget of the universities? It is nice to say that the industry needs them, we will try to supply them to the industry, but they have to be trained.

The minister also tells us that he is well aware of that problem but he cannot do otherwise. I think we have got evidence. I want to quote from a letter which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) quoted a few moments ago. I thought he was going to quote the name of the group. Let me complete his quotation by simply naming the group of medical researchers whose letter he quoted:

I wrote to this particular group asking it to describe itself. I received the following answer:

About three months ago, the medical research group was created on the initiative of a group of responsible citizens, of organizations of voluntary people and medical researchers following the government decision to freeze the budget of the Medical Research Council. After only a few meetings, the movement now gathers citizens from one ocean to the other and the groups are made up of thousands of Canadians from all over the country.

I think the minister knows something about this group because not only they came to meet Mr. Steinberg but they also came to meet us and the minister too.

● (1610)

The organization has several major objectives including drawing the attention of the public to the role played by medical research in the daily activities of each Canadian.

This is followed by the passage read by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

I shall not repeat this passage, but I would simply like to mention, after I met this group of university physicians who are called active researchers, what we can deduce from the protests made by these research groups:

According to official government estimates for 1976-77, the three subsidized councils will have the same amount as last year for university research:

Mr. Speaker, the same amount with a cost of living increase of 12 to 15 per cent means a reduction.

Canada Council, $27.7 million

Medical Research Council, $48.8 million

National Research Council, $91.3 million

Last year, the NRC gave out $78.9 million in scholarships and research grants. The present disagreement concerns only the bookkeeping of the government. For instance, for 1976-77, grants in the field of atomic research were included in the NRC budget and the difference between last year's budget and that for 1976-77 is nearly entirely allocated to atomic research.

And the department says: We have not reduced grants! If everything is aimed at atomic research, how can you operate a research project?

The same estimates show that the federal government will increase its expenditures by about 16 per cent. In that case, why should scientists suffer greater restrictions than the government since the freeze it has imposed will mean the elimination of 10 to 15 per cent of all research projects?

ACCOUNT OF RECENT MEETING BETWEEN MINISTER C. M. DRURY AND 80 RESEARCHERS FROM OTTAWA UNIVERSITY

Here are a few questions that the researchers asked:

RESEARCHERS: They are trying to convince the minister that the combined effect of the lack of government assistance and inflation are endangering research efforts in Canada.

MR. DRURY: He said repeatedly that we were living in a year of restrictions and that everybody should make the sacrifices necessary to stop inflation.

This is not what is being done at national defence, Mr. Speaker.

RESEARCHERS: In their opinion, the current financial conditions discourage young graduates from going into research. They wonder where future scientists will come from.

We probably wait for them to come up from the United States, while we force ours to go over there. And the question is the following:

QUESTION—Does the government intend to support only the best research and let the remaining aside? Does the government realize that

the scientists who are forced to leave research will never go back to it? Has it considered the impact of such a loss? Will these people be able to find adequate jobs elsewhere?

MR. DRURY: He disappointed his audience by answering only to the last question, saying that if those highly educated people were unable to get a job elsewhere, it is because the university was doing a bad job . . .

That is easy to say, Mr. Speaker. You get all the evidence you want when you visit universities, and meet groups of graduate researchers and you can see how sincere and dedicated they are; when a minister dares speak that way, I find it a bit exaggerated.

There is no doubt that the freeze ordered by the government does not represent a decision based on a scientific policy but rather a financial decision. Indeed, when he was asked in the House whether he was aware that the recent cuts would be a mortal blow to researchers, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, president of the Treasury Board, replied that he did not agree with that assumption. The scientists note two long-term effects from those cuts: the manpower problem and that of the level of health care. As for manpower, the scientists are concerned that researchers who will be dismissed will never come back, that many technicians will lose their jobs and that the young scientists will not have an opportunity to make a career in research.

Recently, two University of Manitoba professors wrote to the federal members to explain the importance of manpower. About health care, the Canadian College of Medical Geneticists stated the following:

Solutions to problems and the practical application of knowledge can only be provided by active research programs undertaken in Canada. As professionals involved in genetics, we regret that Canadians at every level will eventually have to suffer from those short-term budgetary decisions.

You have heard the voices of a group of university researchers across Canada. I have in my hand the opinion of the Quebec researchers: "Quebec researchers look at the future with cautious confidence". I do not have time to read the whole document but it is significant that they said, quote:

Quebec researchers are badly affected by the financial crisis involving university research in Canada. Quebec researchers are emerging from this long and hard winter of cuts in financial research more determined than ever while at the horizon there seem to appear the first signs of the unfreezing of federal sources of financing.

The crisis prompted them to tighten their ranks and work together to join the common front of Canadian scientists for a pressure campaign on Ottawa. Then, they mentioned in this article the most critically affected areas, among which, medical biology. As for biology, I had the opportunity, during the year, to follow from a distance a group of researchers in the University of Ottawa. There I was able to realize the plight of those groups, in the field of finance and equipment. The trouble they had getting the material necessary for their projects. Not only did they have difficulty to raise the funds necessary for their projects, 50 per cent only since they gave 50 per cent of their time for nothing—but they did not even have enough money to buy instruments and material for their projects. It is then that I saw the shortcomings or the lack of understanding of the government in the area of university research.

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

Recently I met the Canadian association of professors in the University of Ottawa who had sent me this letter which I quote:

You are no doubt already aware that the Minister of Health has announced that the freeze on medical research financing is lifted and that the council would get an additional $2 million. Surely this is good news for the researchers who are members of our association. This will allow a number of research teams to keep going, which would otherwise have been, as you have underlined, broken up because of lack of funds. Nevertheless, this increased funding does not make allowance for cost increases brought about by the current inflation rate.

In our opinion, however, it is rather unreasonable that the government should increase subsidies for the Medical Research Council without increasing those for university research done under the National Research Council and under the Canada Council. The National Research Council finances university research in non-medical fields such as agriculture, forestry, biology, chemistry, physics and geology. As for the Canada Council, it finances university research in the fields of humanities and social sciences. The CAUT is presently urging Mr. Drury and Mr. Faulkner to see to it that the NRC and the Canada Council get additional funds the same way as the Medical Research Council. We would then be very grateful to you for helping us bring pressure to bear on the government. On the other hand, if we could be of any help in providing you with additional information . . .

And I got plenty of it, but I will not have time to quote much of it since the time allotted to me has elapsed; but I have here all the necessary tables to show the two ministers concerned the evidence that there is—

● (1620)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to deprive any member, so in conclusion I just want to say that there is certainly discrimination, first of all, at the university research level in respect of other fields and especially discrimination against industrial research.

I believe that too much importance is given to industry. Industry and industrial research are important, but priority should go to medical research. Further, if we want to keep our technicians, we have to take hold of the situation. We must keep technicians in our universities so that they will not only train other technicians, but also take part in the research being conducted in our country, so that we must not always rely on other countries, as I heard the minister say. If that is not done, we have all the American technicians and they can bring us all the new discoveries. If we continue to rely on the United States to live, tomorrow we will be forced to go and buy all our food supplies south of the border.

I believe time has come for Canada to wake up, to live as a responsible country and to keep our men in places to be able to ensure the required medical care to our people.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I recognize the hon. Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Drury).

An hon. Member: Now we will hear the good news.

An hon. Member: Where is Yewchuk?

Mr. Paproski: He had to go to a graduation. His daughter is graduating, but he will be back.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say to the hon. minister that the member who moved the motion and brought on this debate this afternoon has to attend the graduation of his daughter. He is sorry that he will miss the minister's speech, but he will be back in half an hour.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Speaker, I cannot see the opposition getting excited over a thing like that. After we have listened to the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) in respect of our own ministers, he should take his own pill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, it does seem that the opposition might well think about planning their days with a little more care. Hon. members opposite knew, for example, that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) could not be present today because of the conference of first ministers, and that the parliamentary secretary to the minister had to be absent. The hon. member opposite who moved the motion has to be away for an event that is important to him. Surely a little forethought in choosing the subject and the right day would do a great deal to enhance the prestige of this institution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I would suggest this is not a point of order but is getting into the area of debate.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, we are addressing ourselves to a motion which stands in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk). I appreciate the fact that he has other obligations and duties to perform, but I certainly agree with the point just made, that it would seem difficult to take seriously a party which has put forward a motion and has complained when that group chooses a day on which they know in advance that the minister had out of town obligations, and knew in advance that the parliamentary secretary was not only out of town but out of the country on government duty. That group also chose a day when the mover of the motion merely had time to have his say, for what it is worth, and then depart on other duties. This may be a method of getting some words on the record, but it hardly constitutes what in my view would be a debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Drury: If, unfortunately, the hon. member for Athabasca could not afford the time to be present to hear what is said on the subject on which he speaks, one can hardly expect him to be taken very seriously.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, all those who have spoken so far have suggested that perhaps the government should take another look at its priorities. Some of their suggestions were thoughtful, but some were, unfortunately, a little less than ludicrous. I will comment on those suggestions later.

In relation to the question of priorities, perhaps one should look at this problem of research, particularly medical research, in the larger perspective. We have in Canada quite an investment in research which is carried out in a number of ways, a number of places and funded from a number of sources. One should recognize that research, basically, is an investment in the future, and to the extent it is not done one is not being prudent in preparing for the future. If all one's wealth and resources are devoted to research, namely, an investment in the future, then the present never arrives. We have to strike a balance between making adequate investment in the future, based on an act of faith, and enjoyment of the present.

A survey conducted in this country in 1973 by OECD indicates that on a per capita basis research in industry in Canada appeared, by comparison with similar research being done in other countries, to be virtually at the bottom of the list. We ranked ninth. When one looks at the quantum of research in Canada in industry, compared with the quantum of research in other OECD countries in industry, he will find we ranked nine out of ten countries. Having regard to research done in government laboratories, on a per capita basis Canada ranked third among OECD countries. Clearly, by this measure we are doing a fair proportion, if all the others are right, of our research in government and a very low proportion indeed in industry.

In respect of research in universities and institutions of higher education, we ranked fourth among OECD countries, exceeded on a per capita basis only by Sweden, Germany and the Unites States. This indicates that our effort must urgently be on the highest priority for fostering research and innovative processes in the manufacturing industry where we are away behind our industrial competitors, the other OECD countries. To this end, a number of government incentive programs were devised. There was a general decision taken that here is where all the additional resources we can find should be directed toward installing more research or more innovative capacity in industry, given that in comparison with our OECD competitors we were up at the top of the procession in respect of research conducted in and by the institutions of higher learning and universities. It is against this background that one looks at the numbers which have been brought out today. I would suggest that far from lagging behind in respect of research, including medical research conducted in the universities in teaching hospitals, Canada ranks high compared to the OECD countries which should provide a reasonable basis for comparison.

● (1630)

I should point out that what we classify in Canada as medical research is performed or is funded or supported not only by the Medical Research Council but by some other agencies. In fact there is, in the current year, devoted to medical research something in the order of $100 million, and in round numbers about half of that comes through the

Medical Research Council. Another fraction, about $12 million, comes from the Department of National Health and Welfare quite independently and distinct from the Medical Research Council. The balance, about $35 million, is funded by institutes of higher education, by provincial governments and, very importantly, by private organizations which this year will be putting up some $20 million.

This means that today, when one directs attention purely to the phenomenon or the mechanism of the Medical Research Council, one is not referring to the whole medical research structure. However, the Medical Research Council, as I think everyone will agree, is in the process of doing very good and very useful work. There is little, if any, suggestion that any of the money put through the Medical Research Council is ineffectively or wastefully used. This is my own view, which I believe is shared by most members of the House. But the Medical Research Council is a relatively recent creation.

Some years ago the medical research on behalf of the federal government was largely carried out by the National Research Council. In the 1960s the Medical Research Council was brought into existence as a separate granting council and it has grown from nothing, then, to the position where it has a budget currently, as I indicated, of very close to $50 million per annum. Its growth in terms of funds available to it in the period 1970-71 to 1975-76 has been of the order of 49 per cent in current dollars, or 1 per cent in real terms. Those who talk about cutbacks even in real terms are unaware of the fact that there has been no slipback in respect of real improvement in the Medical Research Council during that period.

If one looks at the period 1970-71 to and including the current year, the rate of growth in nominal terms has been 61 per cent, which is not a bad rate of growth over a period of some seven years. In the same period there has been a real growth in the order of 2 per cent. This, then, is the answer to those who talk of cutbacks.

I am not suggesting for a moment that this is all the Medical Research Council wants, nor indeed all a great many of us here in this House would like to see put at the disposal of the Medical Research Council or, indeed, the other granting councils for research purposes. Prudent people—and I think most members of this House are prudent—like to see the largest possible investment in the future while still meeting current demands which have to be met. In the current year I think we are all sharing in this process of endeavouring to limit the growth in expenditures by all Canadians, including the federal government. This process of limiting growth is a difficult one. It is one in which I think everyone, including researchers and medical researchers, would want to play their part. As I say, even in real terms, discounting inflation, the Medical Research Council over the period 1970 to 1976 has shown a real growth as I indicated.

A number of instances have been put forward where researchers have felt that their particular grants had either been limited or terminated unreasonably. Certainly, the termination or limitation was a source of intense dissatisfaction. However, in real terms the funds have been growing year by year and the allocation of those funds, both those that are continuing and the increases, is made on the basis of value judgment by the doctors' peers. This, I think—and most people would agree—is the best system we have been able to devise to get the fairest allocation of funds of this sort in very complex and frequently competing fields.

● (1640)

Hon. members will realize that the budget of the Medical Research Council has received continuous increasing support, and I hope this will be so in the future. I have indicated in dollars the share of the total research funds for medical research which passed through the Medical Research Council.

I would like to say that the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Athabasca was rather harsh in his judgment not only of the government's motivation but also of its actions. I hope that shortly, perhaps this weekend, he will be able to return to his native province and invite Albertans, as the government of Alberta has indicated it will do, to participate in a substantial grant through the Heritage fund to cancer research. I have not included this prospective large sum of money in the figures I have quoted because so far the government of Alberta has only indicated an interest, rather than a firm intention, in undertaking this funding. I think the hon. member for Athabasca would be pleased if the government of Alberta were to come through with funds for this very worth-while cause.

The hon. member offered some suggestions as to how the system of funding could be improved. One of his suggestions was that more money should be allocated. That is an easy answer, but at a time of limited funds for all federal as well as provincial government operations, more money is no answer at all; it is merely a form of escapism. However, I suggest that one of the problems in relation to the council was what he called the stop-and-go nature of the grants, the uncertainty among the recipients as to how much money will be granted and for how long they might receive it.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) has recognized this problem, and perhaps the hon. member for Athabasca got this idea from the minister himself at a committee meeting when the minister indicated that work was going forward within his department to try to see if grants by the council could not be reorganized to provide more certainty of continuity than perhaps has been the case in the past. Improvements could be made in this area even without additional funds. Certainly the Minister of National Health and Welfare and I support this kind of initiative.

The hon. member for Athabasca suggested that we should catch up with both the U.S. and Sweden in the area of medical research. Perhaps this is desirable in terms of giving ourselves a glow of well-being, but given the fact, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) pointed out as recently as this morning, that we are in the situation of trying to consume more in a year than we are able or willing to produce—

Mr. Paproski: Did he just find that out this morning?

Mr. Drury: No doubt the hon. member has been absent or he would have heard this on many other occasions. I said the Prime Minister pointed this out again as recently as this morning.

Mr. Paproski: We will hear about it again in 1978.

Mr. Drury: While it might be attractive to think that we are doing more in medical research than either the U.S. or Sweden, this is perhaps another case where our ambitions outstrip our abilities to perform. Consequently, we are in the process now of having to make selections between what we can do and what we cannot do, what we want to do and what we want not to do. In the case of medical research, case histories have been read out to the House. This could go on forever. The list of human ailments is almost without end, and the list of people who would be interested in pursuing cures for them is also very large indeed. The fact of the matter is that we as a country cannot afford to undertake all the research that requires to be done, given the limited resources both in people and in money that we have available for this purpose. Selections have to be made and the method of making these selections in this area is through the granting councils.

It has been suggested that the Medical Research Council has been denied the amount of money that they need in the current year to keep up with their level of operations in the previous year. I am told that the advice was given to the Minister of National Health and Welfare some months ago that in order to maintain the November, 1975, level of activity in the current year an additional sum of $1.2 million would be needed. The minister was able to find in his departmental budget, from other prospective activities, the sum of $2 million which was allocated to the Medical Research Council, so that the allegation that the council does not have sufficient funds this year to keep with last year's activities is demonstrably unfounded. Indeed, more money than the minimum they said was needed has been furnished to the council.

This is not, as the Minister of National Health and Welfare has said on a number of occasions, as much of national resources going through the Medical Research Council for medical research as we would like to see. To be quite frank, this is not as much as I would like to see. One hopes that with the intention of the government to reorganize the three granting councils—which, unfortunately, given our legislative timetable, is not possible before June 30, which, however, with the co-operation of the opposition I hope we will be able to process through the legislative machine next fall—the cause of research will be better served.

● (1650)

With that legislation, the prospects for the new science and engineering council, the humanities and social science council and the Medical Research Council working closer together to adequately serve the cause of research in the universities will be much better than at the moment.

The hon. member for Athabasca indicated, rather loosely I felt, that the cause of research in Canada was "totally neglected", to use his words, by the government. I would suggest that in the case of medical research, continuous real growth, after discounting inflation over the period of the seven years I have sketched, does not correspond to total neglect. Like so many other things, I have indicated it is not as much and as often as a number of us would like, of course. Those who are worried about the lack of investment, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), should remember that in the current year we are operating within a framework of rather severely limited resources, but this does not represent a cutback in any sense of the term.

The hon. member for Athabasca made one statement which I should like flatly to contradict. On the strength of some rather dubious arithmetic he indicated that proportionately more researchers were leaving Canada for the United States than were coming here, and that we as a country are providing the training for them at our cost and thus are the net losers. I am advised that from July 1, 1974, to June 30, 1975, 24 Canadian researchers went to the United States and 58 came from the United States to Canada, a net gain of around 100 per cent of the Canadian movement. This is not simply an isolated phenomenon peculiar to this one year, but is a trend that has been persistent for the last few years. Those who try to bolster a weak case with this kind of phony endeavour to frighten people weaken what is a good cause by trying to support it with fallacies.

The hon. member for Athabasca also indicated that I said somewhere, sometime, that we should depend on the United States for our research. I am not sure of his exact words, but they are so foreign to my notion of what it should be that I could not quite catch them.

Mr. Paproski: I think he said there was a duplication of research.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. minister, but the time allotted to him has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the minister to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members on both sides of the House for allowing me to participate at some length over my regular time in the debate. In respect of the importation of technology, I made the statement that we in Canada—and this applies particularly to industrial research and, to a minor degree, to a number of other fields—are in a unique position in the world. I said at the outset of these remarks that the OECD comparative survey of Canada and the other OECD countries indicated that very much less research was being carried on in industry in Canada than in the other OECD countries. I suggested that the reason for this is the unique position in which we in Canada find ourselves. We have access, at relatively low cost, to the greatest source of new technology in the world, the United States. We, alone, are privileged to be allowed to avail ourselves of this: we are allowed to be the transferee of this technology in a way that the other OECD countries are not. Not only that, but we get it at bargain rates.

It has, consequently, not been necessary for a long time for Canadian industrialists to invest in their own research, because they can get it easily and cheaply from the United States. This has resulted in relatively little investment by Canadian industry in research because of the lack of necessity for it. Information on innovations can be obtained relatively easily and cheaply from our neighbour to the south. Access to it and the economics of it are not

available to industrialists in the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Germany, France or Japan.

While this has resulted in economies for us and has given us, in investment terms, an advantage over the years, it makes us very vulnerable to the possible drying up of this source of technology for one reason or another. It is the view of the government that we should develop more self-sufficiency and more innovative capacity in our own industry. A number of incentive programs have been provided to that end. That, however, is perhaps not relevant to the question we are dealing with this afternoon, namely, medical research.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made an eloquent plea for more resources for this worthy purpose—a plea which I support in principle: I do not condemn it. I want, and would like to see, as much of it as possible but, as I indicated earlier, there are limits in a difficult year—and this is a restrictive year, in fiscal terms—to the kind of increase and investment that the hon. member is seeking. He did say that one way of reducing health costs is to do something about medical research. With that I cannot entirely agree. I commend him for his support of medical research and more medical research. The suggestion that the way to reduce health costs in Canada is with more medical research is only partly true. If one looks at the record of our expenditures on medical research one will see they have been rising year by year for the past ten years. But rising even faster have been per capita expenditures on health care. One could, in a statistical way, show that the faster our expenditures on medical research grew, the more our responsibilities for health delivery grew.

● (1700)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Drury: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I may tell the minister that I am prepared to stand by that statement as one I would make, but may I ask if he recalls that I read it from the letter which came from Westmount?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I suppose, as the representative of that distinguished constituency I would be ill-advised to suggest that any one of my constituents could ever be wrong. That constituent was very likely quoting something which came from Winnipeg.

The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) indicated—

[*Translation*]

. . . in his speech that almost all the increase allotted to the National Research Council would go this year into atomic research. It is only fair that there should have been an increase of almost $10 million earmarked for the National Research Council project, namely the TRIUMF accelerator at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. The hon. member must know that, though this is a meson accelerator in the nuclear field, it will serve mainly in medical research. I attended the inauguration of the very new institute where this accelerator will be used to treat cancer. He describes the additional expenditures to be made this year as being devoted to atomic research. In fact, these will be mostly medical research. To my mind, it must be clearly understood the research is being conducted in the field of health rather than that of destruction or weaponry.

[*English*]

He also, in a philosophical way, suggested that I told some students and faculty at the University of Ottawa that if a university graduate were unable to secure employment in the subject in which he had been trained, the university had not done its job. I wish to make it clear that my remark really was this: the most useful formation intellectuelle which a university can give any young man or woman is that of adaptability. If all you want to learn is a repetitive skill and to apply it without changing it or yourself, you should go to a vocational training school. You go to university to learn how to take existing knowledge and apply it in new and different ways in new and different situations. That is what I mean by adaptability. If the university has not succeeded in inspiring the graduate or in making him, or her, able to do this, I can only say that a graduate like that has not been able to get out of his university training that for which most people go to university.

Over the years the government has followed a policy of consistent support for medical research. As I said earlier the fact that the medical research budget has increased fourfold in the last ten years indicates that commitment. Hon. members should understand that the budget of the Medical Research Council does not represent the total amount of money spent on medical research in this country. The total funding provided in 1976-77 for medical research is, as I said earlier, in the order of $100 million, of which about 63 per cent consists of the contribution of the federal government alone.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before recognizing the next hon. member, it is my duty at this time, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Canada—Dispute with employees of finance branch in Winnipeg—Government action to settle; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Request for report on alleged break-in of Quebec newspaper office by members of the force; the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wise)—Agriculture—Request for embargo on importation of cheese.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—HEALTH RESEARCH FUNDING

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

That this House views with great alarm the ill-considered and illogical decisions of the government which fail to give adequate priority to health research funding.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I must initially compliment the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) for introducing the motion condemning the government's lack of support for medical research in Canada and outlining deficiencies in the government's program for sustaining a viable medical research community.

I am glad to see the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) back in the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have not been away.

Mr. Holmes: I was surprised to hear him say almost in his opening comments that the NDP is as concerned, perhaps more concerned, about medical research as is my party. I suggest that if he reviews *Hansard* and testimony given before the standing committee he will find that, at least while I have been a member of this House, my party has been most concerned about medical research.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): But what about the Tory premiers? How concerned are they?

Mr. Holmes: I noticed that the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Drury) conveniently managed to defuse this afternoon's debate which, basically, has to do with medical research in Canada. He used arguments which have been used in the past. Although he spoke of funds for research being available from provincial sources, federal sources, and private individuals, it is important to remember that today we are debating the federal government's direct responsibility in medical research.

Since my first election in 1972 to the House of Commons the issue of adequate funding for medical research has been a recurrent theme. The biomedical research community has limped from one financial crisis to another. We have seen a reduction in the spending of constant dollars, a termination of programs of excellence, a rejection of projects submitted by highly qualified scientists, the introduction of disincentives which do not entice able young men and women to take up research careers, and a lack of long term fiscal policies to ensure stability and responsible growth in the research community.

If one were to examine all speeches made in this House since I became a member, examine testimony presented before the standing committee, look carefully at the annual reports of the Medical Research Council, assess the great volume of correspondence members have received on this subject, and read the editorials and reports in newspapers on this subject, one point above all would become obvious, that is that the federal government has been and is prepared to sacrifice the medical research community, on the basis of a very feeble excuse that the relatively small amount of money required for its continued viability is not present. We should be very clear in this respect what we are talking about. For example, in this fiscal year we are talking about a sum of money less than the interest incurred by the federal government in terms of the Orion program or the federal funds allocated to Habitat which, I understand, by all criteria has been a failure. Therefore we are talking about relatively small sums of money.

● (1710)

If one compares the moneys required to sustain a constant and steady growth in the research committed vis-à-vis the money committed to a variety of other government programs during my four years in this House of Commons, it must lead one to ask why the continued disinterest by the government in biomedical research. Its propensity for spending in recent years, and I understand there is a projected increase of 16 per cent for this coming year, makes a mockery out of the statement that it cannot find an additional $2 million or $3 million for this present fiscal year.

Why has the government refused to develop a long-term policy to ensure the stability of this very significant component of our health care system? Surely strategy that would ensure the future health of our most important resource, people, should receive the same attention as the government attempt to develop an energy policy, which I remind hon. members for the most part is a non-renewable resource.

The answers to these questions are by no means clear. However, I think it is worth noting that an unprecedented dissection of the health care system has occurred since the introduction of the Hospital and Diagnostic Services Act and medicare. I believe it is the rapidly escalating cost of medical care and not health that has precipitated the debate as to how the health professions function today. I want to emphasize that. It is the escalating cost of medicare and not health which has really precipitated this debate.

The preoccupation with health care costs has produced an endless stream of reports frequently suggesting oversimplistic solutions to solve a very complex problem. Indeed, it has become fashionable in recent years to become an instant expert with ready made solutions. The least that can be said for these well meaning individuals is their uniformity in failing to resolve the shortcomings in the health system with their suggestions.

I do not for a moment under emphasize the importance of escalating health costs, and indeed there is ample evidence to substantiate that the consumer cost of hospital care has risen rapidly and that furthermore, contrary to the impressions created by the government, the costs continue to be unevenly and inequitably distributed.

The reasons for the rising costs are many. Some are understandable, justifiable, and inevitable. In many instances the rising costs of certain kinds of medical care have often been presented in highly misleading ways that do not take into account the changes in the sophistication of services offered. For example, to compare the cost of treatment for a heart attack 15 years ago with what it costs

to treat the same illness today in a coronary care unit is like comparing the cost of a Model T Ford and the cost of a Concorde jetliner just because both represent a vehicle of transportation.

The ongoing debate in the search for alternate forms of delivery of health care to ensure the services of the right kind, at the right time, to the right person, has propelled us into the era of consumerism.

I have not sensed major objections to assessing the shortcomings to our health care system and to developing tools for measuring the quality of care rendered both in and out of hospital.

During this period of self-examination and social analysis, which is characteristic of any society or problem plagued by unrest and uncertainty, the government has seen the failure of its social programs to correct internal problems and yet is reticent to admit these failures. Health care has not escaped this examination.

The government, in my view, has not recognized the complexities of the problems, and because the basic issues do not fit into convenient and conventional economic and political pigeonholes they are interpreted as being insoluable, with the predictable consequences of inaction, overreaction, or the introduction of simplistic solutions. Biomedical research has been one of the victims of this mentality.

I believe it is fair to say that during the forties and fifties there was a simplistic belief that unlimited funds put into biomedical research would produce instant understanding of disease entities that would be transferred immediately to the market place and to the consumer. During my post graduate years in Washington, D.C., this Alice in Wonderland attitèude was expressed by the presence of such institutions as the National Institute of Health. Notwithstanding the gains in knowledge and major accomplishments of biomedical research which I will refer to in a moment, this unrealistic attitude which was never fostered by the scientific community at that time or today resulted in unrealistic expectations which have overshadowed monumental accomplishments. I have sensed this attitude is present in the government and has been interpreted by the government as a failure of the research community to resolve complex health problems which, unfortunately, have permeated its thinking with the resultant effect that biomedical research has been designated as a non-priority item.

It should be noted in passing that the government has an unmistakable loss of confidence in the value and effectiveness of science. It touches science in general, and medicine in particular. I was glad that the Minister of State for Science and Technology was here today because we talked about this recently on an opposition day where science in general was the focal point of that particular debate.

The government, in its inability to grasp the complexities of the problem, has sown the seeds of doubt about the capacity of science to solve our health problems. The doubt generated by the government has not unexpectedly generated intense public anxiety, and genuine fears have suddenly been replaced by acupuncture, copper bracelets, transcendental meditation, or astrology.

[Mr. Holmes.]

The question can be logically asked what has transpired in recent years to generate such criticism of our health care system? Why is it fashionable for so many to say there is nothing good in the system? I believe the answer to that question, at least in part, is related to the misunderstanding of technology, and not economics, as suggested by the government.

How many in this Chamber recall when our hospitals were filled with lobar pneumonia, when meningococal meningitis and scarlet fever took their annual toll, when outbreaks of diptheria would plague urban centres, when typhoid fever and erysipilas would cause fear and panic at the mere mention of the word? With the introduction of sulfanamides, penicillin, streptomycin, and other antibiotics a revolution in hospital care evolved, unprecedented in history.

Can you visualize the problems in hospital financing today if all the subsequent changes that have occurred, including hospital insurance, had not been accompanied by the technology to control major infectious diseases? It is important for each of us to recall this bit of history since it has and will repeat itself in the future if we continue to get results to which we are entitled from the biomedical research community.

The point which must be emphasized, and which the government has not grasped, is that the future of hospital economies is clearly bound up with the future of medical science and technology. In this I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Dr. Lewis Thomas, president of the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Centre in New York, and professor of Pathology and Medicine at the Cornell University College of Medicine, has defined three quite different levels of technology in medicine so unlike each other that practitioners of medicine and the analysts of our system will be in trouble if the differences are not understood and kept separate.

● (1720)

First there is the large body of what he termed "non-technology". This is impossible to measure in terms of its capacity to alter either the natural course of disease or its eventual outcome. A great deal of money is spent on this, and it is highly valued by the professionals as well as by the patients. It consists of what is commonly called supportive therapy and includes what physicians must now do for patients with intractable cancer, severe rheumatoid arthritis, multiple sclerosis, strokes, and advanced cirrhosis, to name but a few. The cost of this non-technology is very high and getting higher all the time. It represents the efforts not only of a substantial segment of the health professionals in coping with this kind of problem but obviously represents a substantial segment of the health sector.

The second form of technology defined by Dr. Thomas is termed "half-way technology". This represents the kind of actions which must be taken after the fact to compensate for the incapacitating effects of certain diseases. It is a technology designed to make up for disease or to postpone death. Examples in recent years are transplantations of hearts, kidneys, livers, other organs, and the invention of artificial organs. In the public mind this kind of technolo-

gy has come to appear as the equivalent of the high technology of the physical sciences.

The media tends to present each new procedure as though it constituted a break-through or a therapeutic triumph, instead of being the make-shift it really is. This type of technology is at times, by its very nature, highly sophisticated. Yet it is still primitive. It is the sort of thing one must do until there is a general understanding of the mechanisms involved in disease. Such technology, embracing as it does the development of costly apparatus to manage heart attacks, specialized ambulances, distinct hospital units, and electronic gadgetry is characterized by the necessity of investing enormous sums of money in hospitals, hospital facilities, and highly trained people. This portion of medicine will be with us in the future and our only hope of removing this level of technology lies in the new information which can be obtained through research.

The third kind of technology which is described by Dr. Thomas is the kind which is so effective that it seems to attract the least public notice; it is the kind which is taken for granted. I referred previously to the revolution in hospital care which came about with the introduction of antibiotics and modern methods of immunization against diphtheria, whooping cough, and childhood virus diseases. Our capability in dealing with tuberculosis and syphilis was a major medical triumph despite the fact that, in my view, full use has never been made of this potential. The treatment of endocrinologic disorders with appropriate hormones following basic research in immunology in Liverpool, England, is now virtually wiping out hemalytic disease of the new-born which occurs in Rh-negative mothers. There are other examples, but the truth is there are not as many as the public has been led to believe.

The point to emphasize about this kind of technology, one which implies a genuine understanding of disease mechanisms, is that when it becomes available it is relatively inexpensive, relatively simple, and relatively easy to deliver.

I refer to the influence that the discovery of antibiotics had on medical care. If a case of typhoid fever had to be managed today by the best methods of the mid-thirties, the expense would be staggering. Counting about 56 days of hospitalization during which demanding standards of nursing care would be required, careful dietary consideration, constant laboratory monitoring, and surgical intervention in certain circumstances, a conservative estimate of the cost of the illness would be around $10,000 in today's terms. The cost today would be a bottle of cloramphenical and a day or two of fever.

Mr. Philbrook: Would the hon. member accept a question? Would he acknowledge that many of the discoveries he has mentioned, particularly in the field of antibiotics, were the result of accidents such as in the celebrated case of Dr. Fleming's discovery of penicillin? Or would he not agree they were discoveries in the private sector, particularly within the pharmaceutical industry, rather than the results of long-term and expensive research at the universities?

Mr. Holmes: The question is only partly pertinent. I was attempting to make the point that biomedical research, whether in the universities or in the private sector, has been responsible for the major break-throughs we have seen.

The hon. member for Athabasca referred earlier to the statement by Dr. Fudenberg before a sub-committee in the United States about a year ago. This statement gave evidence of other areas in which large savings had been made as a result of discovery in the course of research into immunology. The point I wish to emphasize is that it is the responsibility of the federal government to ensure that this basic research is carried on in an acceptable fashion.

I want to say a word now about target research, or applied research. Although there is general agreement that applied research should be encouraged in certain key areas I believe it would be an error to do this at the expense of basic research or by restricting the freedom of our scientists. If freedom is severely curtailed, scientists will lose their enthusiasm and become less productive or, more tragic still, move to a country where greater freedom exists.

Traditionally the major function of a university is to teach and generate new knowledge through research. In my opinion it would be tragic if research priorities were established by government, as suggested in the Speech from the Throne and subsequent statements by the former minister responsible for science and technology, thereby placing the major burden of applied research on the universities. I do not suggest that applied research cannot be structured into such institutes, and indeed there are examples of successful endeavours in this respect. However, it should be noted that universities are involved in important tasks in connection with higher education and the development of new knowledge. In existing circumstances it seems unreasonable to ask the universities to maintain high standards of performance while accepting new responsibilities for government-directed research.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret I have to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member may continue?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Holmes: I thank the House for permitting me a few more moments in which to speak. I shall try to summarize. I only wish I had more time to give a detailed account of the many problems which are presently facing the research community. However, it is my personal belief that future action in the medical research community is really predicated upon an understanding of the basic importance and the problems of medical research. I hope that in the very brief time that I have taken this afternoon I have persuaded the Minister of State for Science and Technology and the government of the importance of this particular sector of technology, and I have attempted to define technology as I see it and as viewed by many. I hope the government will develop a long-term policy to restore confidence to this important segment of our health care system.

● (1730)

I should like to conclude by quoting an article entitled "The Technology of Medicine" by Dr. Lewis Thomas which appeared in the *New England Journal of Medicine* in 1971. He concluded the article with the following observation:

It is when physicians are bogged down by their incomplete technologies, by the innumerable things they are obliged to do in medicine, when they lack a clear understanding of disease mechanisms, that the deficiencies of the health care system are most conspicuous. If I were a policy maker interested in saving money for health care over the long haul, I would regard it as an act of high prudence to give high priority to a lot more basic research in biologic science. This is the only way to get the full mileage that biology owes to the science of medicine, even though it seems, as used to be said in the days when the phase still had some meaning, like asking for the moon.

One can only hope that the minister, who has been present today, and the government will grasp the implications of this very famous physician's observations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, we are faced today with a motion of the opposition which describes very well, in my mind, how the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Yewchuk) sees his role as a parliamentarian either in this House or in standing committees. I could elaborate further in a moment if the hon. member wants to be patient.

I would like to say, however, that I am not against medical research nor am I opposed to basic medical research financing in Canada. First of all, I would like to mention that I have enough scars on my whole body to say how much I appreciate the advancement of sciences which have enabled me to recover my health.

It is however obvious for anyone who has read the text of this motion put forward today that it is filled with partisan views, that it is basically negative and reflects failure of its sponsor to propose valuable and responsible solutions and to advocate some kind of alternatives.

And how easy it is with a subject like this one which receives the support of the majority of Canadians, I am not afraid to say so, how easy it is to indulge in demagogy! Obviously, any objective individual who has followed the development of medical research funding in recent years will admit with me that the achievements of this government are certainly not as described by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) or his colleagues.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), through his positive attitude, his availability, his flexibility, his wish to engage in a dialogue that will lead to new cooperation avenues does much more for Canada, for the welfare of Canadians, for medical research than the individuals who see only the bad side of the situation and live in isolation without any regard for other sectors of the Canadian economy.

I referred a moment ago to the open-mindedness of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and to his will to cooperate. As evidence I wish to quote some of his remarks made before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs on May 18. This is what the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) said:

With regard to medical research, once more—and I have said so—I felt that the increase was inadequate. Even with the additional $2 million—

[Mr. Holmes.]

And here the minister refers to the announcement made the same night about the $2 million increase in the medical research budget which he took from elsewhere in his department. I think it is satisfying evidence of his good will and his good intentions. I continue the quotation and it is still the minister who is speaking:

—I am not boasting that we are really rushing ahead and putting money into medical research. It is just going to allow medical research to keep up, roughly with where it was last November. It is nothing to boast of, in the sense, as I said, that we are just a country being over generous.

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister is frank and sincere beyond reproach.

I go on reading his comments, and I draw here the attention of the author of today's motion to the following passage, hoping he will see in it not illogical and irresponsible decisions, as he says, but a sense of organisation and planning. I quote:

But, once more, you have to look at it in a longer perspective than that of one or two years. You have to realize that over the last decade we have put a relatively high priority on the total funding of medical research.

And to support what the minister was saying in 1966-67, the budget of the Medical Research Coucil was $12,350,000 and for the current fiscal year, it has been increased to $50 million, Mr. Speaker.

I think what we should be looking at over the next few years, and what I am most concerned about in medical research, is those fluctuations, those cycles in medical research. I think this is most unfortunate. One year you get an 18-per cent increase, the next year you get 2 per cent. As you yourself, or as some of your colleagues, have said . . .

. . . he was speaking to a member of the committee, Dr. Halliday . . .

You cannot just turn it on and off as if it were a water tap. What we are trying to develop is a kind of formula or criterion, by which research . . . particularly medical research . . . will be able to count on some reasonably steady rate of growth in its expenditures.

● (1740)

I have argued with some people saying, even if we were to say 5 per cent a year or 3 per cent a year, at least we would know what to expect, and the researchers would know what to expect. Those who found it not good enough would leave, abandon, or do something else, but at least there would be some direction. I hope it will be higher than that, and that it will be related to some other criterion.

I think one of the big problems we are facing in medical research, and research generally, is the establishment of some criterion upon which researchers will be able to plan on the basis of a longer term than in the past, and I hope we will be able to arrive at that this year.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for quoting in full such a lengthy extract from the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, but I think it was important today, in the absence of the minister, to record his views so that Canadians will know exactly that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is a righteous and honest man devoted to the welfare of all Canadians.

What I find most encouraging, Mr. Speaker, in this whole matter, is the will to co-operate that we seem to have suddenly discovered. On the one hand, we have the medical research community which says it needs more money for the current fiscal year, to which the minister replied by a $2 million increase, and on the other hand, federal restraints are now being felt in every field. It will

be remembered that on December 18 last, the President of the Treasury Board, the Hon. Jean Chrétien announced the action taken by the government under its anti-inflation program.

The Medical Research Council was not the only one affected by this action, but the fact remains that at that time, the President of the Treasury Board, while admitting the restraints, still allowed a budgetary increase of $1 million, plus $414,000 which were transfered to the Department of National Health and Welfare from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and this was in addition to the $2 million announced last month. This is therefore a rather large increase when we know that other departments were not as lucky.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Yewchuk) wants to put a question to the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin).

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on with my remarks and I shall be glad to listen to the hon. member for Athabaska at the end of my speech, if time allows, because I am aware that it is a favourite tactic of opposition members to interrupt other members during their speeches, and I am against it.

It is interesting to note, still in the minutes of proceedings and in reply to an inquiry from the hon. member for Athabasca himself, that the president of the Canadian Society for Clinical Investigation, Dr. John H. Dirks, said the following:

> On the long term, I mentioned some of the issues in terms of maintaining stability, including consideration and careful monitoring of the costs of research which is being done now, including setting new directions by the MRC in terms of new programs or changing their programs in terms of looking at the schools that have special needs that need to be developed. I think these are some of the categories to look into. We have proposed to the minister that perhaps a meeting of interested people in government, political parties—

I have some doubts about this—

> —,scientists, and MRC be held to discuss in greater detail the issue of long-term funding. I hope that will come to fruition.

In fact, we all know now that these meetings have started and that they will go on during the summer, which is to the credit of all people of good will who do not simply criticize, as the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Yewchuk) usually does, but who unceasingly and conscientiously work at a very complex problem in a society which is always asking and demanding more from its governments.

As far as catching up is concerned, and particularly in the field of medical research, it is suggested that a per capita contribution similar to that in the United States or Western Germany would be a good thing for Canada. This is maybe a commendable aim but it is a bit too simplistic. As I said in the beginning, this is like living in isolation. Even if we admit this relative progress by those countries, it remains that they have some catching up to do with our policies here in Canada and with our financial support for social programs such as medicare, hospital insurance and the many social programs which I will not enumerate here but which are all familiar to us and which excite the envy of many other countries, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said today during question period.

I shall not drag on refuting more than necessary today's motion. Several colleagues want to take the floor and they are perfectly able to come to grips with that question but I am obliged to recognize that, on top of being essentially negative, the motion is pessimistic and it does not take into account all that has been done for some time to promote a dialogue between the scientific community, the government, the Medical Research Council and—why not—the politicians in senior positions.

I shall end by quoting, as I have done during my remarks, the minutes of proceedings of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. I have to quote myself to put the question in its true context. During the Friday May 28 meeting of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, where Dr. J. Gordon Kaplan, President of the Canadian Federation of Biological Studies was one of the witnesses, I asked the following question:

> Is it not true that we have reached this critical threshold of readiness of mind and of practical and open dialogue?

Dr. Kaplan answered:

> It is true that the dialogues have started. I must add that it already existed between the hon. Health Minister and the medical research community of Canada.
>
> For the past two or three years, his door has always been open to us and we have been able to talk frankly with him, although you know what consequences this may have: unfortunately, an open dialogue does not guarantee that medical researchers will have enough funds. Nevertheless, I agree with your optimism and we hope that this true dialogue will lead to the development of a long-term policy on medical research subsidization.

And why put all the burden on the government, Mr. Speaker? It seems to me that the medical community has, too, the responsibility and duty to plan its own research, to establish its own priorities and not to rely always on the government.

It is obvious, from the statements I quoted today, that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) and the medical research community, including the Medical Research Council, are much more optimistic than the hon. member for Athabasca and his party as regards the future. That is why I cannot support this motion. I feel the remarks of the hon. member for Athabasca add nothing of substance to the debate, and that the minister has already taken into account all the representations made in committee of the House. An attempt was made to politicize a problem which, to my mind, is now in the process of being solved.

The doctors and medical researchers lobby is possibly the best organized and among the most powerful in the land; to my mind, it was not necessary to draw the attention of the House to this matter today. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I come from an underdeveloped area of the country, which is often badly developed. I should have thought that on the Progressive Conservative side the hon. members would have preferred taking up the matter of regional disparities, of equal opportunities, instead of rehashing the same old arguments in a lobby that it is quite capable of taking care of its own needs, which indeed it has proved very ably.

[*English*]

I just cannot be turned on by today's motion and the plea for more medical research funds in the way the motion is

worded. After listening to all opposition spokesmen I am more than ever convinced that the object of today's debate was to try to score political points against the government, and not so much a concern for the benefit of the medical research community in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Corbin: That is not to say, and I would like to repeat, that I am against medical research. I am for medical research for the same reason I am for motherhood, for fatherhood, or the sacred cows of India, or democracy. The real question is whether or not the government is administering the public moneys in a responsible and balanced way. I believe it is. The question really is a matter of balance, balance of job creation, equal opportunity throughout all areas of the country and a happy life, and balanced growth in all departmental expenditures.

● (1750)

In conclusion may I say I am surprised that such a motion would come forward today from the hon. member for Athabasca after the poor show we went through on Friday a week ago when this House had referred back to it from the standing committee a bill to control smoking in public transit facilities. The committee spent something like six full meetings debating the question. In the course of those meetings it was proven that smoking is obnoxious to non-smokers. Money was spent on interpreters, on printers, and on other salaries in respect of the committee. The committee referred the bill back to this House in a modified form. Who opposed the measure to improve the health of Canadians? None other than the hon. member for Athabasca, and that is a bloody shame!

Mr. Yewchuk: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has just terminated his speech with what comes closest to the unusable term. He told an untruth at the conclusion of his speech. If he had bothered to listen to or read what I said in the committee or in the House when that bill came back, he would know that I supported the bill all the way. He should withdraw that falsehood. It is unacceptable. The bill was spoken to by five members, including members from the other side, during that hour of debate, and they must take just as much blame as we do for the bill not having passed at that time. I think the hon. member should withdraw that falsehood.

Mr. Corbin: I will be fair with the member from Athabasca. It is quite possible he did not understand the way I put the question. He may not have been opposed to the legislation, but he certainly organized the blocking of the passage of that legislation in the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the point of privilege raised by the hon. member was well taken. Perhaps I might be permitted to mention to the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) that he should not inpute motives. He is not entitled to impute motives over and above stating the facts. I would hope the question would be resolved in good understanding. Perhaps the hon. member would qualify his statement again.

[Mr. Corbin.]

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Speaker, with all the respect I usually direct to the Chair I certainly will abide by your recommendation in respect of my clarifying the statement I just made. I will withdraw what the hon. member for Athabasca has asked me to withdraw, which is the statement that he opposed the legislation, but I will say that he blocked the passage of that bill.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would have to draw to the attention of the hon. member who has just spoken that it is patently obvious that he has failed to read the debates dealing with the anti-smoking bill. Otherwise he would realize that what he has stated with regard to the hon. member for Athabasca has absolutely no truth in fact.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member does not want to bring the Chair into the debate which took place in the committee. I think the question is resolved at this time, and that I should recognize the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday).

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it would be the wish that I call it six o'clock to allow the government member time to cool down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we call it six o'clock as suggested?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

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

At 5.58 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, before we recessed for dinner tonight we heard the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) launch into what might be called a tirade not on the subject of our debate today but rather on the matter of the provision of separate accommodation for smoking in public conveyances. Therefore I think it might be apropos to review what the motion before the House today is. It reads as follows:

That this House views with great alarm the ill-considered and illogical decisions of the government which fail to give adequate priority to health research funding.

We are talking about research, Mr. Speaker, not about a bill which was before the House some time ago.

I want to approach the subject for debate today from two or three aspects that are somewhat unnconventional and different from what we have heard of late. First, I want to allude briefly to some of the peculiar attitudes of the government toward research. Second, I would like to touch on some of the philosophies behind health care research which do not seem to be understood by the government. Third, I want to speak about aspects of medical research to which adequate consideration has not been given by the speakers from whom we have heard so far in this debate in

the House or in the committee, namely, research into the practice of family medicine, a very important part of the health care delivery system in Canada.

First of all I should like to get rid of some rather unpleasant comments which I feel I must make about the govenment's approach to the subject of medical research in the last year or so. It was disappointing to me when it was brought to my attention by some people from the research community who were on Parliament Hill in the last month or two that they received a very discourteous and unfriendly reception from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) when they visited him in his office not long ago. That does not get any marks for the government or for the whole principle of medical research.

The second point which concerns me has been alluded to by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) when he led off very capably for the official opposition, and that is that there has been an obvious lack of attendance by some important members of the government who should be here. I am the first to admit that reasons were given why the Minister of National Health and Welfare and his parliamentary secretary could not be here, and I accept them. I presume the same is the case for the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien). However, it is gratifying to see here tonight the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) because he, like the Minister of Science and Technology (Mr. Drury), comes from a community in Canada where there is much interest in medical research. I am surprised that those two ministers have not been able to come up with a more effective program for the provision of research funds in view of the local interest which exists in their communities.

There is a third matter that concerns me regarding actions of the government. It relates to what has gone on in the Department of National Health and Welfare in the past and up to the present. I want to raise one particular instance and I hope I will not offend anyone. It has been brought to my attention that Dr. Jack Wiggin, who was employed in the Department of National Health and Welfare as head of the health research grant program until about the end of 1975, had a very difficult time as head of that branch. His role was to assess and rule on grant applications which came before the department. As most hon. members know, these grants are scrutinized by at least three separate committees. One was a committee of the department itself, another was a committee of outside experts, and there was a third committee, all of which could offer opinions on grant applications.

● (2010)

There is one glaring example of where an application was made for a grant, was approved by all three committees, and it had to be vetoed by a man higher in the department than the director of the branch itself. That was so deplorable that the committee threatened to resign and the chairman of this branch has since resigned. That is the kind of department that tries to run the program of research grants in this country, and it is disappointing to learn of it.

Recently a well known medical educator in this country told me how disappointed he was with the status of the staff in the Department of National Health and Welfare. He said it has gradually gone down hill in the last five or six years and that he could count on one hand five competent people in the department now as compared to the situation some years ago.

Dealing with the attitude of the government, there is one other area to which I should like to allude and which has been discussed in some detail by other members. It concerns the spending attitude of the government as it relates to medical research. I can summarize this whole thing rather succinctly in a quotation from an article by Dr. Daniel H. Osmond, Associate Professor in the Departments of Physiology and Medicine at the University of Toronto. I will quote from the article which appeared in the spring edition of *The Graduate*, a publication of the University of Toronto. He was referring to the feelings of research workers after the announcement last December of the freeze on research grants. The article was headed "Sickness in Canada's Health System" and he wrote:

> This much was clear: the financial noose was firmly in place. Inflation would steadily complete the strangulation.

That is the attitude and feeling of research people across the country toward the government's conduct of medical research.

While discussing the peculiar attitude of the government I should like to touch on something to ward off an obvious argument the government has brought forth in committee on many occasions about recommendations from the official opposition to the effect that there should be an increase in spending in certain areas. We are always told that we cannot have it both ways.

I was very interested to read an article not too long ago in a magazine called *Farm and Country*, which is circulated to 86,000 farmers across Canada. It is a lay organization as far as medical research is concerned and as far as the costs of health care are concerned. The government tries to tell us that we must follow a policy of restraint and that the only way to do it is its way. But, Mr. Speaker, there are other ways of looking at it. I have been upset when this point has been brought up with the Minister of National Health and Welfare and he has just replied that we are not going to have any deterrents, as though there is something bad about the word. I do not like the word myself, but he is using it in the wrong sense. When we use it on this side of the House we mean to stop the over-use and abuse of the health care system. If the minister would look at it that way he could find ways to save the extra money that the research people need.

The editorial in *Farm and Country* of May 25, 1976, dealt with the closing of the hospital in Chesley. It is a layman speaking on behalf of farm and country people. It reads:

> It gives us little satisfaction to note that five years ago we predicted that neither Ontario nor Canada could afford a lavish health system. At that time we pointed out that comprehensive medicare was bankrupting Britain, and the same would happen in Canada. Politicians of all parties, who fostered the something-for-nothing attitude among the electorate, must share the blame for the present crisis.

Apart from that perhaps negative approach to the problem, the editorial advanced three rather constructive suggestions which I would recommend to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. One comes from the chairman of the Chesley and District Memorial Hospital board

who suggests a fee of $4 per day for people using the hospital.

Another suggestion comes from one of the board members of the same hospital who thinks that patients, who are able to, could pay $100 per year for their health care bill. This, if applied nationally, would save hundreds of millions of dollars which could be applied to medical research. He also suggested—and he is talking about OHIP because he happens to be in Ontario but this would apply to any government-sponsored health care plan—that in the area of cost cutting there could be a new approach to billing OHIP. He says that when patients visit a physician's office they never see the amount the government run service is charged for the consultation or treatment.

I can suggest a fourth way in which the minister could save money for medical research. The patients could pay the physician directly and then collect the money from the appropriate source, be it the government or a private plan. The government could save money in many areas but it pretends the only way it can do it is by cutting back on the funds available for medical research.

Going on to deal with some of the problems of the philosophy of the government in regard to medical research, I should like to read a quotation from the magazine I referred to earlier, *The Graduate*. The article entitled "Sickness in Canada's Health System" by Dr. Osmond reads as follows:

"For the first time in 20 years," says one head of a medical science department in Toronto, "I would advise graduate students to leave Canada."

There is a problem in medical research funding no matter what the Minister of State for Science and Technology says, or what the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria says, or how they try to juggle the figures to prove it is not so. It is obvious there is a problem, and the system is being down-graded because of lack of funds.

Another area which is certainly very important and is often not recognized as being a problem is that the Minister of State for Science and Technology does not understand what medical research and health care are all about. To go back to the article I just quoted from, it reports Dr. Malcolm Brown, President of the Medical Research Council, an agency of the Department of National Health and Welfare, as saying:

The effect of research on the quality of teaching and on patient care is evident in the ways in which patients seek out teaching hospitals for treatment. The evidence supports the view that there is a positive relation between the amount of research, the quality of teaching, and the amount learned.

The Department of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of State for Science and Technology do not seem to appreciate the fact that there is a close connection between research, teaching medicine, and the quality of health care, and that any restraint in expenditures in these areas is going to affect adversely medical teaching and thus the quality of care which Canadians receive.

I should like now to discuss two areas which come under the heading of the concepts or philosophies of research and health care. There must be a distinction between research and development. We hear a lot about "R & D" which is carried out by many government departments at the present time. Of course research is something entirely different from development. Research is something you spend money on without knowing exactly where you are going and what the results will be. Development is where you spend money on a program that you know is going to achieve a certain result. Unfortunately our government does not appreciate the distinction between the areas of research and development. Because of the long term implications it seems unwilling to spend money on research. It would rather spend money in the area of development.

[Mr. Halliday.]

● (2020)

We must also consider the problem of in-house research, a new term which connotes the concept that research should be carried on by people in the Department of National Health and Welfare. The researchers who have been on Parliament Hill during the last few weeks have brought to our attention a deplorable situation. Apparently in the most recent spending estimates there is to be a 16 per cent increase in moneys allotted for "in-house" spending. That represents a considerable sum.

While on this topic may I quote from page 94 of report No. 22 of the Science Council of Canada, entitled "Science for Health Services", dated October, 1974. A note of dissent was sounded by M. Bonneau, a well-known health care worker and educator in Quebec. Speaking about in-house research he said, as the report notes on page 94:

. . . Judgments on the scientific quality of the researcher and his project can be made only by experienced people, capable of understanding the objective and evaluating the correlation between the means and the end.

. . . Any structure for the encouragement and co-ordination of research efforts must be removed as fast as possible from the administrative and political area.

I submit that we should curtail in-house medical research and allow experts in the field to conduct such research.

I am concerned about the government's lack of consistency in medical research spending. In this regard I wish to quote Pavlov. As hon. members know, Pavlov left the world a legacy in the field of the conditioned reflex. In a message to youth he said:

What would I wish for the young people of my motherland who dedicated themselves to science? First of all—consistency . . . Consistency, consistency and again consistency . . . Inculcate in yourself the habit of strict consistency in acquiring knowledge . . . Restraint and patience . . . Modesty . . . Do not let pride take possession of you . . . Be passionate in your work and in your quests.

I suggest that the medical researchers of this country have been patient, have been consistent and, above all, have been passionate in their work. They passionately plead for more money for medical research.

In my remaining few minutes I wish to touch on the important subject of research related to the practice of family medicine. I have some experience in this area. In Canada health care in the majority of cases for the majority of people is delivered by the family physician. It is about time we spent more on research relating to the practice of family medicine. The previously alluded to report of the Science Council of Canada touches on this subject at page 82. Under the heading "Adequacy of Funding", we read the following:

The R & D on health care delivery ... is less than half the above amount.

The author is referring to the fact, alluded to in the previous sentence, that Canada spends 1 per cent of the costs of health care on R & D in health services. I continue quoting:

Such a low level is inconsistent with sound industrial practice. An increase in the small outlay on health care R & D is obviously needed to improve the value obtained from the much larger outlay (over 200 times) on health care itself.

The report lists a number of government departments and various other agencies which spend money on R & D. The Department on National Health and Welfare ranks ninth on that list.

The report goes on to say:

It is not an impressive illustration of the relative importance currently being attached to health care R & D. This would be of little significance if the needs for new knowledge in this field were reasonably well satisfied. However, the preceding pages should have shown that the extent of the outstanding need for knowledge is such that it will have little chance of being met without a major increase in funding.

The foregoing illustrates why we should spend much more on medical research and on research in family medicine. We could examine many areas of family practice. Time does not permit me to deal with them. I will do this on another occasion when I can put facts in more detail before the House.

May I now draw to the attention of the House some comments made by Dr. Donald I. Rice, executive director of the College of Family Physicians of Canada, at the national conference on research in family practice held in Miami, Florida, in January, 1975. He said in part:

The appropriate funding of family practice research is a must if we are to encourage an adequate number of researchers to become involved in research activity. Research costs money as well as time, and we must do what we can to find the necessary funds to support legitimate investigations in family practice. Here the practising family doctor interested in research is at a distinct disadvantage vis-à-vis his confrere with an academic appointment.

He went on to say—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. member to inform his that his allotted time has expired. He may continue if he has unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Halliday: I thank hon. members for their indulgence. I shall speak only a few more sentences. Dr. Rice went on to say:

Major funding bodies must accept that family practice research will play an increasingly important part in determining the future direction of health care in our respective countries, and they must be encouraged to invest the necessary research money to ensure that adequate numbers of family physician researchers are being trained, and that appropriate investigations are being carried out.

Finally, I cannot do better than quote Hippocrates, known as the father of modern medicine. He said, in about 400 BC:

Other discoveries will yet be found out, if a person possessed of the proper ability, and knowing those discoveries which have been made, should proceed from them—to prosecute his own investigations.

Medical Research

Following the words of Hippocrates, Canadian researchers will be unable to prosecute their investigations unless the government reconsiders the provision of medical research funding.

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, for the second time in two years I participate in debate on this subject. I think the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) told the House he has participated in similar debates three times. I hope that we shall not participate in any more such debates for some time, considering how this debate has been carried on. I cannot help but agree with the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Drury) that this debate has been disappointing, to say the least.

Mr. Brisco: What has been disappointing?

Mr. Philbrook: The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) is not here; his parliamentary secretary is not here, and the Conservative spokesman, the hon. member for Athabasca, could not be here himself this afternoon. Worse than that, throughout the afternoon attendance in this House was poor.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I point out that I was here all this afternoon, except for one hour when I went out to attend my daughter's graduation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brisco: Apologize. Withdraw.

Mr. Philbrook: According to my recollection, there was, generally, poor attendance this afternoon on the part of members of the official opposition party. Sometimes fewer than five were present.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Fewer than five!

Mr. Philbrook: The same goes for the other opposition party, the NDP.

Mr. Brisco: If that is a demonstration on your debating skill, you can quit now.

Mr. Philbrook: At one time the hon. member for Athabasca spoke of heart attacks. As he said, we do not want any member of this House to have a heart attack. You know, we could translate the work of researchers into concrete results if we work at it. For example, the pamphlet put out at the initiative of the Minister of National Health and Welfare having to do with a new perspective on the health of Canadians deals with physical fitness and how physical fitness can prevent heart attacks. I wonder how many of the hon. member's colleagues have lately used our gym facilities to improve their own physical fitness. It is not just research that is important. It is using the results of research as well.

● (2030)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Philbrook: I ask the opposition to accord our speakers the same kind of respect and silence that we accorded their speakers.

Getting back to the subject for this opposition day, I will not comment on the statement by my good friend and medical colleague, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), because I have a great deal of respect for him. With regard to some of the remarks he made tonight all I will say is that I thought he knew better.

The subject of this opposition day is criticism. Why not? There is criticism all around us these days. It is an era of criticism. Everybody criticizes everybody for everything. In this particular case there is criticism with regard to federal government funding of the Medical Research Council, that it has not been sufficient to meet the growing demand of the medical science community. Often there are demands from people in an ivory tower who think that because they are in splendid isolation they are entitled to the taxpayer's dollar without supervision. In fact since 1973 the real value of government allocations to the MRC has declined in terms of 1966 constant dollars. Why not? Many other things have too, the stock market, for example.

This trend had been exacerbated further by the freeze announced on December 18, 1975, keeping this year's contribution at the same level as last year, $48.8 million. Therefore the MRC budget for 1976 is identical in real terms to that of 1969. Even with the additional $2 million provided as of May 18, 1976, it is still felt that another $4.6 million is needed for the council to meet this objective for this year. That is fair enough coming from the medical research community, and I think we all accept that.

Let us look at the reasons behind that. Federal funding has fluctuated so strongly over the past several years that it is impossible for MRC to establish a long-term strategy in the provision of research grants. That is a fair criticism and worth examining. On the other hand, however, many other things have the same difficulty in these times of inflation and recession.

A word about the nature of medical research in Canada. Unlike most other advanced western nations, notably the U.S., Britain, and France, Canada does not have any medical equivalent of a central research organization which has its own research facilities. Unlike many countries, as well, such as the U.S. and Switzerland, Canadian industry does not engage in as comprehensive medical and pharmaceutical research. Therefore most medical research here is carried out in the universities, and these are highly dependent upon outside funding, particularly from the government. It is the responsibility of the MRC then to ensure that the government subsidies are distributed to gain the maximum yield in furthering medical knowledge. That is a sacred trust to the public. As such it is purely an administrative structure.

With respect to the attitude of the scientific community toward the MRC, the medical research community is unanimous in its approval of the purpose and function of the MRC. It is also largely content with the manner in which the MRC has distributed the funds it is given. The main area of complaint remains the amount provided to the MRC for distribution.

[Mr. Philbrook.]

With respect to the attitude of the medical research community toward government restraint, medical researchers are sympathetic toward the government's desire to bring the economy under control, as are all Canadians. They feel, however, that much less than being contributors to economic disorder they are victims of inflation. They feel that medical research should receive the same increases that government departments and government-conducted research facilities received last year, which averaged 16 per cent, as opposed to the MRC's budget increase of 2.9 per cent.

With regard to the funding of medical research in Canada, I wish to deal with the breakdown and perspective. From 1959 to 1963, under the Tories, federal funds provided to MRC went from $2,008,000 to $4,300,000. By 1967, under the Liberals, this figure had reached $12.3 million. From 1967 to 1976-77 federal support has more than quadrupled to $50,848,000. Over the long run, therefore, the Liberal government has demonstrated clearly its support of medical research. I emphasize over the long run.

An hon. Member: What about the United States?

Mr. Philbrook: We will get to that. You like to compare us to the United States when it is in your favour, but when it does not make your point you are pretty quiet about it.

It must be kept in mind, as well, that government support of medical research does not stop with the MRC. For 1976-77 the MRC allocation of $50 million comprises only 79 per cent of all federal government support of medical research in Canada and only about 50 per cent of the over-all amount spent in this area.

For example, the MRC contributed $50,848,000, and all other government department programs $12,804,000, with a total federal expenditure for 1976-77 of $63,652,000.

The other main sources of funds for 1976-77 are contributions from provincial agencies, $12,600,000; contributions from major voluntary agencies, $19,997,000; contributions from other voluntary agencies and foundations, mainly foreign, $1,500,000. Over-all, these contributions add up to a total of $100,749,000 to be spend on medical research in Canada for this fiscal year; not bad for a small, young country.

I wish to say a word about participation of the voluntary sector. Over the past ten years contributions from the voluntary sector have kept pace with the growth of the MRC budget, quadrupling from $5 million to about $20 million. This growth in participation has been attributed to gradual improvement in the medical research community's ability to publicize its cause, as well as better organization in efforts of the contributing organizations themselves. Aid from the voluntary sector is quite uneven, however, with some groups increasing their contributions substantially, others remaining constant, and yet others decreasing their financial support.

With respect to private industry, apparently the MRC has never made direct representations for support of medical research. Personally I think that is unfortunate. I have had experience, as perhaps other members have, in this area. It is an area which is very important in many other countries. I mentioned before, the United States and Switzerland. It is an area where Canada has not even begun to

scratch the surface. There is a great deal of potential there in spite of the fact that most of our private industry is foreign owned and controlled. A lot of people think that is perhaps an inhibiting factor to the private sector. I believe a great deal more can be done.

I also wish to say a word about government explanation of medical research funding cutbacks. The government is aware that many worth-while projects have suffered as a result of its cutbacks in this field, but it is felt that no area of government spending can be fully exempted from the government's current austerity program designed to overcome the most pressing immediate problem, namely, inflation. It is wrong to look only at the last two or three years and assume this represents a typical pattern in the government's attitude toward medical research. Combating inflation, hopefully, will not be a permanent preoccupation for the government. I think if we honestly look we will see some significant early results in the battle against inflation, in fact in all of the industrialized countries in the western part of world, as recently reported by the OECD.

● (2040)

It is acknowledged by the government that contributions to medical research are inadequate at the present time. Certainly they are more inadequate than we would like them to be. But this inadequate funding is seen as such only in contrast to a previous decade of reasonably generous support. Regarding the need for stability in funding from one year to the next, this too is acknowledged by the minister to be a serious problem. What is lacking is a workable formula or set of criteria whereby an appropriate growth rate can be determined for funding. The minister for science referred to that today and I believe the matter is being seriously considered.

There are a number of arguments which might be put forward in defence of the current level of government funding of research. For example, how is one to determine what is the optimum level of federal funding? This is a problem in all areas of federal funding. There is no easy answer. It has to be arbitrary. Is all research good? Is all research valuable and worth while, particularly when it is done with the taxpayers' money? Hopefully the situation will change, but in this area there is resistance, there is unfamiliarity with business management, with cost accounting, with the setting of strict objectives, particularly in the basic research area, and our changing times demand a more cost-efficient approach.

Even if certain research is deemed imperative, must it be expensive? Yes, a great deal of it must be expensive, but must it all be expensive, or as expensive as it is? After all, the greatest medical discovery, that for which this country is famous around the world, was the discovery of insulin, and this was done on an extremely low budget, using very simple means.

The opposition talks at times about return on investment. The official opposition critic referred to a number of discoveries in respect to which there has been good return on the money spent. That is true in those cases. But the information he gave us is a bit loaded. He was speaking only about the research which has worked; the examples given did not reflect the cost of all the research which is carried out.

Medical Research

The government must weigh demands from many different sectors in society. Every one of them has a legitimate claim for more funds. As we all say these days, everybody wants decreased government spending but nobody wants particular cuts. Where would the critics have us make these cuts, in transport? In a country like this? In regional expansion? In social welfare? In development of culture, in communications—

Mr. Stevens: We showed you where you could save a billion.

Mr. Philbrook: —in native and northern development, in health and sports? In business and economics, where a great deal of money goes? In foreign aid, perhaps? Would they have us make cuts there? It is easy to say these things when you are not in government, when you are the critics. Particularly during times such as these, when the government must lead efforts in restraint to bring the economy back in line, the administration can expect to be subject to particularly strong pressure from all sectors attempting to avoid the squeeze. This kind of austerity should provide needed pressure on the researchers themselves to encourage maximum efficiency and rationalization in their operations. There is no question about that.

In prosperous times everyone grows a bit fat—the universities are no exception and the research laboratories are no exception either. The university organizations themselves have been concerned about this. They have set up studies to encourage rationalization, to increase efficiency, to prevent duplication. In industry when we were approached for funds, when we were approached to buy expensive equipment for university departments, we often found that the equipment requested was already there in another department, next door. It was simply duplication. Yet the two researchers had not talked to each other about it, had not co-ordinated their requests. This would have been money down the drain had somebody not been careful.

Times such as this should as well provide an added opportunity for researchers and private industry to get together to their mutual benefit. The greatest potential for increasing funds for medical research lies in one heretofore untapped reserve—and I referred to this a little earlier, Mr. Speaker—a process of working together involving private industry, government, and universities. It is well done in many countries, by countries such as our great neighbour, the United States, by many European countries, particularly Switzerland. There seems to be some disinclination in this country for these sectors to work together. In the meantime the work is not getting done or, if it is getting done, it is being achieved in a more expensive way.

I would like to quote from a committee report of May 18, 1976, when the Minister of National Health and Welfare was addressing the Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. He said:

> I am advised by Dr. Bois that the MRC itself has not made representations to private industry about contributions to medical research.

That would be my impression as well. I think the situation is the same with the universities and private industry—a certain aloofness which is a little hard to define and hard to explain.

As I said before, various members of this House have had some direct experience with medical research, some of us in private industry, and we found that in great contrast to other countries the co-ordinated effort simply is not there. Private industry does possess considerable resources and it is my experience that if the effort were shown on both sides, foreignowned or not, they would be more than willing to work with our research community and help answer a great deal of our concern about funding. At one time, when with industry, I recall approaching the head of MRC, a very fine man who has done a fine job in most of his functions, with a concrete offer for some kind of tripartite arrangement between MRC, the universities, and industry, to work together for a better research effort than we could do alone. Mr. Speaker, there was no significant response. Yet MRC has performed most of its functions well. But both the MRC and the universities will have to look at their relations with areas such as private industry to generate new funds and to use the funds they have more efficiently.

I also believe that medical research in this country has a great friend in the deputy minister for science, Maurice LeClair, with whom I have discussed this subject. He certainly knows medical research and is very sympathetic to the cause, including this concern about funding. I believe, by the same—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Philbrook: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will wrap up my remarks very briefly. I believe time will prove that medical research in this country has a very great friend in the Minister of National Health and Welfare, indeed in members on the entire government side. I believe that all members of parliament and the general public too are appreciative of the research community. But there are problems which must be worked out. There is no sense kidding ourselves. One of our concerns must be the efficiency with which funds are used, and whether we are experiencing difficult economic times or normal ones, those things must be worked out. If we do this we will be a better research country and a better medical community for having done so.

● (2050)

In the meantime I think it is fair to say that our researchers will need to come down from their ivory towers and learn a little more about what the world in general is like. They will need to learn to sell to the public and to the government their very important function better than has been the case in the past, and thus compete with all the other important and vital needs that are facing this country. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and would like to thank other hon. members of the House for giving me the extra time.

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to listen to the remarks on this subject of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook) who said that he had had experience in the field of medical research. Be that as it may, I would say from the tone of his remarks that he also indicated he had had very little experience in the field of economics.

This debate on the failure of the government to give adequate priority to health research funding in Canada takes place in an interesting context. A first ministers' conference has just concluded at which a major item on the agenda was a revision of the cost sharing arrangements with the provinces for the medical care and hospital insurance programs. Including the value of abated tax points to the province of Quebec, these programs will, according to the estimates, cost the federal treasury approximately $4 billion this fiscal year. One of the goals sought by the federal government at the first ministers' conference was to hold down the rate of growth of these expenditures through the implementation of a new formula.

The sum of $4 billion is an impressive amount of money in anyone's language. One of the aspects of this debate revolves around a smaller and less impressive amount, the approximately $4 million in additional funding that is required to maintain the level of medical research at last year's standard. The bearing that these two amounts have on one another is very important.

I want to say at the outset that I am fed up with the stock response we always hear from the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), which has just been reiterated by the hon. member for Halton, when the request is made for additional funding for medical research by members from this side of the House. We have all heard that response, Mr. Speaker: It goes something like this, "You are always telling us to restrain government spending. We practice it in this specific area and now you complain. Why can't you be consistent?"

That is a phony argument, and the hon. minister, who I regret is not here tonight, shows his contempt for the House by employing it. If he does not know that it is a phony argument then he does not know the difference between restraint and false economy, between being penny wise and pound foolish.

The whole point of our argument, which the President of the Treasury Board has never refuted or even attempted to refute, is that this is an expenditure that will not only save lives—a consideration that I would hope would be of some importance to him—but it is an investment that will save the federal and the provincial taxpayer money that will more than repay that investment.

The so-called restraint that has been imposed on Medical Research Council funding, following a cutback in funding, is equivalent to a cost cutting program in a business that begins by terminating the fire insurance policy or deferring replacement of worn out machinery that must be kept in operation to keep unit costs down.

The savings the minister boasts of today are in reality ensuring higher costs in the future, and probably in the very near future. If the aim is to hold down health care costs, let us not throw away the tools that will enable us to do so not just this year, but on a long term basis, perhaps in some cases even on a permanent basis. An ounce of prevention is still worth a pound of cure. Four million

dollars more this year may save us tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars later on; and if that seems extreme, consider how much it would cost us today in treatment, rehabilitation, and welfare to care for those potential victims of polio who were saved from that dread disease by the discovery of Salk vaccine.

Many Canadians, both members of this House and countless thousands across the country, have pleaded the case for increased medical research funding on humanitarian grounds and on the hope for a better quality of life. I think of the many people who have written to me expressing their concern at the government's insensitivity to the need for more research funds. I think not only of medical researchers—although many of them have written me—but of concerned citizens who consider the good health of Canadians to be one of the nation's prime assets. Many were prompted to write because of personal knowledge of the ravages of as yet unconquered diseases. Some have family, friends or relatives who stand to benefit from breakthroughs in the major diseases threatening mankind today—cancer, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cystic fibrosis. Many others simply expressed their understanding of the need to use our financial resources wisely in researching new methods to combat disease.

Canadians are interested, tremendously interested, in this matter. Each year through voluntary donations they give a large amount of money to medical research. And their interest is such that each year their contributions increase, up 20 per cent this year over last year. Ordinary Canadians are doing their part, but at the same time they have had to watch the government reducing its commitment in this field.

For every dollar spent in research today there is a saving of $20 in 10 years' time—some estimates of the cost-benefit ratio are even higher. This represents a better than 20 to 1 payoff on investment—an opportunity that no businessman could resist—but an investment that the government fails to comprehend. Dr. Vivian Abrahams, a medical researcher and teacher at Queen's University, one of these researchers who the member of parliament for Halton says continually live in an ivory tower, in his appeal to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) summed up the frustation of so many researchers when he said:

> This generation has benefited hugely by the efforts of previous generations and we have a responsibility to generations to come to devote a reasonable and fair proportion of our resources to the support of medical research.

The direct savings in future medical care costs are convincing enough, Mr. Speaker, but equally important is the potential contribution to the Gross National Product through earnings and productivity of the many who have been spared, because of the successes of our medical research teams, the crippling effects of once terrifying diseases and even premature death.

The economic logic for increased support of medical research is so compelling that it is the ultimate in frustration and bewilderment to witness the lethargy of the government over the past few years in allowing the erosion of the medical health research capability of this country, with all the demoralizing consequences that that entails. What is happening in the field of medical research is indicative of the government's negative approach to science and technology, as was so well set out by my colleague from Halton-Wentworth during a recent debate in this House on science policy.

● (2100)

What the government does not seem to realize and does not seem to comprehend is that the prime requisite in successful scientific research is continuity. It cannot be turned off and on like a tap, and yet that is the course the government has been following.

In the middle and late 1960's the government moved to alleviate the inadequacies of the facilities in our medical schools and research labs. This period was marked by considerable expansion in Canada's medical schools, with a clear understanding of the symbiotic relationship of research and teaching to an over-all improvement in the quality of our medical schools. Ten years later, just as Canada is moving into a position to enjoy the fruits of this investigation, we are witnessing instead the painful and slow dissolution of our research capacity caused by government restraint in medical research funding.

We cannot afford to lose our bright young medical researchers. We cannot afford it in economic terms, and we cannot afford it in human terms. But, because of uncertainty and declining opportunities in the field of medical research, there has been a serious reduction in the number of medical graduates entering the research field. Only 1 per cent of graduates is expected to go into research this year as compared to 5 per cent in 1970.

Dr. Alex Sehon, head of the Department of Immunology of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Manitoba said recently:

> It is absolutely essential to the success of our biomedical research that we provide for our brightest young people the appropriate milieu to develop their talents. These are among the best dollars we can spend in terms of the value received. Clearly, no investment in research can be expected to yield its full harvest by an "on-again and off-again" policy which puts the whole research establishment in a state of chaos and does not allow for long-term planning. Neither parliament nor the Canadian public can expect to reap the promising harvest of medical research by discouraging potential research workers from entering a research career, when the continuance of research activities by existing medical scientists is being threatened.

And threatened that future is in Canada, threatened by the government. Studies and statistics can be cited to prove it.

A study in process by the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges shows that there has been a decline of 23 per cent in the past four years in the number of medical research grants per 100 students in our medical schools. Figures for this year show that 127 projects which the Medical Research Council's selection committee considered of sufficient calibre to be worthy of funding had to be turned down because of the lack of funding; because of the lack of $4.6 million. If you want to put that figure in another way, that is 3/20ths of 1 per cent of the over-all health care budget of the federal government. That is 3/20ths of 1 per cent of what the government now spends trying to correct the health state of this country. As I mentioned earlier, this is a government that is penny wise and pound foolish.

Harry Gunning, President of the University of Alberta, summed it up well in a speech last month to graduating classes of the university when he said:

> There are obviously many ways in which the federal government can push this nation towards bankruptcy. Perhaps the most efficient method of achieving this undesirable goal is to so stifle and starve the innovative spirit of this country that we are forced to rely almost entirely on other countries to provide us with the highly sophisticated goods and services that we must develop as an industrialized scientific nation. In this respect the present government is doing an outstanding job.

Canada is a highly industrialized nation. Our researchers are held in high regard throughout the world. Yet the erosion of our medical research capability will transform us into medical mendicants when it is incumbent on us to be developing excellence in this field here in Canada to alleviate the problems of less developed nations. Is Canada to be a parasite on the developed nations, importing medical advances from other developed countries? Where is our sense of pride? What has happened to our ambition to want to contribute rather than borrow? This government recognizes neither.

A growing concern in the scientific community, and one which deserves immediate attention, is the thrust of the government's science policy to encourage targeted or mission-oriented research at the expense of basic research. The resulting imbalance in the various research divisions has serious implications for our scientific effort.

Applications for targeted research quickly become known throughout the scientific community as "safe", that is, more likely to be successful in receiving funds from the Medical Research Council. Applicants understandably are tempted to tailor their proposals to strengthen their chances of obtaining grants. If the tendency on the part of the government to recognize targeted research continues, basic research will suffer. Testimony after testimony from scientific researchers supports the necessity of giving priority to basic research.

I should like to quote from an article by Dr. Louis Siminivitch, geneticist-in-chief, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto. He says:

> The idea that scientists are self-serving and are not directing their efforts to the important problems of our society also represents a lack of understanding of the scientific process. Practical problems such as the development of treatment modalities for disease or the solution of energy problems, are also not solved in a vacuum. Their investigation also rests on the total body of knowledge in science and, in fact, many such problems may simply not be resolvable at this time because of the absence of key fundamental facts. The development of a vaccine for polio or of the laser required knowledge gleaned from several directions by many investigators of various levels of quality, and over many years. The importance of the polio vaccine and the utility of laser in problems as diverse as subway construction and eye surgery, need not be elaborated here. What is important is to realize that these are not isolated examples, and they are introduced here just to underline the fact that the development of medical cures and other such practical advances are, of necessity, a continuous process which feeds on what many might consider to be basic non-practical research. The lack of recognition and support of a strong basic science effort mortgages our ability as a nation to meet the many important practical challenges of the future.

Dr. Fudenberg of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of California said, and this is interesting to note:

> Had funds been awarded for "practical research" in the late 1940's, they would have been to build a better respirator—and perhaps polio would not still be with us.

In fact a comprehensive study by Comroe and Dripps shows conclusively that of the major advances in certain areas of medicine, basic research had yielded key discoveries almost twice as often as all other types of research and development, yet the government's tendency is to downgrade basic research.

I began my remarks by making reference to efforts to restrain health care costs at the first minister's conference during the past two days. Let me conclude by referring to another recent development in federal-provincial relations designed, I presume, to serve the same purpose. I refer to the health review and the proposals made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) to the provincial health ministers earlier this spring to share the cost of relatively inexpensive alternative services to hospital and medical care in return for a commitment to hold down costs in those relatively expensive areas. This proposal has much to commend it, but surely only a minister with tunnel vision would fail to see that a review designed to shift the focus from high to low-cost health services in the interests of restraint must include as an integral element an adequately funded medical research program designed to seek more efficient and effective alternatives to present treatment methods. Some money will be saved by treating people out of hospitals once they fall ill. Considerably more money will be saved if you invest in research that may prevent illness in the first place or shorten the period of time in treatment facilities.

● (2110)

Those solutions will come not only from targeted research in specific areas but as spin-offs from pure research and from research in related fields. But we must give those discoveries a chance to happen with adequate research funding, and not delude ourselves into thinking we save money by short-changing those research scientists who will hold down our costs in the future. Even disregarding the economics of this expenditure, the case for it in terms of human lives, human health, and maintaining a cadre of trained research personnel in this country is overwhelming.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that her allotted time has expired. She may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Does she have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Miss MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Surely there should be no melodramatic conflict between saving dollars and saving lives. We have an opportunity to do both. Only the most shortsighted government, a government such as the one we are saddled with at the present time, would let such a rare opportunity slip by.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, if one were to ask the question, is there a doctor in the house, the answer would have to be that there are many doctors. The member who led off the debate is a medical doctor, and three of the last five speakers are medical doctors. However, once you and I have heard the way these doctors have analyzed the problem and have given their cure, it is obvious that if we were to follow their cure the patient

would still be sick and incurable. This is why it is necessary for a layman to participate in the debate in order to give some direction and guidance concerning this very serious problem.

We heard the lead-off speaker for the Tories this afternoon read the motion in which he said that this House views with great alarm "the ill-considered and illogical decisions of the government which fail to give adequate priority to health research funding." I am sure, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, we in the New Democratic Party support that principle. But what really happens is that our Tory friends are really great on analyzing the problem; they have a multiplicity of words, but are very weak on the cures and the answers.

I will put the lead-off speaker for the Tories to the real test. I will ask him to move a motion tomorrow under Standing Order 43 which will read: "That this House views with great alarm the ill-considered and illogical decisions of the government of Ontario which fail to give adequate priority to hospital and medical care." It will be interesting to see the response of his Tory colleagues to such a motion, because when I heard some of their speeches with regard to Bill C-68 I realized that they were basing all their arguments on the question of restraint while at the same time their own Conservative government brought forth a measure which closed hospitals across the province, which caused unemployment, and which created a great deal of uncertainty, all in the name of restraint.

I have also noticed that my Conservative friends are great when it comes to marching across this country and talking about the great problem of inflation. They say there are two things we must do. We must cure this problem. That is their first cure. Second, the government is issuing too much money. That is their second cure. What would happen if we were to follow those two great cures of the Conservative party? We would have real problems in respect of inflation. We would have real problems in respect of unemployment, and we would have real problems with regard to health care across the country.

When I heard the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) a few moments ago talk about the one and one-half day conference of first ministers, yesterday and part of today, I realized that what is happening in respect of that conference is that when we discuss the great problem of health care and education across the country it is the province of Ontario, the province of Alberta, and the province of British Columbia which are causing the greatest division and complexity with regard to that conference. What they really want is all the tax-sharing points to themselves. They want to determine just how the money should be spent. They do not want to follow the national principle that was enunciated by the late Mr. Pearson, and which has been followed in past years with regard to co-operative federalism in which we have a national standard concerning health and medical care as well as education. No sir.

What they want is the lion's share of the tax points so that they can control those measures and those programs themselves, and not worry too much about the people in the have-not provinces, such as the Maritimes and Newfoundland, who need proper health and medical care.

The Tories seldom tell what they would cut. However, they did this in one instance. During the budget debate we in the New Democratic Party put them to the test. The Liberals said, "We must have restraint; we must make cuts; we will hit the working man; we will increase the qualification for UIC from eight weeks to 12 weeks." After hearing from the Tories in all their great restraint, and after hearing the many complaints by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), we put them to the test. What did they do? After hearing the speech of the premier of Nova Scotia on the consequences with regard to the people of that province what did they do? They voted against the amendment of the New Democratic Party. They are great on words but they are very weak on cures and answers. Let me deal with the Liberal party for a few moments, Mr. Speaker.

Miss MacDonald: Why not deal with medical research?

Mr. Gilbert: In April of 1974 the Minister of National Health and Welfare called for more research on accidents, heart disease, mental illnesses, drug abuse, physical fitness, industrial toxicology, high blood pressure, and at-home drug therapy. The Lamontagne Committee Report of 1972 recommended that Canadian research must double by 1980 to bring Canada in line with most other advanced countries. Those are very laudable principles, but when one studies the actions of the Liberal party one finds that they amount to very little. They amount only to the very disappointing programs that they have brought forth.

● (2120)

So that the impact of what has happened with regard to recent budget commitments concerning health research can be fully appreciated, I should like to quote one example. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) quoted many medical researchers from across the country who feel very gloomy about the austerity program of the government. I should like to quote from the Ottawa *Citizen* of March 1, 1976, from an article by Bob Cohen, part of which reads as follows:

> Dr. William G. Schneider, president of the National Research Council, has worried publicly about "the serious risk in underinvesting in science".

He says that money is tight and the country's policy makers evidently feel they can ignore research and development with political impunity. The article states:

> One of the problems with research and development, in terms of political appeal, is that it can be arcane and long-term. Things do not happen overnight. When they do happen, the public invariably has a tough time getting a handle on what they mean in ordinary terms.

The article also states:

> Times have changed, and science has been left out in the treasury cold.

That is a very sad comment about what is happening by reason of the programs of the federal government. Just to show the impact in Ontario let me quote from an article in the *Globe and Mail* of April 13, 1976, which reads in part:

> The last batch of this year's research termination notices have just been sent out from Ottawa to Canadian medical schools.
>
> As a result of the federal government's decision to freeze the Medical Research Council budget, more than 21 University of Toronto projects have been given three to eight months to close down. These include research into calcium disorders, liver damage, fat breakdown, abnormal

bone growth, stress hormones, blood and clotting diseases, marijuana and drug detection, bone and joint transplants, kidney transplant rejection, heart output measurement, male infertility and many others.

In addition, another 60 U of T requests for starting new projects were turned down. These include research into asthma, cardiac angina, infections, plasticity, arthritis, diabetes, obesity, ozone pollution, pineal function, kidney diseases, bronchitis, barbiturates, emotional disorders, allergic pathology, sex hormone abnormalities, anti-hypertension drugs, geriatric diseases, stroke, homosexuality, senior citizen retirement, pituitary diseases, noise pollution and leukemia.

That indicates the importance of medical research into these problems, and it indicates the carelessness with which the government sets its priorities with regard to national health.

We spend close to $1 billion on foreign aid, and even $1 billion is not sufficient for that purpose, and we spend $50 million on medical research. This indicates how twisted our priorities are at times. We in the NDP oppose the positions taken both by our Conservative friends and the Liberal government. We have repeated this many times and we will continue to repeat it until health receives the top priority it deserves, because we think that there are certain rights which Canadians should have. They should have rights with regard to full employment, housing, health, environment, and education.

Health is a very important right because we must have physical and mental health, and research is a necessary part of it. This is why Stephen Lewis, the leader of the NDP in Ontario, has had such success. He has underlined problems with regard to asbestosis which causes lung cancer, problems with regard to mercury poisoning affecting our native people, and problems with regard to lead poisoning, also causing cancer. These are some of the human problems that the leader of the NDP in Ontario has underlined. Is it any wonder that the Liberals in Ontario are fading into oblivion and that the Tories are shaking in their shoes?

Mr. Beatty: How many people in Ontario did you have before the last election?

Mr. Gilbert: I might say to my hon. friend one thing about our party: we really possess quality. It is one thing he should remember.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gilbert: I have said, and so has the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that the research community is upset. When I heard this afternoon the Minister of Science and Technology (Mr. Drury) say that Canada is getting a free ride with regard to research and development in the industrial field, I felt like getting up and telling him that not only are we getting a free ride but we are suffering a terrible loss of physicists, scientists, and engineers who are not developing research in Canada but who are going to the United States after graduating to do research and development for multinational corporations which come to Canada, do their business here, and then take their profits back to the U.S. and elsewhere. When I heard the Minister of Science and Technology say that this afternoon, I was really disappointed, and I was also disappointed in the lead-off speaker for the Tories because his great solution was to get rid of Petro-Can. If we had the money saved from Petro-Can, we would have a tremendous thrust forward with medical research, he said.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gilbert: I happened to be over in Iraq during the Easter break. One of the ministers connected with the oil industry was pointing out that Iraq was in the same situation as Canada in so far as oil was concerned, that the oil industry was under the domination of multinationals. He said that prior to nationalization in 1973 they received $600 million in taxes and royalties, but last year they had a $7 billion profit from the oil industry in Iraq. If we were to nationalize oil companies in Canada, you can imagine the amount of money we would have for medical research, housing, or environmental problems.

Then we heard the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) propose his great cure-all. He said that what we need is deterrent fees.

An hon. Member: No, no.

Mr. Gilbert: Well, one of the remedies he prescribed—and I do not know whether this is part of his party's national policy—was to prescribe deterrent fees.

Mr. Halliday: No, deterrents to abuse.

Mr. Gilbert: Let us talk about deterrents. Just whom do deterrent fees affect? Do they affect the rich people? Not for a minute. They affect moderate income people just slightly, but they affect the poor people always.

Mr. Halliday: Never.

Mr. Gilbert: This is the great remedy. How much do we need medical research in Canada? For the last two weeks I was out in Vancouver at the Habitat conference and I heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) say that we must have a conspiracy of passionate love. The next day when some of the great men at that conference told him that we should have a moratorium on nuclear reactors, he said, no, we have to sell them to other countries. What do we have? We have problems with regard to nuclear power, with regard to reactor safety, and we have radioactive waste. These are the problems attendant on nuclear power.

● (2130)

You probably heard the announcement on the "National News" last night that the Nuclear Reactor Association is not going to be set up. It was to go across the country publicizing the greatness of nuclear reactors and it was going to use half a million dollars to do it. What we need is a body that will go into the nuclear reactor problems with regard to safety and radioactive waste, in great depth.

When I heard the host of physicists at the Habitat conference speak, as well as Barbara Ward and Margaret Mead, it made me realize, and it should make all Canadians and people throughout the world realize, the dangers attendant upon nuclear waste and the safety problem with regard to reactors.

In the few minutes I have left, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it seems to me we are suffering from two types of sickness. There is the political sickness in that most of the

leaders today are aimless in purpose, they are drifting, and their priorities need to be rearranged. And there is the physical sickness. Has there ever been a time when there was so much sickness around the world, when there was so much cancer, so many heart attacks and diseases? The government is cutting back on medical research which could help solve these problems.

What is needed is hope. What is needed is courage, and the courage comes when the government sets forth its priorities in their proper order, when it gives medical research its proper attention, and nuclear reactors its lowest attention, when it gives housing and employment full priority. It is only when these priorities are established that we can justly and proudly call ourselves Canadians.

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, the topic before us today, that of an appropriate level of funding by the federal government for medical research, is an important one with serious implications for the lives of Canadians.

As was pointed out in the preface to "A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians," a working document published by the Department of National Health and Welfare in 1974:

> Good health is the bedrock on which social progress is built. A nation of healthy people can do those things that make life worth while, and as the level of health increases so does the potential for happiness.

The fundamental importance of measures to maintain and improve good physical and mental health has long been recognized by the provincial governments and the Government of Canada and, as a result, we have prepaid medical and hospital insurance, public health protection, programs to counter environmental pollution, accident prevention programs, and safeguards and requirements for food and drugs. Medical research, whether in-house research carried out directly by the Department of National Health and Welfare, or research funded by the department through the Medical Research Council, or research funded by private organizations cannot be considered in a vacuum but must be seen as one factor in a very broad spectrum of factors that contribute to the health, happiness, and quality of life of Canadians.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), in his preface to "A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians", commenting on the fact that physicians, surgeons, nurses, and hospitals spend much of their time treating ills caused by environmental factors and behavioural risks, stated:

> It is evident now that further improvements in the environment and reductions in self-imposed risks . . . are necessary if more Canadians are to live a full, happy, long and illness-free life.

At a national symposium on health research priorities held at McGill University on May 25, 1973, the point was made that many proven advances resulting from basic and clinical research are not being applied at the level of the practising physician. If one accepts this, one might see measures for more co-ordinated and effective use of existing knowledge as having higher priority than the search for new knowledge.

Examination of mortality figures in Canada shows a very high proportion of deaths which with our present knowledge could be avoided. For example, the highest single cause of death in males between 15 and 24 is the motor vehicle accident. Other accidents, whether domestic accidents in the case of young children or industrial accidents, also account for a disconcertingly high proportion of deaths. Avoidable diseases of life style including those relating to abuse of tobacco, alcohol, or drugs take a high toll.

Another concern that emerged from the McGill symposium was that an insufficient proportion of research money is allocated to clinical, socio-medical, and organizational aspects of health and health care. This is not an issue of which we have heard much in recent months. The groups who have been lobbying members of parliament have placed their emphasis, for the most part, on basic biological research. Many of the people we have seen, too, have been unwilling to come to terms with the important questions of priorities and with choosing among conflicting options. One scientist, whom I asked for an indication of his priorities, told me that all applications from universities should be funded, that there is no possibility of bad or incompetent research being done in universities because of the peer review system.

Miss MacDonald: You should quote his name.

Miss Nicholson: I find this somewhat less than realistic. No group in society can claim an unlimited right to have their productions unexplained, unexamined by members of other disciplines, and funded uncritically with tax dollars.

At the other end of the scale from the person who says all applications for medical research from universities should be funded, is the person who is extremely critical of all work that is not done in his or her own department. The working paper "A New Perspective" commented on the need for researchers to develop:

> . . . a unity of purpose which has often been lacking because of the destructive competition for limited funds. Balanced progress in all fields can only be obtained when researchers pull together toward the common objective of raising the health status of Canadians.

A very gentlemanly sidestepping of anything that looked like "destructive competition" was achieved by a member of a group lobbying for "more research" who, when I asked him to define areas which he considered priorities, explained that his organization represented people with many interests and could not promote any one area of endeavour without offending some members.

The Oliver Twist cry for "more" is understandable but is singularly unhelpful to legislators unless it is defined and some priorities set in terms of contemporary health needs.

Prior to 1974 the federal government limited its activities in the health field to its traditional responsibilities such as quarantine medicine, protection of the food supply, product safety, ensuring accessibility to personal health care through financial assistance to provincial health insurance plans, and financing research. The basis for concentrating its interest in these areas was the belief that the improvement of personal health care was the principal means of raising the level of health of Canadians.

The 1974 working paper, "A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians", stated:

The evidence uncovered by the analysis of underlying causes of sickness and death now indicates that improvement in the environment and an abatement in the level of risks imposed upon themselves by individuals, taken together, constitute the most promising ways by which further advances can be made.

The paper continues:

Accordingly, it is the intention of the government of Canada, first, to maintain at a high level the services and support provided through its present activities in health protection, research and the financing of personal health care. To these will be added measures directed at specific national health problems, chosen in consultation with provinces, consumers, professions and associations according to their gravity and incidence, and aimed at removing or reducing the factors underlying sickness and death.

● (2140)

Some of these measures in time will no doubt be directed at environmental factors; others will be directed at lifestyle risks; still others will expand the horizons of health research and yet others will encourage more personal care services to neglected parts of the Canadian population . . .

Since direct health care is already consuming some 7 per cent of the wealth that Canadians produce annually, it is evident that the rate at which the Government of Canada can expand its activities in the field of health is severely limited by financial considerations. It is also true that measures directed at the prevention of illness will take some time before they are translated into savings in the costs of providing curative health services.

Later the report went on to say:

. . . with the recognition that the good health of Canadians is an objective that shines brightly above . . . special interest groups, the Government of Canada proposes to take steps that will start the nation on the road to levels of health even higher than those that Canada now enjoys.

To achieve the aims of reducing mental and physical health hazards for Canadians whose risks are high and improving access to good health care, five strategies were proposed:

(1) A health promotion strategy aimed at informing, influencing, and assisting both individuals and organizations so that they will accept more responsibility and be more active in matters affecting mental and physical health.

(2) A regulatory strategy aimed at using federal regulatory powers to reduce hazards to mental and physical health, and at encouraging and assisting provinces to use their regulatory powers to the same end.

(3) A research Strategy designed to help discover and apply knowledge needed to solve mental and physical health problems.

(4) A health care efficiency strategy the objective of which shall be to help the provinces reorganize the system for delivering mental and physical health care so that the three elements of cost, accessibility and effectiveness are balanced in the interest of Canadians.

(5) A goal-setting strategy the purpose of which will be to set, in co-operation with others, goals for raising the level of the mental and physical health of Canadians and improving the efficiency of the health care system.

The paper contains 74 proposals of which 15 deal with research. These are:

1. An ongoing dialogue between health planners and the research community on the priorities for mission-oriented health research while preserving for the research community the setting of priorities in basic research.

2. The implementation of a regular national health survey to determine the prevalence and nature of acute and chronic mental and physical illness, to permit an assessment of the health status and needs of Canadians and to measure changes in status and needs.

3. The institution of a special program for identifying health status indicators and high-risk segments of the Canadian population, for the evaluation of the nature and gravity of mental and physical health risks, and for the proposal of measures to abate the level of risk.

[Miss Nicholson.]

4. Measures to help integrate, improve and use, on a national basis, the data and statistics being recorded at various governmental and institutional levels.

5. The establishment of a well-designed comprehensive system for the reporting of accident statistics which would, among other things, identify accident-associated products.

6. The promotion of increased support for research on underlying causes of coronary-artery disease.

7. Support for more research on the cause and treatment of mental illness.

8. The support of projects designed to evaluate the results of present mass-screening programs and to test the effectiveness of future ones.

9. The establishment of a national drug abuse institute covering all abusive drugs including psychotropic drugs, both licit and illicit, alcohol and cigarettes, and responsible for gathering statistics, supporting research, evaluating preventive and treatment measures and recommending policy.

10. The undertaking of a broad continuing study into the ways and means of effectively informing the Canadian people on changes in behaviour which will significantly reduce self-imposed risks.

11. The continuation and strengthening of present research into the effect of the physical environment on health.

12. The establishment of a program for assessing the effect of social and environmental change on health, including the calculation of risk factors due to lifestyle.

13. The continuation of support for research on physical and mental fitness and for fitness testing.

14. Continued and increased support for research into better ways of providing health care.

15. Continued support for research consistent with the scale of the health care industry.

The emphasis on applied or clinical research as opposed to basic research is clear: but obviously the position of the latter is protected, especially by recommendations Nos. I and 15.

Within the Department of National Health and Welfare a sum of $11,088,000 has been assigned this year to the national health research and development program. Some of the representations received in recent months from university employed scientists have expressed opposition to in-house research but have not offered reasons for their opposition and, in the absence of clearly stated reasons and supporting data, I cannot accept that research, in order to be valid, must be completely controlled by a university.

Several provinces have allocated moneys to health research or have indicated that they intend to do so. The voluntary sector is increasingly supporting research.

Finally, let me turn to the Medical Research Council for which main estimates for 1976-77 provide $48,848,000 for research support programs, and $1,142,000 for administrative costs. To put these votes in perspective it may be useful to remember that for 1966-67, a decade ago, main estimates provided $12.3 million for research support through the Medical Research Council. This figure has therefore almost quadrupled in the intervening ten years. The present provision of $48.8 million represents 79 per cent of the support for research provided this year by federal agencies, including the Department of National Health and Welfare, which have some major responsibility for health research. It is about 49 per cent of the total support expected to reach extramural health research in Canada this year from all sources.

On December 18, 1975, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) reported to the House a decision to limit the actual increase for the Medical Research Council

over 1975-76 to $1,414,000. Subsequent to that decision the Minister of National Health and Welfare stated that he had been able to re-allocate an additional $2 million from within his department to the Medical Research Council. This limiting of the rate of growth has been misrepresented as a cut in the funds available for medical research.

It may very well be that more funds should be allocated for medical research this year, but the onus is on those who think so to make the case more clearly and effectively than they have done to date, and to state unequivocally what elements of health programs should be given up or reduced in order to free additional funds.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, before I sum up what has been said today it should be noted that we have in this country developed decent health care facilities. We have built up in Canada an infrastructure for an effective research establishment which does its work from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We are at a point in our history at which provinces have undertaken studies to determine how best to provide decent health care services for Canadians. As I went from coast to coast four years ago researching this matter, everyone agreed that, whether you are talking about basic research, clinical research, educational research or research into actual delivery of medical and health care services, centrifugal to the quality and the decency of these services in maintaining a decent research establishment. What does the government do? Unilaterally, without any logical reason whatsoever, it cuts back on funding of meaningful research in this country.

● (2150)

Above politics, I do not hesitate for a minute to pay tribute to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) who, years ago as premier of his province, pioneered with other members of parliament and people in public life one of the better health schemes on a provincial level in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: We have in Canada today, for a relatively young country, both from the private sector and from what we have done with medical and health care services vis-à-vis medicare, every reason to stand up and say that, looking back historically, we should be the one country in the whole world that can today deliver the best, the most decent, and the most humane medical care services in the world.

An hon. Member: We do.

Mr. Grafftey: No, we do not, especially because of our contemporary shortsightedness, what you are doing with the provinces today vis-à-vis cutting back on these programs, what you are doing unilaterally, cutting back on funding for meaningful research, not just this year but over the past three or four years.

Stop being political. Open your ears. Talk to the medical and health leaders of this country. They will tell you that because of the shortsightedness of the government, services at the local level are slowly but surely slipping from excellence to mediocrity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: Apart from the humanitarian considerations, and I do not even like to say that, how can you measure the cost—

Mr. Lessard: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Minister, if you do not have anything better to do, go out and amuse yourself. Don't intervene in this debate. You are doing a bad enough job running your own portfolio.

I have already said, and I believe the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) alluded to this, we are not just talking about pure biomedical research, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) talked about. We are talking about clinical research, research in education, basic research in terms of how better can we, not in an institutional way, deliver medical and health care services. There is no use talking about savings in medicare or medical and health care programs until we put some meaningful research dollars into the whole area of how we are better going to deliver medical health care services.

An hon. member alluded in a political way to what the premier of Ontario is doing. He knows what the premier of Ontario is doing. He is finally doing what the former Minister of National Health and Welfare said years ago. We must have meaningful planning where the community hospital is the central institution for the total delivery of medical and health care services. The minute one premier has the guts and do on the local level what the federal government should have been doing in the past four or five years, what do you say? Politics. The Ontario minister of health has been a statesman in many instances.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 58(11), proceedings on the motion have now expired.

● (2200)

ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills.

Bill C-81, an Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act and the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act with respect to the escalation of certain payments thereunder—Chapter No. 99.

Bill S-34, an Act to amend the Aeronautics Act—Chapter No. 100.

Adjournment Debate

Bill S-35, an Act to amend an Act to repeal the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act and to amend the Trade Marks Act—Chapter No. 101.

Bill S-33, an Act respecting United Grain Growers Limited.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

AIR CANADA—DISPUTE WITH EMPLOYEES OF FINANCE BRANCH IN WINNIPEG—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO SETTLE

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks I have been calling for a complete examination of the Air Canada finance department operation in Winnipeg by the Auditor General's department because of the huge deficit experienced by Air Canada in 1975 amounting to $12.5 million; and for the first four months of 1976 the deficit has reached $14.5 million.

Before listing further reasons for the necessity for a complete examination into Air Canada's affairs, it is my understanding that a new Air Canada act is to be introduced by the government later this year which would separate Air Canada from being audited by an auditor appointed by the CNR, which makes a lot of sense. But due to the gravity of the situation in Winnipeg, the government is obligated to take immediate action to clean up the mess.

The government's repeated answer to me that MP's can question Air Canada in committee is nothing but a cover up. The committee system is not the area to conduct an audit; nor are MP's able to conduct an audit and investigate whether Air Canada has proper accounting procedures. Air Canada should appear before the committee for questioning in other areas.

A proper audit can only be done by qualified accountants and auditors who would have to spend considerable time at the finance branch examining Air Canada's procedures. Further, Mr. Speaker, the auditor's report contained in the 1975 Air Canada report from Cooper and Lybrand of Ottawa states that their examination includes a general review of the accounting procedures. It would seem that their terms of reference must be very limited.

Serious charges of financial mismanagement have been laid by CALEA and they have been documented charges, not supposition. An Air Canada public relations officer has denied these charges and has stated that the air line is subject to continuous external audit procedures by independent auditors appointed by the federal government. "We are under constant scrutiny", he said.

I have discussed this matter with Air Canada employees and they inform me that no independent auditors have scrutinized their procedures at all. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a direct contradiction and a further reason for an immediate investigation to be conducted into Air Canada's financial procedures, which were highly criticized in the Estey report.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Also, Mr. Speaker, a member of the accounting firm of Touche, Ross and Company has stated that if Air Canada had realistic accounting procedures the 1975 loss would be about $100 million instead of the reported $12.5 million. This is a serious charge and cannot just be swept under the rug.

Further charges have been laid by CALEA that the present billing work being contracted out across Canada is a cover-up designed to "get rid of all the embarrassing material". To date the contracting out of Air Canada finance work has cost a quarter of a million dollars. This ridiculous practice should be stopped and all billing work returned to the finance branch in Winnipeg. I am informed the contracted work is returned with a 50 per cent error factor, further compounding the problem.

● (2210)

The Saturday, June 12 edition of the Winnipeg *Free Press* in a front page copyrighted article by John Sullivan under the headline "Work Slowdown, Mismanagement Cost Air Canada Millions" stated:

> Millions of dollars in revenue has been lost or written off by Air Canada in the last year because of inadequate or non-existent auditing practices, according to confidential financial reports by the airline's strike-bound Winnipeg financial workers.
>
> In releasing the reports to the Free Press this week, local officials of the Canadian Airline Employees' Association . . . said a lack of adequate financial control has cost the publicly-owned airline enough revenue to "almost or perhaps totally" account for Air Canada's record $12.4 million deficit last year.
>
> The financial study, conducted by union leaders late last year, says Air Canada has written off millions of dollars in unreported ticket sales by airline sales offices, travel agents and commercial subscribers.

I should like to remind the parliamentary secretary, who I assume is here to answer me tonight, that we are dealing with a Crown corporation and the taxpayers' money. This is not a private organization and we cannot have repeated slough-offs like I have been receiving over the past few weeks. The article continues:

> More millions have been lost because the airline is simply paying out refunds and flight coupon billings from other airlines and accepting sales reports from travel agents and commercial subscribers without auditing them for errors, the union claims.
>
> Interest on this revenue which has been lost, as well as the Crown airline's practice of farming out financial work to private firms in recent months, because of a huge backlog in processing, has also cost millions, the study says.
>
> In short, the union leaders say Air Canada financial controls are in a mess, aggravated but not caused by the long-simmering labour dispute:
>
> "The problem is one where the system originally devised for the audit and accounting process of the finance branch cannot accommodate the volume of work. Until such time as an automated process relieves the congestion, or until an adequate level of trained staff is reached, Air Canada will continue to have no protection for its revenues—strike or no strike".

I have also pointed this out to the parliamentary secretary and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on a number of occasions. The article then states:

> The CALEA study apparently was written and released to the union's membership last year in a series of "progress reports" on the effects of a work slowdown and work-to-rule campaign by the employees.
>
> Contract negotiations between Air Canada and the union—which began last April—broke down in December over the issues of job security and employee classifications—

This has nothing to do with poor accounting procedures.

—after the existing contract expired August 25. The dispute is now under federal mediation but CALEA's slowdown and rotating strikes have continued for months with no end in sight.

The union says an Air Canada official at corporate headquarters in Montreal had admitted to them last year that "labour unrest in the accounting services division was costing $300,000 a week and this has been going on for two years."

A high-ranking official at the Winnipeg finance branch—

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

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the situation in Winnipeg, as my hon. friend knows, is a particularly difficult one because of the various circumstances he has described this evening and on other occasions in the House. We have two separate issues involved that continue to complicate one another, and continue to muddle the situation. On the one hand we have a very difficult and complex labour situation, and on the other we have the allegations that have been made about faulty accounting and auditing procedures in that particular part of Air Canada's finance branch.

The labour situation described by the hon. member has, indeed, been under discussion for a very long period of time. Relatively recently, of course, we have had the submission of the report of the conciliation commissioner which has been reviewed by the company, the union, and the Department of Labour in light of the anti-inflation program.

The issue which has kept the two parties apart the longest in connection with the labour dispute, as the hon. member knows, is the matter of job descriptions and job security. For the past two years Air Canada has devoted an enormous amount of time, money, and effort in an attempt to resolve this issue. The advice of two outside consulting authorities has been sought, and when their various proposals did not prove acceptable to the union a commissioner, Mr. D. J. Jessiman, was named by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro). Negotiations which had broken off in the early spring of 1975 were resumed under his jurisdiction in July last year. They continued until mid-September when the union requested the commissioner to take evidence and submit his report.

As I say, every effort has been made by the government and the company to bring this lengthy dispute to a conclusion. At the same time as the discussion on the labour dispute has been going on, we have had as well the problem that has been mentioned by my hon. friend in connection with the auditing matters.

As he has mentioned this evening we do have before parliament and the country the very comprehensive Estey Report into this whole question affecting Air Canada which, as he mentioned again tonight, will result in useful legislation. There is, as he has mentioned as well, an outside auditing procedure already in place, and there are also the ultimate safeguards of parliamentary scrutiny of the operations of Crown corporations. Beyond those assurances and the explanation with respect to the complicating factors of the labour dispute interfering with the other matter, I think for the time being this evening that is where I would leave the explanation.

Adjournment Debate

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ALLEGED BREAK-IN OF QUEBEC NEWSPAPER OFFICE BY MEMBERS OF THE FORCE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are many members in this House of Commons who, like myself, would like some more background on the rather bizarre sounding incident of our national police force, the RCMP, breaking into the premises of a Quebec newspaper sometime ago. I know that members of all parties have asked questions about it. I recall the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) asking a question about it on behalf of the Social Credit Party. My friend the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal) also made an inquiry in this House about the information and background surrounding this incident.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make another appeal to the minister or his parliamentary secretary to give the House of Commons a little information. The minister indicated on several occasions he would do this. If my memory does not play me false, I think it was on March 31 of this year that he indicated he hoped to give the House as much information as was possible once he received an RCMP report on the matter. On April 2 he repeated that remark in effect, and again on April 28, I believe as recorded at page 12952 of *Hansard,* he said the same thing for the third time. Then on May 18 he admitted that he had received a full report from the RCMP, but instead of reporting to this House as he had promised he turned the report over to the Quebec Solicitor General to, as he said, determine whether something illegal had taken place.

Any force as large and complex as the RCMP inevitably makes mistakes. They are entitled to make a few mistakes because most of the time they do a tremendous job. But like fire, the RCMP is a good servant but a bad master. If there are occasions, and we all know there are, when mistakes are made, I think it is incumbent on the minister who is responsible for the conduct of our national police force to come into the House of Commons and tell us in effect what went wrong. I do not wish to go into many incidents to make my point, but I think it is of some interest that, for instance, here in Ottawa on the very premises of parliament a member of the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires and his family were considerably embarrassed by the RCMP who made what turned out to be an unfortunate mistake by coming into his premises on a mistaken apprehension that there may have been drugs there. This of course resulted in an action being taken against them, for which this man and his family were compensated. That is fine. We all understand this.

What I would like to know, and I am sure other members would like to know, is what the implications are in respect of this unfortunate incident with regard to the Quebec newspaper *L'Agence de Presse Libre du Québec.* Obviously there was no warrant. The RCMP took part in a joint venture with other police forces. I would like to know more about this. Whose responsibility was it to have made certain that the entry was done properly? Perhaps under the circumstances it could not have been done properly, which makes it all the more serious.

Adjournment Debate

● (2220)

Without straying too far off the subject I would like to say that so far as I am concerned I really believe that the rank and file members of the RCMP would support a crackdown, or a check, on some of the procedures and methods used on occasion which result in these unfortunate types of incidents. It would be a good idea for the responsible ministers and the government to exercise a little bit more supervision over the force. However, I will not talk on that topic because that is not the issue here tonight.

I would like to remind the parliamentary secretary that as a member of parliament I feel that this House is entitled to more information about this incident than we have received. It is all very well for the solicitor general for the province of Quebec to have an investigation to ascertain what happened. He has responsibilities there as well to see what part the force played vis-à-vis MUC or the Quebec provincial police, but there is only one minister responsible to the House of Commons for the RCMP, and that is the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand).

So without saying anything more this evening I am simply inviting the parliamentary secretary to give us as much information as he can and to assure us that this incident, which has rather alarming overtones, was in fact an isolated one and that remedial steps will be taken. Without wanting to sound as if I were asking that people be punished if mistakes were made, I want to remind the parliamentary secretary again that members of the force in the past have been severely disciplined, and often discharged without a hearing, for incidents which on the face of it sound to me a great deal less serious than permitting something like this to happen with respect to that procedure, whatever it was, affecting the rights of this small newspaper in Quebec.

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be as co-operative as I can with the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay). I know he has a real concern in these matters and he has made it a special interest of his in the House. He is very well aware of the fact that the Solicitor General of the province of Quebec is responsible for the administration of justice in that province and it is he who must determine the need for a complete investigation of all the facts from all the police forces involved and whether or not further charges should be laid in this matter. However, I will attempt to provide further information to the hon. member who last June 8 asked the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) if he was prepared to give the House a complete report on the break and entry into the *L'agence de Presse Libre du Québec*.

As most hon. members are aware, this break in is supposed to have occurred in 1972. The minister did not become aware of the break in until 1976. Upon learning of it the minister requested details from the RCMP. Officials in the RCMP were able to confirm that there was a break in and that officers of the RCMP, along with members of the Montreal Urban Community Police Force and the Quebec Police Force were involved in this act. Originally the minister stated that the RCMP had played a supportive role, but later was informed that the event was a combined effort. He was also informed that as far as the RCMP were concerned there was no warrant obtained before the break-in.

The RCMP have completed their investigation into the role which any of its officers may have played in this break-in. The minister has also had the opportunity of discussing the matter with the Solicitor General of Quebec. On any criminal act which may have taken place in Quebec, Mr. Lalonde has asked that the RCMP report be made available to him. The report is now in his hands.

The Solicitor General wishes to emphasize that only the report of the RCMP involvement was made available to him. The reports involving the other two forces were naturally given to the Quebec Solicitor General.

The Solicitor General of Quebec will therefore be responsible for determining whether or not criminal charges should be proceeded with. The minister wishes to advise this House that any action which he may take will have to await the decision of Mr. Lalonde.

AGRICULTURE—REQUEST FOR EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CHEESE

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, the question I raise deals with a subject somewhat different from those raised by my two colleagues. I want to remind the House that on May 25, 1976, the *Globe and Mail* published an article which indicated that an attempt was being made to re-condition rotten imported Feta cheese for the purpose of moving this product on to our domestic market as a fresh commodity.

During the question period later that same day I raised this matter, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) replied in part:

> I understand there is every possibility that this cheese was inspected when it was brought into Canada, but it has been in Canada for over a year. It was when it was brought out of storage that it was found to be unfit for human consumption.

It was found to be unfit for human consumption only after a Canadian cheese manufacturer "blew the whistle" and requested that this product be inspected. The Minister of Agriculture went on to comment that "over 4,000 inspections of imported cheese were carried out last year." Granted, Mr. Speaker, 4,000 inspections seem substantial, but one has to remember that applies to 50 million pounds. That represents only one inspection on every 12,500 pounds of imported cheese. It becomes even less significant when you consider that many of these cheese imports are prepackaged and shipped in small packages ready for the retail market.

It is interesting to note that the reported facts in this particular case, according to the district supervisor for the Department of Agriculture, include the admission that although his department monitors all cheese imports to see that weights are labelled correctly and butterfat composition is up to standard, there is no monitoring of these products for freshness. Indeed no regulations exist governing the freshness of imported cheese products. The supervisor went on to comment that the department does not inspect every shipment that comes into the country, but rather it depends on the importer's record as to whether or not we take samples for inspection.

It is interesting to note as well that, according to comments from a spokesman from the health protection branch, when imported food comes into this country it is not checked by health inspectors for bacteria contamination unless there has been some complaint.

Regardless of the minister's answer to my question on May 25, and likely including the reply that I am about to receive tonight from his capable parliamentary secretary, one must remain convinced that under the present policy of the government our own Canadian cheese industry remains at a serious disadvantage right here at home in relation to foreign competitors.

In the case of Feta, Mr. Speaker, it wholesaled for $1.40 a pound compared to 90 cents to $1.29 for imports, and this particular shipment of 18,000 pounds was being offered by the importer at 50 to 60 cents a pound below market price if it could be cleaned up.

Cheese imports have been a bone of contention to the Canadian cheese manufacturing and Canadian dairy industries for some time. The present 50 million pounds of imports is estimated to be costing our own industry over $3.6 million.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that if the minister continues to refuse to reduce or place an embargo upon cheese imports, then I submit he is obligated at the very least to take immediate steps to place imported cheese under the same type of rigid inspection regulations that are currently applied to our Canadian producers. Anything less than this is totally unacceptable, grossly unfair, and highly dangerous to the health and well-being of Canadians.

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, on May 25 an article appeared in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* which was entitled "Mould Scraped Off Cheese". This article, by its implications, may have caused concern to consumers. I am pleased to have the opportunity of touching briefly on the actual fact of this matter.

● (2230)

[*Translation*]

In late 1974 and early 1975, several shipments of Feta cheese from Denmark were imported in Toronto. This cheese was packed in barrels and covered with brine. Only the last shipment, dated March 10, 1975, brought difficulties; due to the evaporation of the brine, part of the cheese was no longer covered by the solution, which caused the growth of mould.

[*English*]

In an attempt to determine the best disposition of this product, some of the cheese was scraped clean of mould, rebrined, and repackaged. This reconditioned cheese was tested by the health protection branch and was found to be suitable for human consumption on the basis of analyses performed to date. Additional tests are currently being run to make absolutely sure that this assessment is correct.

[*Translation*]

We got in touch with a Canadian manufacturer of Feta cheese to see whether he was interested in reconditioning a certain amount of cheese. This business is in direct competition with imported Feta cheese. The Health Protection Branch which was very careful in this matter has been retaining all the mouldy cheese since April 30.

[*English*]

The foregoing prompt action is illustrative of the effective control of both imported and domestic cheese which is exercised by the actions of the food inspection system of the Government of Canada. It would be unfortunate if erroneous impressions were gained, by situations such as this, that the food inspection system of Canada was not effective and efficient, since, indeed it is efficient.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 16, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF GUIDELINES FOR DECENTRALIZATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the terms of Standing Order 43. In view of the importance of a policy of decentralization of government installations to the operations of government, to the public service and indeed to the people of Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil):

That the President of the Treasury Board table all Treasury Board guidelines with respect to the government's policy on the decentralization of government departments and agencies.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

PERFORMING ARTS

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF POLICY TO ENSURE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF CANADIAN FILMS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, motion pictures have a profound cultural and economic effect on all Canadians. No one concerned about the preservation of Canadian culture can deny the influence of films on our attitudes and way of life in general. Since Canada is now the largest foreign market for United States films in the world, where for example 96 per cent of the feature films exhibited in Ontario are U.S. made and, considering that the distribution of motion pictures in Canada is largely American controlled, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That this House urge the government to bring forward a film policy which will ensure the development and distribution of a viable and sustained production of Canadian films.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR STUDY OF CONTAMINATION OF FISH IN ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to discuss an important matter of pressing necessity.

Considering the incredible statement just made by Quebec minister Claude Simard that although they are highly contaminated by PCB and unfit for consumption, one should not worry since eels taken from the St. Lawrence are 97 per cent sold on export markets; and considering that this poor specimen of humanity was echoing similar statements by two federal ministers—including the present Minister of State for Fisheries—despite the fact that serious reports indicate a PCB rate averaging eight times higher than the maximum security standard allowed by the Department of National Health and Welfare, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House now discuss the entire matter and review the duties and responsibilities of the authorities as regards pollution and health to avoid on one hand that Canada and Quebec be accused of poisoning foreign countries and on the other hand to avoid that the Canadian people lose further confidence in their leaders since they can no longer rely on food security standards within the country.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

[*English*]

AIR CANADA

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO PREVENT LOCKOUT OF EMPLOYEES OF FINANCE BRANCH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I have been informed that the management of Air Canada intends to lock out the employees of the Air Canada finance branch in Winnipeg. In the light of the continuing internal problems of the Air Canada finance branch, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway):

Finance

● (1410)

That this House instruct the Minister of Labour to take the necessary action to prevent a lock-out of employees at the Air Canada finance branch by Air Canada management until the federally-appointed mediator has had an opportunity to complete his inquiries into the labour problem and file his report.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Such a motion can be presented only with unanimous consent. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

SUGGESTION DECISION IN CASE OF WORKERS AT THOMPSON BE REPEALED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to seek the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the Anti-Inflation Board has rolled back the wage settlement of Local 6166 of the United Steel Workers of America in Thompson, Manitoba, to a point at which it is below the salaries earned by steel workers in Sudbury; in view of the fact that this decision not only contravenes a section of the Anti-Inflation Act which allows for wage parity within a sector but also creates difficulties in persuading people to accept work in Thompson, and in view of the fact that the government has the authority to over-rule a decision of the AIB on exactly those grounds, and has done so in the past, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That this House instruct the cabinet to over-rule the Anti-Inflation Board on this issue and award Local 6166 of the Steel Workers of America a contract equal to that of steel workers in Sudbury.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FINANCE

PROPOSED EXAMINATION OF PRACTICE OF TRUST COMPANIES OF GIVING ONE-YEAR MORTGAGES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise under the provision of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that some trust companies are turning mortgages over on a one-year basis and encouraging this practice by offering discounts of one quarter per cent on the initial mortgage, which poses serious problems to home buyers, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That the Minister of Finance examine the practice of trust companies selling one-year mortgages.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can be considered by the House only by unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

An hon. Member: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43.

Considering that bilingualism in air communications is an essential matter that will determine to what extent Francophones can put any confidence in the future of bilingualism in Canada and considering that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) said himself how impressed he was by bilingualism in air-to-ground communications in Paris, which proves that bilingualism is also possible and logical in air-to-ground communications in Quebec, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin):

That this House call on the government to establish immediately and without delay a policy of bilingualism in air communications, since it has been proven that in this field it is possible and logical to respect the policy of bilingualism which is essential to the survival of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the hon. member's motion, which requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

RIGHT OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS TO HOLD A LEGAL STRIKE—DATE OF APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR TO MR. KEENAN

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. It has to do with the air traffic controllers dispute and the prospect of a nation-wide strike. Since it is the position of the air traffic controllers, based upon their assessment of the situation, that a contract has not been formally ratified, nor has a collective agreement been duly signed, may I ask the President of the Treasury Board whether he can clarify the position of the government in this regard, in particular, the statement he made himself outside the

House with respect to the right of the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association to hold a legal strike?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): According to Treasury Board lawyers this strike would be entirely illegal and we shall take whatever steps are needed to prevent illegal actions.

Mr. Mazankowski: My supplementary arises from the nature of the minister's reply and the fact that the government has been unreasonably slow in resolving the prime issue in this dispute, namely, the appointment of a suitable replacement for Mr. John Keenan—I might say this slowness has had the effect of jeopardizing the good relations which had developed between the parties during the negotiating process. Would the minister tell the House when an announcement might be made regarding the appointment of a successor to Mr. Keenan, and can we expect it before this weekend?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is possible to appoint a replacement for Mr. Keenan before the return of the Minister of Transport who is now travelling abroad.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for clarification purposes. Having regard to the statements which have been made by the president of the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association, Mr. Livingston, to the effect that an air traffic controllers' strike now appears inevitable, may I ask the minister to clarify recent press reports and advise the House whether it is now the position of the government that it has definitely taken a decision to apply for an injunction if a strike is called?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I stated yesterday that in the last two years we have tolerated no illegal strike and that we will take whatever action is available to us to make sure there are no illegal strikes. If we have to go to court, we will do so.

* * *

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE SAFETY ASPECT OF BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL WITH BE LEFT TO INQUIRY

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Acting Prime Minister. Since it is the shared opinion of both the government and the opposition that safety, and safety alone, is the issue at hand, would the Acting Prime Minister assure the House that any decision as to the safety of bilingual air traffic control will be left to the commission of inquiry and not to the *ex cathedra* judgments of an absentee Minister of Transport?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport has made it very clear that safety is the first and most important consideration.

Mr. Fraser: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the right hon. Prime Minister said that safety was the first and most important factor in this area, but then he went on to say, as reported at page 14514 of *Hansard*:

> What we are asking all concerned—the workers, members of the opposition and indeed members on the government side—is to have an open mind on, and objective approach to, this question.

My question to the Acting Prime Minister is this. Would the Acting Prime Minister assure us that until there is some judgment on safety from an independent commissioner, the hon. Minister of Transport will be asked to refrain from making a difficult situation even more difficult by making statements that indicate that the government's mind is already made up, no matter what the evidence may be?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I see nothing in anything that the Minister of Transport has said to indicate that he is not entirely objective and acting in the public interest, and I resent any suggestion to the contrary.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

EFFECT ON PROVINCIAL REVENUES OF ALLEGED CHANGE IN TAX SHARING FORMULA—STUDIES OF EFFECT ON REVENUE FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. Considering that the federal government guaranteed to the provinces in the tax changes announced in 1972 that they would not get less revenue during the course of that revenue sharing agreement, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister why the federal government has now unilaterally changed that formula with the result that retroactively all of the provinces are now going to get less revenue than they had anticipated?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a question that should be directed to the Minister of Finance who will be back in the House very soon, I expect. The government is very conscious of the undertakings which were made at that time. I believe they have lived up to them and I do not think the kind of conclusion that the hon. gentleman has put forward is valid.

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It would have surprised me immensely if the Acting Prime Minister had admitted the truth.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I should like to go to a minister who should know something about the changes in the formula and direct my question to the Secretary of State. Has the Secretary of State's department done a study of the proposed changes in cost sharing proposed by the federal government and of the effects of the changes in terms of the share of revenue paid to the provinces for post-secondary education?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, if there have been any studies done on that matter, they would have been done by the Department of Finance.

● (1420)

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as the minister responsible for this program—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

An hon. Member: Ask your question.

Mr. Broadbent: I will go back to the Acting Prime Minister. Assuming that the studies have been done, will the Acting Prime Minister now take steps to ensure that these studies will be made available to all the provincial premiers, many of whom complained about the absence of this data, and specifically I am thinking of the request of Premier Hatfield of New Brunswick?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister dealt with these questions very adequately I thought yesterday, much to the discomfiture of the opposition. There is nothing I can add to that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF PROVISION DISQUALIFYING PERSON FROM BENEFITS WHO WAS WORKING ON AN EXTENSION

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Could the minister advise the House whether he intends to remove from the Unemployment Insurance Act section 36.3, under which a claimant is disqualified if he has the heart to go to work on an extension? If he works for six weeks and his employer goes bankrupt, that claimant is disqualified under section 36.3 and is no longer entitled to unemployment insurance benefits.

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if, as I understand, the hon. member is referring to what we call the 4-week rule under which a person cannot work more than four weeks without having his claim terminated, it is certainly our intention in the amendments we are presenting to the House to correct this situation which we think should be changed.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REACTION OF PROVINCES TO PROPOSALS RELATED TO MEDICAL CARE AND REVIEW OF JOINT PROGRAMS

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that put by the leader of the NDP and is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Can the Acting Prime Minister tell the House what the reaction of the provincial premiers was to his established program financing proposal in so far as it relates to the Medical Care Act and the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should have thought the reaction would have been given by the Premiers of those provinces. I am sure the hon. gentleman would not expect us to repeat what we hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp: The premiers, as far as I can see, are able to speak for themselves very adequately.

Mr. Yewchuk: In view of the repeated mention in his established program financing proposal of a joint federal-provincial review of health legislation and programs, would the Acting Prime Minister tell the House whether he and the premiers had any discussion about the circumstances of such a review?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I will direct that to the Prime Minister who was present at the meeting, which I was not.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POSSIBILITY OF STRIKE BY RAILWAY WORKERS AS RESULT OF VOTE ON HALL REPORT

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that arithmetically the railway workers actually rejected the Hall Report by a narrow figure, can the minister advise whether the railway workers realized, when they voted, that significant items had been settled before the appointment of the Hon. Emmett Hall, and that the Hall Report was confined to matters of wages only?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that there may be some question as to just how many of the 95,000 railway workers in this country who voted really knew there were a lot of items, almost all, outside of wages that had been negotiated and removed from the bargaining table prior to the ballots going out. There is no question about that. I would also advise the hon. member that although a simple majority did marginally reject the Emmett Hall report, ten of the 16 unions had a majority within their own unions accepting it. The formula in terms of the constitution of the various unions committed the minorities to what the majority did. On that basis, in terms of the bylaws of the unions involved, it works out in theory to an acceptance of the Hall report by 54 per cent. Thus the associated railway unions advised me of their acceptance yesterday and are prepared now to sit down with railway management to negotiate an agreement on the basis of the Hall Report. I believe that means optimistically that there will be no strike in the railways as for as this year is concerned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

POSSIBILITY MINISTER WILL ASCERTAIN WHY AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS WANT TO STRIKE

Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

As there has already been an agreement between the CATCA and the Treasury Board and as that same association has decided to go on strike because of racism, is the Minister of Labour willing to meet the union to ask how they justify the possibility of a strike and to persuade them not to strike strictly on the basis of their contempt for the French fact in Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Well, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member, as I am sure he is aware, that the employees in question here—I understand his question although I did not hear the earlier part of it unfortunately—who are direct employees of the government do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Labour Department. As you know, we are involved in disputes for all those employees in federal jurisdiction outside of direct employees. So we have no direct role in this matter. Although I have some considerable sympathy with the area the hon. member is talking about I think his question probably should be directed to the President of the Treasury Board.

* * *

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

ALLEGATION OF DUAL CHARGES—POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT WITH SASKATCHEWAN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I should like to know whether a successful agreement has been negotiated between the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the province of Saskatchewan where a situation has existed in which some $500,000 was siphoned off as a result of dual levies, first for the filleting cost at the local level and, second, the charge that was added because of the over-all filleting costs at the central plant.

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, while not accepting at all the premise and the words used "siphoned off" which were indicated in the hon. member's question, I know that some weeks ago I met with the minister responsible for this area in Saskatchewan. We had agreed at that point that the position could be shared on the problem of recognizing Saskatchewan's particular situation. This would be a decision of course for the board of the corporation. I have no indication that this has not taken place but I will check into it.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, when the minister is carrying on his discussions will he determine whether the agreement that apparently may have been reached will result in greater returns to the fishermen themselves or whether it will only be the processors in Saskatchewan who will be in a better financial position.

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I understand that both problems are closely related, since many of the fishermen belong to the co-operatives engaged in the activities in Saskatchewan. I certainly think that anything which allows the fishery in Saskatchewan to return better prices to the fishermen should be encouraged. On the other hand, I would remind the hon. member that the province did ask the federal government to put together this corporation. Their input should not be limited so that it is only on the sideline and only looks to the benefits to their own province because there are four provinces involved.

* * *

URBAN AFFAIRS

KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER THAT TRUST COMPANIES ISSUING ONE-YEAR MORTGAGES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, I would direct my question to the acting minister. Keeping in mind that interest rates on mortgages have been increasing by three-quarters of one per cent for the last four years, I am wondering whether the minister is aware that some trust companies are offering one year mortgages, and if he is aware of this what action is he taking to correct that situation or to look into it.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is a well known practice of mortgage companies to offer lower interest rates on mortgages of one year. They also offer five-year mortgages which are renewable after five years and the interest rate of course is a little higher. If the hon. member has a specific case he wants us to look into, I guess I would accept the question as notice.

Mr. Whiteway: Then, Mr. Speaker, I would direct this question to the parliamentary secretary. In view of the fact that trust companies are offering a discount of one-quarter of one per cent, I wonder if the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or the Minister of State for Urban Affairs is aware of this and what they intend to do about the come-on offered by the trust companies in view of the long term implications this has on the amount of interest paid by Canadians taking out mortgages.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I just answered. It is common practice to offer lower interest rates on one year mortgages.

* * *

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

POSSIBILITY OF RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION TO REDUCE QUEBEC'S TAXATION FIELD

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the right hon. Prime Minister, I should like to put a question to the President of the Treasury Board.

In view of the fact that the federal-provincial conference came to an end yesterday and it seems that, in any event, the provinces will lose $750 million as a result of it, and that in the case of Quebec, it will mean a decrease of $250 million, I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether in his discussions with the Quebec premier, the latter was given guarantees which might leave him some hope that the federal government will reverse its decision and that he will comply with the settlements already agreed upon? As a result of his statement, we have to believe that the Quebec premier still hopes to recover those $250 million. If he does not, it would seem that the Quebec premier is trying to keep the truth from the Quebecers.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand there will be a meeting of finance ministers in July and certain points will be discussed again. This enables Mr. Bourassa to say that there may be some hope. But on the other hand, the agreement concerning the guarantee to the provinces which was reached at the time of the tax reform terminates in 1976. Thus we meet our part of the commitment.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Considering the minister's remarks, it seems in any case that if I stick to his concrete answer this represents a decrease in income of $250 million for the province of Quebec at this time. Is it right?

Mr. Chrétien: Not this way, Mr. Speaker. At the time of the Canadian tax system reform, we assured the provinces we would protect them against changes during a certain period of time, but this period is already terminated and the Minister of Finance undertook to discuss the conditions of the new agreement, if any, during the meeting of the finance ministers next July.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

UNITED STATES IMPORT QUOTA ON SPECIAL STEEL PRODUCTS FROM CANADA—POSSIBLE DIVERSION OF FOREIGN SHIPMENTS TO CANADA

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that the United States has imposed import quotas on special steel products from Canada, can the minister say what action the government is contemplating, if any? Will a complaint be lodged under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that if we are going to take any action I would not want to indicate it specifically in advance. However, we have indicated a complaint, not in the GATT context as the hon. member has mentioned but to the U.S. directly, and we are considering what further steps may be undertaken.

Mr. Murta: In a supplementary question I would like to ask the minister whether there is any possibility that foreign shipments destined for the U.S. may be diverted to the Canadian markets, thus compounding the problems that our steel manufacturers will have. Has the government looked into this problem and, if so, could the minister inform the House?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to some extent. I have not heard of it in precisely that fashion but if the hon. member or anyone else for that matter knows of any such action, we would be glad to hear about it. I think the hon. member would know as well that one company is primarily affected, and of course we are in constant touch with them.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

BASIS ON WHICH GRANTS MADE TO PROVINCES—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF EFFECT ON PROVINCES OF FEDERAL PROPOSALS

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister in the absence of the Prime Minister. Will he assure the House that if the Prime Minister is really as concerned about equalization grants being as effective as possible for the low income provinces, as he stated yesterday, that his government will base those grants on the two top provinces within our federal system?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): I have heard this proposal made on behalf of certain provinces. It will be considered, but I could not give any assurance that that would be equitable across the country. I am sure the hon. gentleman understands the importance of some restraint in government spending and I hope he supports us in this point of view.

Mr. Hogan: I want to suggest to the Acting Prime Minister that it would be the most equitable to do. In relation to the Prime Minister's remarks yesterday on cost sharing I want to ask the Acting Prime Minister if he will table in the House or present to interested members of parliament the federal estimates of the effect of the federal proposals that were made at the first ministers conference, for example, on a province like Nova Scotia or New Brunswick over the next five years.

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker, I could not undertake to do that.

Some hon. Members: Why not?

Mr. Sharp: These discussions are just in the preliminary stage. As my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board, has said, there will be further opportunities when the finance ministers meet to look more particularly at these problems. The purpose of the federal government in putting these proposals forward was to get some sort of reaction in principle before getting down to the necessary bargaining.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGATION ISRAEL HAS STOCK PILE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the government's posture of devout nuclear virginity and stern anti-proliferation of nuclear arms, may I ask if in the light of sustained and widespread reports of possession of substantial nuclear stock piles by the Republic of Israel, the minister can advise if the government of Canada has made any investigation of, or inquiry into, the serious allegations and, if so, has it cautioned the friendly government of Israel regarding the dangers of adding further highly incendiary elements to the already explosive Middle East situation?

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POSSIBILITY OF LOCKOUT OF AIR CANADA FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. I have been informed, and it has also been announced in the news media in Winnipeg today, that the management of Air Canada intends to lock out employees of the Air Canada finance branch in Winnipeg. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour to take necessary action to stop the lock out of employees of the finance branch until the federal mediator has completed his inquiry into the labour problems and filed his report with the Minister of Labour.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): I believe the hon. member is well aware of the fact that we have had a mediator in on this situation for considerable time. Unfortunately, up to date, he has not been able to resolve an outstanding issue between the parties over which there is considerable emotion. I must say that this news about the possible lock out by Air Canada of the finance division is a relatively new development in the whole situation. We are looking at it very actively in the department right now. What we can do we will do in order to resolve this dispute and ameliorate the effects of any dislocation to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. McKenzie: If Air Canada proceeds with this lock out, I understand this will be the first time that a Crown agency or a government agency has locked out employees. Will the minister investigate to see if Air Canada has the legal right to lock out employees?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will, although I would be less than frank if I did not say that I believe that just as the union is in a strike position, so can the employer, from the legal point of view, be in the lock out position.

EDUCATION

PROPOSAL TO CREATE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL BODY TO DEAL WITH CERTAIN ASPECTS—POSITION OF PROVINCES

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. In view of the fact that the government wants to attach strings to post-graduate education by the creation of a federal-provincial body to oversee certain aspects of education, can the minister tell the House if the provinces have agreed to this and what the make up of this proposed body might be?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member's description of our proposal is very accurate. I do not fault him for that, but it is not accurate. What we are saying at the federal level is that there are areas of national concern, areas to be described as national goals in post-secondary education. What we would like to do is to set up a mechanism, with the co-operation of the provinces, within which we can talk about these things, and we specified certain areas. Without putting words into the mouth of the provinces let me say that there was general sympathy for the idea and concern about the exact forum. I have written to the chairman of the Council of Ministers of Education suggesting that ministers of education and myself meet early in July to examine this proposal more fully, and I am optimistic that I will get a favourable response to that proposal.

Mr. Ritchie: Can the minister tell us if this proposal is primarily concerned with language training and post-graduate education?

● (1440)

Mr. Faulkner: Certainly, it is true that we are concerned about the implications of two official languages at the level of post secondary education, but that certainly is not the only area we would like to explore with them. We have talked about the state of Canadian studies and the problem of accessibility of low income students to our universities. These all seem to be issues of national importance. We are not trying to insinuate our way into the curriculum development of the university. We are not threatening academic freedom. We just believe these are issues of national importance, and in view of the fact that we are participating rather handsomely in terms of financing the post-secondary level, we should have an arrangement to discuss these matters with them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

SUGGESTED PROHIBITION OF EXPORT OF CONTAMINATED FISH

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of State for Fisheries.

Since Mr. Claude Simard admitted yesterday at the Quebec National Assembly that the St. Lawrence eels are contaminated by PCB—polychlorinated biphenyl—and unfit for human consumption, and since 97 per cent of all eel catches in Quebec are exported, can the minister tell us

if he will take the necessary action with his colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, to stop the export of poisoned fish or if he will warn those responsible to stop this pollution to keep the good reputation that Canadian exports enjoy?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I hope that what the hon. member said about poisoned fish will not have any repercussions on our market. I believe this type of statement can be irresponsible if it is not based on facts and well controlled scientific data. Having said this, I want to point out that we are extremely strict for export products. The inspection services of the provincial fisheries department and those of the federal government have close relationships in this regard. For inspections, in fact, the powers are delegated to federal authorities by the provincial government of Quebec. However, I do not foresee any difficulties. I shall check on the statements of the hon. member, but until then I hope no one will make any alarmist statements.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Can the minister tell the House whether he is cooperating with his provincial counterpart from Quebec, Mr. Claude Simard and, if so, why has Mr. Simard made such a statement? This did not come from me. The statement was made by Mr. Claude Simard and reported by newspapers this morning. I am well aware that it is nonsense to say that fish exported by Canada to other countries is poisoned. I find this ridiculous, but if they work together, how can the Quebec minister report such nonsense that could discredit our exports?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, the normal precaution before reacting to a verbal statement based on a press report is to check exactly what was said. This is what I shall do.

* * *

[*English*)

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

PROTECTION OF LANGUAGE RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES BEING MOVED FROM OTTAWA

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services, of which I have given him notice. In the welcome move of the superannuation section of the minister's department to Moncton, what assurances were sought by the government of Canada that the rights of the public servants who are being moved will be protected under the Official Languages Act?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his question.

Treasury Board is now reviewing the conditions under which the government decentralization program should operate, in the case of employees. Of course, I made sure with local authorities about the extent to which a government unit using French in a proportion of about 30 per cent would be welcomed, and I am sure that local authorities are prepared to cooperate fully with the federal government. As to protecting the acquired rights of employees now working in the government pension division, this of course comes under the policy known to everybody and adopted by Parliament.

* * *

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POSSIBILITY OF OVERRULING ANTI-INFLATION BOARD DECISIONS IN CASES OF WORKERS AT THOMPSON AND KITIMAT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour in the absence of the Minister of Finance. In the town of Kitimat, some 20 union members have now been arrested and jailed as a result of their belief in the AIB guidelines—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Leggatt: —and it is also true that in the town of Thompson, Manitoba, we have another community being torn apart. In view of the confrontations which are now developing in the country, not between the companies and the unions but between the AIB and the unions, would the minister advise if he has investigated the option of overruling these AIB decisions, particularly when an historical relationship has been the problem, and whether his government has investigated whether any action can be expected from this government to overrule AIB rulings when northern communities are torn apart and strikes develop as a direct result of those rulings?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has pointed out two instances, but I have already indicated that the railway unions, in which there are 95,000 men involved, are prepared to negotiate on the basis of the Hall settlement, which hardly indicates a widespread confrontation over these particular guidelines.

In any event, not to detract from the hardship of the two communities about which the hon. member is talking, let me advise him that I hope the unions and the membership involved are aware of the appeal procedures now applicable in this situation. As far as Thompson is concerned, the administrator is in Thompson today gathering facts with respect to the situation in order to make his final ruling. There are procedures set out in the Act for appeal from his ruling and also reference to the cabinet. I am sure that the leadership is aware of that situation and will take advantage of the appeal provisions of the statute.

Mr. Leggatt: In the town of Kitimat it was a case of the workers in that town believing the AIB guidelines and winding up with an 8.9 per cent settlement, whereas their counterparts at Eurocan in the same community received an approved 18 per cent settlement from the AIB. My question is this: where this kind of disparity arises, not as a result of that decision but as a result of the confidence of the workers in the anti-inflation program, will the minister now make some representation to the company and the

AIB to re-open that contract and see that these massive inequities are corrected in these northern communities?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): The appeal procedures are available under the Act, and I might say that the party of which the hon. member is a member made strong representations with respect to the inclusion of these appeal procedures, to which we responded.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Just a minute, please. I believe that there is enough latitude there to have this situation reviewed, if they wish to take advantage of the procedures. Certainly, in terms of any contact with the Department of Labour or our staff with respect to these difficulties and any requests for representations to be made have not been made with respect to the Kitimat situation.

* * *

FISHERIES

POSSIBILITY OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INCREASED SURVEILLANCE WORK AND USE OF "BRAS D'OR" AS PATROL VESSEL

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of State (Fisheries). The minister has indicated that his department plans to double the level of boardings and inspections this year in the ICNAF area, which will mean about 1,200 boardings carried out with the assistance of the Department of National Defence and the Department of Transport. This will, of course, require additional funds for new ships, and I would like to ask the minister whether there will be supplementary funds provided for this purpose.

Second, since the taxpayers of Canada have contributed $58 million toward the construction of the 200 ton experimental hydrofoil ship HMCS *Bras d'Or*, commissioned in 1971 and now mothballed until 1981, has the minister given any thought to utilizing this expensive prototype in fisheries surveillance work, even though the ship does not have a weapons system or sonar devices, which are not necessary for surveillance?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, the doubling of the number of boardings can be done with the present hardware available in terms of ships and planes. In the case of the tracker aircraft there will have to be some upgrading of the present equipment, particularly radar. We do not expect to have a supplementary estimate for this. We are absorbing part of it in the fisheries program by cutting corners in other places, and other departments involved are also absorbing the increased cost, utilizing the existing destroyers and the existing aircraft, and in the case of the Ministry of Transport, existing vessels, particularly icebreaker capacity which we need in the region of Hamilton Inlet and off the Labrador coast at certain times of the year.

● (1450)

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Acting Prime Minister? In trials in 1969, the year after she was launched, the *Bras d'Or* established the reputation of being the fastest warship in the world by reaching the approximate speed of 62 knots. Since she will be 12 years old in 1981, the end of the mothballing period, does the government intend to let the ship wear out while sitting high and dry at a yearly cost of $30,000? What are the government's plans for this expensive prototype?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall make inquiries.

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON STATIONING AIRCRAFT AND SHIPS IN NEWFOUNDLAND FOR PATROL WORK

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of State responsible for fisheries concerns the maximum use of existing aircraft and surface craft. Bearing in mind the doubling of the number of boardings for enforcing ICNAF regulations and the increased surveillance which will be necessary as a consequence of our declaring our 200 mile economic zone, does the government intend to station aircraft and surface ships in Newfoundland, in order to maximize their use?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily accept that there will be need for increased surveillance in the 200 mile zone. There is the right to arrest, the right to issue permits, the right to cancel permits, etc. There will be the obligation on the part of the foreign vessel to inform Canadian authorities where it intends to move from week to week, and so on. This should simplify matters but I do not disagree that we will need a credible surveillance. As for the stationing of aircraft, I might say that at the moment it is planned to have aircraft stopping in Newfoundland with crew changes to take place after one week or ten days, depending on the requirements of the military. The servicing of these aircraft, which have reached a certain age, can best be carried out at the Halifax facilities, but we intend in future to have a greater surveillance capacity in Newfoundland than we have at present.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REQUEST FOR TABLING GUIDELINES ON DECENTRALIZATION OF DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, before the question period I tried to move a motion under Standing Order 43 with respect to the decentralization of government departments. My motion may have been misconstrued. I was not asking for cabinet minutes with respect to that matter. May I ask the President of the Treasury Board if guidelines have been established by cabinet or Treasury Board in a form which can be tabled in this House to do with the decentralization of government departments? I ask this because it is a matter of importance for the administration of the Public Service of

Canada, the personnel involved and areas and municipalities involved. Are there such guidelines? If there are, can the minister arrange to table them? If not, will he arrange as soon as possible to have them prepared, so that everyone will know the ground rules with respect to decentralization?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I have myself made a few speeches on the matter and outlined the ground rules for the federal government decentralization policy. I will inquire whether there would be some information I could table and which could be acceptable to the hon. member. I must say, however, that, according to my recollection, we established this policy last year and afterwards it became one of the most important planks in the leadership campaign program of the hon. member for Rocky Mountain seeking to be elected leader of the party. He is now leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC WORKS

REGULATIONS GOVERNING USE OF POLYCHLORIDE PLASTICS IN CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. Can the minister please tell the House if his department has internal, I stress internal, regulations strictly governing the use of polychloride plastics in the construction of public projects, owing to their potential danger as a fire hazard?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. There are extensive regulations coming under the national building code and the Canadian Government Specifications Board as well as regulations under the national fire code. In cases where we, ourselves, do not have them, reference may be made to the American society for testing materials. All of those comprise a thick document covering a whole range of polychlorides. If the hon. gentleman is interested in something specific, I will be glad to advise him.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REASON FOR FAILURE TO LABEL POLYCHLORIDE PLASTICS AS HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the minister's reply, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs? If the Department of Public Works considers polychloride plastics as a fire hazard so serious that they have introduced strict regulations regarding their use, why does the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs not even require such products to be labelled under the Hazardous Products Act?

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall simply have to find out and inform the hon. gentleman.

FAILURE OF FORD MOTOR COMPANY TO REPLACE DAMAGED TRUCKS

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Since Harley Peterson of Condor, Alberta, purchased a new one-ton Ford truck in June, 1975 which he found, after taking delivery, to have been damaged in transit, and since the Ford Motor Company of Canada has refused to replace the vehicle with a new, undamaged one, would the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, in his efforts to protect Canadian consumers, personally put ministerial pressure on that company and ask it to fulfil its obligation to Mr. Peterson, and thereby protect Canadian consumers generally?

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DATE OF PUBLICATION OF HALL REPORT ON RAILWAY PENSIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour? Since it will soon be two years since Dr. Noel Hall was given the important assignment of reviewing all aspects of railway pensions, is the minister in a position to give a new forecast as to when that report might be submitted and presented to the House?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I had notification from Dr. Hall approximately three weeks ago indicating that he has taken time off from the university, gone on a sabbatical, taken the various material and actuarial studies with him, and would complete the report shortly. I expect it any time, hopefully by the end of June or the middle of July.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): How long is the sabbatical?

* * *

INCOME TAX

KNOWLEDGE OF DEPARTMENT OF PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON MORTGAGE TO OFFSHORE LENDING COMPANY

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. Has he determined the answer to my question of June 14, as to how the government knows if Canadians who are paying interest on off-shore or foreign mortgages have declared this obligation to the Canadian government?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, we have looked into this matter, as raised by the hon. member. Unfortunately, we can do little. Really, it involves a bookkeeping problem for banks in the United States. We ran into the same situation in Florida but were able to convince the internal revenue service that something should be done, and it was. We shall make similar

representations in the area about which the hon. member is concerned, as well.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

POSSIBILITY OF MOVING A BRANCH OF DEPARTMENT TO CAPE BRETON

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Supply and Services. I apologize for not sending him notice; at the same time I commend him for his recent announcement about the decentralization of government services.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muir: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister will soon be in the position to announce a similar decentralization involving Cape Breton Island, an area which, as the minister well knows, suffers from very high levels of unemployment. If the minister cannot answer today, we are very patient and will be glad to hear from him in the next week or so.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, up to now my rate of announcements has been one a year. I expect the hon. member will have to wait one year before we announce another decentralization.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting Reports from Standing and Special committees.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the question period the Minister of Labour inadvertently misled the House when he suggested, with respect to the contract under which workers at Kitimat are controlled, that there is some appeal procedure available to them under the AIB legislation. The reverse is the fact. The contract has been signed; the problem is with regard to re-opening the contract. There is no provision in the law for that. I do not think the minister would wish to leave the wrong impression with the House, and perhaps would like an opportunity to correct what he said.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity the hon. member has given me in this regard. I was considering getting up tomorrow. I was referring to the Thompson situation when I indicated that there is an appeal procedure open to those workers and that my office would be available to them also. I was not referring to the appeal procedure as it applies to Kitimat.

● (1500)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PERFORMING ARTS

PRESENTATION OF PETITION BY WORKERS IN ANGLOPHONE FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the film workers in the Anglophone Canadian film industry. I advise you, Sir, that the member of parliament for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury) and the member of parliament for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) are associated with me in this presentation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are marked by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 5,091, 5,163, 5,166, 5,330 and 5,552.

[*Text*]

$500 HOME OWNER GRANT—CONSTITUENCY OF TÉMISCAMINGUE

Question No. 5,091—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

Since the implementation of the programme of grants awarded for the purchasing of non-commercial housing (a) how much was spent in the Constituency of Témiscamingue (b) how many persons in the Constituency expressed their desire to receive such grants (c) how many received a grant (d) what was the distribution of such grants in the Constituency?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows: (a), (c) and (d) See Table following; (b) Data on the number of applications are not available.

NOTE: Data on activity under the NHA are compiled by municipal county in Quebec, and not by Federal electoral constituency.

$500 Home Owner Grant—Municipal County of Témiscamingue

Municipality	Number of Grants	Amount $
Angiers	1	500
Belleterre	3	1,500
Duhamel West	1	500
Évain	31	15,500
Lorrainville	5	2,500
Moffet	1	500
Noranda	23	11,500
Notre-Dame-du-Nord	3	1,500
Rouyn	110	55,000

Order Paper Questions

Municipality	Number of Grants	Amount $
St-Édouard-de-Fabre	3	1,500
St-Placide-de-Béarn	2	1,000
Témiscamingue: Town	17	8,500
Ville-Marie	7	3,500
Unorganized	2	1,000
Total	209	104,500

TESTING OF SMOKE CONTROL SYSTEM—PLACE DU PORTAGE

Question No. 5,163—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was the smoke control system tested before completion of the building at Place du Portage and were certain deficiencies found and, if so, what were they?

2. Was the system retested on completion of the building and (a) if so (i) on what date (ii) by whom (b) if not, was a letter sent to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs asserting that everything was in order and, if so (i) who signed it (ii) on what date was it sent?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. (a) The Division of Building Research of the National Research Council conducted a series of research tests in March 1973 prior to the completion of the building and submitted a report to the Dominion Fire Commissioner. As a result of these tests, the National Research Council modified and refined the criteria for smoke control system design which were published as Change Series 3 of the National Building Code in October 1973; (b) Deficiencies found in these research tests were: (i) The smoke control shaft was found to be leaky in the sense that concrete block is more porous than poured concrete. (ii) The air supply ducts were interconnected between floors which tended to neutralize the suction pressures of the venting action by the smoke shaft. (iii) The roof hatch of the smoke shaft was found to be defective. (iv) Unsealed openings were found in masonry walls through which ducts and pipes entered vertical service and pipe shafts. (v) Air flow was found to be diverted into stairshafts on opening of an exit door to a stair on test floor. Doors were installed in stair shafts to prevent chimney effect in a stair enclosure.

2. (a) No. (i) Not applicable; (ii) not applicable. (b) No. (i) Not applicable; (ii) Not applicable.

SPRINKLER PROTECTION SYSTEM—PLACE DE VILLE

Question No. 5,166—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was a sprinkler protection system programmed for completion on all floors of Tower A of Place de Ville during 1976 and, if so (a) how far advanced is the installation (b) what is the estimated date of completion?

2. Was a similar sprinkler protection system programmed for Towers B and C and, if not, for what reason?

3. Was such a system actually ordered for Towers B and C by a directive of the Department of Public Works and, if so, for what reason was this directive ignored?

4. What are the reasons such a sprinkler system was not installed in all three towers at the time of construction?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. No. (a) Not applicable; (b) not applicable.

[Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier).]

2. No. These are privately owned leased buildings and subject to requirements of City of Ottawa Building Bylaws. Sprinkler systems were not required by the National Building or Fire Codes except in basement areas.

3. No.

4. At the time of construction, there was no requirement in any code or bylaw for sprinkler protection in other than basement areas of a building.

SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING—CONSTITUENCY OF TÉMISCAMINGUE

Question No. 5,330—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

Has Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation granted loans to certain municipalities in the Constituency of Témiscamingue for the construction of senior citizens homes and, if so (a) what municipalities are concerned (b) what are the names of the establishments (c) what are the (i) amounts (ii) terms of the loans?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows: CMHC has made one loan to Quebec Housing Corporation to finance the construction of a housing project for senior citizens, in the municipal county of Témiscamingue. The project, Maison Pie XII, is located in the City of Rouyn, and the loan totalled $790,844, to be repaid over a term of 50 years at an interest rate of 6-7/8 per cent.

NOTE: Data on operations under the NHA are compiled by CMHC on the basis of Municipal Counties in Quebec, not on the basis of federal electoral constituencies.

BILINGUAL DISTRICTS

Question No. 5,552—**Mr. Horner:**

1. How many bilingual districts have been named in each province to date?

2. In each case, was the (a) provincial government (b) municipality involved consulted before such districts were designated?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): 1. The Official Languages Act provides under Section 9(1) for services to the public in both official languages in certain locations, including 'the National Capital Region'. Section 12 of the Act provides that '... the Governor in Council may from time to time by proclamation establish one or more federal bilingual districts ... '. The Governor in Council has not proclaimed any bilingual districts to date.

2. Not applicable.

* * *

[*Translation*]

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 5,469?

[*Text*]

*REDUCTION IN PURCHASE OF MANITOBA LIGHT CRUDE

Question No. 5,469—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has there been a reduction in the purchase of Manitoba Light Crude by 40% and, if so, for what reason?

2. How long will this reduced allocation last in this time of oil shortage?

[*English*]

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question is as follows: 1. During the month of April 1976, an equipment failure in the refinery of a major user of Manitoba crude oil caused a temporary reduction of about 5,000 barrels per day in the demand for this oil. 2. Demand for this oil was restored in May.

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

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My question No. 4,957 has been on the order paper since March 15. It deals with complaints with regard to price increases and rollbacks by the Anti-Inflation Board. The question relates to a board which ought to be able to give the answers very, very quickly. However, this has not been the case. I ask the parliamentary secretary to take notice of my point of order and to ensure that the Anti-Inflation Board expedites the answers to these questions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—STATE OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East) moved:

That this House views with alarm the accelerating collapse of the Canadian textile industry, rejects the fatalistic inertia of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and demands serious action to counter the ruinous pressure from excessively high import levels.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, before touching upon the particular and central subject of this debate, namely, the Canadian textile industry, I think

it is very timely that we discuss in this House this afternoon some of the things relating to the economy and the atmosphere created by the government vis-à-vis business in general.

It goes without saying that governments are not meant to represent big anything; they are meant to represent the people. That is almost a cliché. It is something we sometimes forget. Of course governments are not meant to represent big institutions, be they unions or big business.

I want to underline time and time again this afternoon that a government cannot and should not be the spokesman for any particular segment of society or the economy. Having said that, I want to state that the government has absolutely no excuse for what I call the degree of anti-business bias that it has shown under eight years of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), our former leader, mentioned in Nova Scotia some nights ago that the time for confrontation between major interests in society is over, and the time for conciliation is here. I agree. If anyone in this House thinks I am kidding about that, just go from one end of this country to the other and talk to businessmen. They will say that never in the last 40 years have they been given such a hostile reception as they have been given by this government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grafftey: Hon. members opposite do not like to hear the truth. It is going to take more than the seraphic smile of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) to rectify this situation. This anti-business bias and anti-business climate are even exaggerated in the case of the Canadian textile industry.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, what are we dealing with in the House today? We are discussing whether or not, in the near future, we shall have a textile industry in this country and I wish to state most emphatically that unless we do something right now, we shall not have any.

[*English*]

It has been said time and time again by businessmen in this country that business leaders and businessmen from other countries receive here in Ottawa a much more cordial and decent reception than our domestic businessmen. I think the minister will have to explain this. We have brought this motion before the House of Commons today purely and simply because we on this side of the House believe that if immediate action is not forthcoming, not just promises and words, much sooner than later we shall not have a Canadian textile industry.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I spoke with several executives in the textile industry. In my view there is no cooperation in this area between the Ottawa officials and the industry which can compare with the kind of cooperation existing in the United States between Washington and the textile industry.

In Ottawa decisions are made without consultations with the private sector, with the industry. I do not wish to blame the minister in question all the time but his officials are often in the foreground and he is responsible. On many

occasions, and I am sure many hon. members will agree with me, businessmen and textile manufacturers are informed by government officials that a decision has been made without any previous consultation.

● (1510)

[*English*]

I think it is very important to call attention to this state of affairs. For the last five or six years, as I have gone around the country, businessmen in the textile sector have been telling me they cannot understand the hostility shown to them by federal civil servants. It is almost as though they were not welcome here in Ottawa. I know the minister is not entirely to blame.

I want to say at the outset that I agree with much of the government's policy in connection with the textile industry. The fact is, however, that the policy we build up in the House of Commons is not carried out or, when it is carried out, it is too late—the damage has been done. This is a general consideration, one we should speak and think about in the House. I am not going to start being sensational, but I believe this is a problem which faces each and every one of us as parliamentarians, be we on the government side or on the opposition side. In the last year or so I have talked to many ministers who have told me privately that on many occasions the intentions of the bills and the orders we have drafted in the House of Commons have been completely controverted in subsequent regulations made by the bureaucrats—the whole intent of the law has been controverted by civil servants interpreting it in their own fashion or putting up roadblocks or, as in the case of the textile industry, failing to apply it. This applies to many policies which we have approved as legislators in the House of Commons. This being the case, as I believe it is, let us debate the issue openly because it is my opinion that in many instances the government has built up a monster in the form of a bureaucracy which nobody can control.

[*Translation*]

As far as textile is concerned, I fully agree with the policy as a whole but, unfortunately, we are here to find an answer to a very serious problem for several members, especially members from Quebec. I would say that in general I totally agree with most of the government's policy but it should act responsibly, and it is not a policy which is implemented often enough by the officials concerned.

[*English*]

I would simply like to say this: I am very suspicious, after being around here for a few years—

An hon. Member: Too long.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You are just a young fellow.

Mr. Grafftey: I am more than suspicious that some very influential officials and some cabinet ministers believe that the textile industry in Canada is expendable. They are not alone in this point of view. I have talked to businessmen in big cities, men who have nothing to do with the textile industry and who have never lived in textile towns, who say that the textile industry is expendable. That is the conventional wisdom within much of the bureaucracy which has to apply textile policy.

The minister is a good minister in many ways. He is loyal to his civil servants, unlike some of his colleagues. But if he is really frank with the House he will admit he has run into this head-in-the-sand conventional wisdom that, for one reason or another, the textile industry in Canada is expendable. If this is what the minister is hearing from his advisers, whether in the private sector or in the public service, I think he should level with us because we are talking now about the survival of an industry which is important not only to Eastern Canada and to various other areas of the country, but to Canada as a whole. It is imperative that we find a good solution and a long term solution to the problems of a troubled industry.

In my view it would be disastrous to accept the conventional wisdom that somehow or other we can get along very well in this country without a textile industry. I want to make it abundantly clear that we in the Progressive Conservative party are committed to the existence of a viable textile industry here in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: I can almost hear the minister saying, when he replies to the debate, "We, too, are committed to that objective." But, Mr. Speaker, ministers on the other side have been saying that for far too many years, and every year the situation has been getting worse and worse. I am not speaking only on behalf of the industry. I am speaking on behalf of all Canadians who want this industry to continue. Ministers whose responsibility this is will have to replace mere words with action and prove the sincerity of their undertaking. The industry does not need any more studies, commissions, reports, and committees of investigation. What the industry needs is a firm declaration from the government that there is a national will in favour of its continued existence, along with concrete measures which will bring some hope for the future.

I have always said that the federal government is shortsightedly living off the short-term windfall benefits resulting from the sale of our natural resources while letting in cheap imports. This is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that these imports will always be cheap. Once we have destroyed the means of Canadian production, what happens? One of the hon. members who sits opposite said to me the other day that he used to be able to go into a store and buy shirts, for instance, made in the Far East at a price far cheaper than anything we could match here, but that this situation was now coming to an end; the imported shirts were getting more and more expensive.

The government talks about the benefits the public derives from cheap imports. Mr. Speaker, those benefits are very short-lived. Take binder twine, for instance. We warned the government time and time again of what would happen if a domestic supply of binder twine were not available to farmers. People who should have known better allowed this industry to be destroyed by cheap imports, using the excuse that the farmer was benefiting from lower prices. What has happened? Only a year or so after the local industry was destroyed the price has risen by three times.

An hon. Member: Four.

Mr. Grafftey: I apply this situation, by analogy, to the textile industry. Consumers should not swallow the bait that they would be better off by getting short-term benefits. Quite apart from that, what happens when our natural resources run out? From what source can the government expect further windfall benefits to finance social programs?

The point is this: we have been saying, both inside and outside the House for a number of years, that the government has no industrial strategy. If we are wrong, then in the name of goodness will you tell the House what it is? Will you tell the businessmen about it because they are waiting to hear you? I do not intend to get mixed up in philosophy, in a discussion of the merits of private industry and free enterprise versus socialism, and so on; what I am asking is this: in the name of goodness tell us where you want business to go, because we don't know. I am not saying we want Mr. Howe or his ghost back. I am asking for some indication of a general industrial strategy for this country.

● (1520)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to intervene, and I do not do so because the time of the hon. member has expired, far from it. I would just invite the hon. member, who has been addressing himself directly to the minister, to address himself to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly correct my mistake, and I apologize once again.

[*English*]

I just want to underline in general the necessity for an industrial strategy for Canada, which is no more emphasized than by the situation in which the textile industry finds itself at the present time. I should like to make one last general remark before citing some global statistics vis-à-vis the textile industry. I have always felt that, unlike any other country that I know of, particularly in the western world, many of our senior bureaucrats and some ministers of the Crown think that the textile industry is expendable. They have this old-fashioned international trade philosophy, which I suggest is about 40 years out of date, that says "So long as you guys take our natural resources, some of our foodstuffs and our raw materials, to heck with the textile industry, it is expendable". I have heard that alluded to, being on the opposition side for so long, and I am sure the minister would like it to be prolonged.

We do not always get to talk with the senior bureaucrats as frankly as the minister does, but I am pretty darned sure that that is the advice he gets. It is a saw-off—"You take our natural resources, our foodstuffs and so on, and we will keep talking to the textile industry and try and keep them happy, though we really do not think they are viable". That is a disastrous situation.

Mr. Pelletier: You are too much.

Mr. Grafftey: You say I am too much.

[*Translation*]

Did the hon. member talk with the leaders of Sherbrooke?

Mr. Pelletier: Yes, at meetings that you did not even attend.

Mr. Grafftey: I want to put a question to the hon. member because his intervention seems quite strange at this time. Did the hon. member talk with the union leaders, with the heads of companies? Are they satisfied with the present government's textile policy?

Mr. Pelletier: That is not the question.

Mr. Grafftey: I agree, that is not the question. You have the answer and the best thing for you to do now is to keep quiet a little while.

[*English*]

There is also the question of the Third World countries. I am proud to be a Canadian, and I say that in a non-partisan way, in terms of our responsibilities in international trade and so on. There is nothing partisan about this. But there is another conventional wisdom which says that if we get tough in the textile sector we will be damaging the ability of the Third World countries to export. I have heard that debate. The fact is that Canada is doing one heck of a lot more than any other country in terms of permitting the Third World to be viable exporters, whether of textiles or any other materials.

I am not going to get into the general debate as to whether we are tough negotiators or not. I am as aware as any member of this House of the rightfully legitimate aspirations of emerging Third World countries, emerging not in the political sense but in the economic sense. But while we are leading the world in our understanding of this, I am sure that even the Third World countries do not want our textile industry to disappear completely, as it is beginning to do at this time. The reason we are debating this question today is that we on this side of the House firmly believe—

[*Translation*]

—that if immediate measures are not taken in the very near future, the textile industry will disappear.

[*English*]

Are we talking about completely sacrificing this traditional industry when we talk about our position in relation to the third world? This is nor an original statement of mine, but I will repeat it. Obviously what is needed is a rationalization of our approach. Some might say, what does the word "rationalization" mean?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member again, but there is a point I should like clarified by the hon. member and the House at this time. It concerns a point of procedure.

Hon. members are aware that the motion before the House at this time is one moved by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Balfour). The fact that be moved the motion means, according to citation 166(4) of Beauchesne, he is considered as being the spokesman for the official opposition, and he is considered as having spoken. He is also the one who is entitled to speak for 30 minutes as spokesman for the opposition and according to Standing Order 58(13) only one member of the official opposition and one member of the government are entitled to 30 minutes. Since the hon. member for Regina East, under the

rules, is considered to have spoken, and that right having been used, hon. members will agree with me, perhaps by unanimous consent, that the House would allow the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) to go beyond his time and complete his remarks. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank you sincerely. I understand your ruling and I appreciate the House's courtesy. That means that I still have 10 minutes left. I took the 20 minutes allowed to me.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have asked for more than that and the House agreed. If the hon. member wants to limit himself to 10 minutes, that is his own decision.

Mr. Grafftey: To those officials and others who declare the conventional wisdom that the textile industry is expendable, to those in their ivory towers who have never visited a textile town, I am going to say this. I realize that the textile industry is spread across Canada in every province. But in my own part of Canada when you talk of a textile town you are talking of a one industry town. These are towns with a population of 12,000, 15,000, 25,000 people. Very often a large primary textile plant is the only employer. Do not ask me why. Sometimes these towns have industrial commissaires, as we say in French, but they never have any industry in addition to the textile industry. Up until recently labour has not been generously paid; les salaires ne sont pas fameux. Especially the older workers lack mobility. In human terms and in terms of suffering, it is not just ordinary unemployment that hits a textile town; it is devastating unemployment, grinding unemployment, unemployment of the worst kind.

These workers not only lack mobility, Mr. Speaker, especially if they have been working until they are 45 or 55 years of age and then have to find work somewhere else. Apart from the fundamental consideration that any country with a secondary industrial base, such as Canada, must have a viable textile industry, I appeal to those—and I declare there are many—who say that the textile industry is expendable to reconsider their point of view, and I ask them to visit towns not only in Quebec but all over Canada that depend on this one industry.

If the United States government had let happen in the U.S. what we are now letting happen in Canada, the United States textile industry would have disappeared over five years ago. Domestic consumption in Canada accounts for about 46 per cent of textile output, extending to approximately 200,000 jobs. Compare this with Japan where 90 per cent of the industry is domestic. I have already alluded to the United States. Eighty per cent of the consumption of textiles in the United States is of goods from the domestic industry, as is the case in many of the EEC countries. As I am sure many hon. members are aware, this is accomplished through quotas instead of by tariffs. If we can hold our own with the EEC and the United States there would be a minimum of 150,000 more jobs created in Canada. This is not going to be easy. There are 200,000 jobs involved in making the textiles imported into Canada from abroad, and I suggest that 150,000 domestic jobs could be created because of the superior productivity of Canadian textile manufacturing.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

● (1530)

The Canadian textile trade represents 1 per cent of the world-wide market or, as I said before, 200,000 jobs, and imports represent 54 per cent. That is, there are 200,000 jobs approximately in other countries, and I have already alluded to the increased productivity in Canada, so that we stand a good chance of creating 150,000 more jobs here in our own country. Canada's consumption is 2 per cent of world consumption, whereas manufacturing represents 1 per cent of world production.

Having listened, not only to industrial spokesmen, but to many others including union spokesmen, it is my view that if we froze imports we could bring production up to a satisfactory level. That would not mean we would diminish the status quo of the Third World countries. It would probably take four years to get production up to the level of 80 per cent of the domestic market by Canadian manufacturers.

As I said before, the United States has comprehensive quotas from yarn to finished product, and I believe this is what the Canadian industry vitally wants. It is the domestic industry which keeps prices low. If we lose the viable domestic industry, and I have already made the argument in respect of the binder twine situation regarding agricultural products, then prices may well skyrocket. This is arguable but not so arguable as prices are now; however, if we eliminate domestic competition I suggest prices will skyrocket.

Trade agreement rules are the same for the United States, Canada, and many other countries. As I have said time and time again—

[*Translation*]

—and at the beginning of my remarks, the rules as applied in other countries are not applied by the civil servants here in Canada.

[*English*]

Of countries that are rapidly developing, only Canada is short-term in its outlook in that we do not have comprehensive tariffs, although I have argued this afternoon basically for the quota approach. The suggestion is to freeze the basic quota on imports, and the domestic percentage of production increase will be Canadian without affecting the status quo of Third World imports. Quotas should conform to the average of U.S. and EEC quotas.

The Canadian textile industry is advocating a quota policy similar to that of the United States instead of placing the emphasis on tariffs. Foreign imports would not be cut back, but instead would be frozen until Canadians regained a share of their market equal to the United States control of its domestic market. When this occurred this freeze on imports would be replaced with a quota system which would be kept on par, with U.S. quotas.

It is fair to say that we are talking about a four-year period or something in that general time frame. I think it is also fair to say that Third World countries would understand the rational approach we are taking in this regard.

Before moving the motion, and I think from what you have said, Mr. Speaker, I might have some difficulty in

that regard, but we will cross that bridge when we come to it—

An hon. Member: It has already been moved.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I am very fortunate when it comes to the rules in being not too far away from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

The Standing Committee of the Senate on Banking, Trade and Commerce was seized of many problems concerning the Canadian textile industry. Before moving the motion I would like to put on record some—

An hon. Member: At least you are consistent.

Mr. Grafftey: I would like to put on record some of the more salient points that were touched upon there. The minister is already aware of them, but I think they should be headlined.

In spite of increasing textile and clothing exports the Canadian negative trade balance has grown by an average annual rate of 16 per cent since 1969, and had reached $1.1 billion by 1974. This is not only a serious matter for the textile industry; we on this side of the House suggest it is a serious matter also for Canada. I have already referred to the delays that take place in implementing decisions, and I note here the lengthy and damaging procedural delays which often follow the completion of any inquiry of the Textile Clothing Board. We know that in nine separate cases four months lapsed between the time the board's reports were submitted to the minister and the date when the reports were tabled and made public.

We often hear, and I think very unfairly, that the domestic industry in Canada does not have a good rate of productivity. Let me point out simply that, compared to other countries, and I have already underlined this in terms of job creation, productivity is pretty good. Let us consider comparative statistics here in Canada. Productivity in the textile industry has increased over the past decade at an average rate of 5.1 per cent compared with 4.2 per cent for all manufacturing. I think that is a pretty good record. Let me say to all those critics who suggest that some parts of our textile industry are obsolete, they are obsolete in many instances because the industry will not invest in new, modern plants until it gets some long-term direction from the federal government.

In addition to problems created in the industry by delays and the lack of vigorous administration of textile policy, there are many elements of the policy itself which militate against its stated objective, that is, to provide a sense of direction and a framework and conditions within which the textile and clothing industry can plan and invest with a greater degree of confidence.

Finally, another element of the policy, or lack of it, which has adversely affected the whole industry relates to the required climate of confidence and stability and the necessity of the board to recommend immediate removal of restraint measures or to refrain from recommending new measures on the basis of short-term marketing considerations. I think anyone who recognizes the working of the appeal board and the delays in the short-term considerations recognizes what an important matter this is.

In closing I would say it is apparent to us on this side of the House that the Canadian textile industry is in serious danger. We brought this debate on this afternoon because we believe that unless we have no more commissions, no more studies, no more of this and that, but instead immediate action, the industry will be in greater danger.

I sympathize with the minister because he will have to come down pretty hard on a lot of senior officials who will say to him behind closed doors, "We are expendable, and many of these things will have to go down the drain before we can export this, that, and the other thing." I hope the minister will level with us and give the country in general, and the textile industry in particular, a strategy of hope for the future.

[*Translation*]

For the reasons I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I cannot move this motion. Would you enlighten me, Mr. Speaker? Frankly and sincerely, I find the situation rather complex. May I second . . . but the motion is already seconded—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The motion has already been moved. Notice appeared on the Order Paper and the motion was moved by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Balfour) and seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). The hon. member was just speaking on the motion.

● (1540)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I thank you ever so much for your very kind assistance. Under the circumstances, obviously the only thing for me to do at the end of my three speeches is to ask the House to support our motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, even though the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) did not move the motion I should like to congratulate him for his good intentions. I certainly also wish to express my admiration for his passion regarding the position of the textile industry. I think this does him a great deal of credit. Nevertheless, I think I would be less than frank if I did not say that I found some of his remarks somewhat too simple in the sense that they did not answer the questions. While I can understand the deep emotion behind his concern about the industry, the situation is not as straightforward as he would put it, nor do we have any really clear indication what the Conservative party would be prepared to do officially in this regard.

When the hon. member says that he wants quotas put on and wants to lower imports from other countries completely over a period of years, I can understand that as it affects Canadian workers. However, I cannot understand it as it concerns our international responsibilities. Surely the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, who is well known in this House of Commons for his sentiments regarding assistance to countries around the world, is not serious when he says that Canada should stop all imports from other countries, if I understood him correctly, or place an immediate quota on them until the industry revives, and then when the industry revives, establish some high level of import quota.

Mr. Grafftey: I did not say that.

Mr. Saltsman: The other thing he did not make very clear is whether his party is a high tariff party and whether it wants to see the tariff increased. There is in fact a very considerable tariff on textiles now. I fail to understand his argument when he says that if there were no foreign textile industry Canadian prices of textiles would be higher than they are now. In fact the reason we have some of the highest textile prices in the world is the protection given to the textile industry in Canada, as inadequate as the hon. member may think it is.

The point is that the consumers of Canada are clearly being asked to pay higher prices for the goods they consume in order to protect a vital industry in this country. The question is to what extent can we bring up the level of protection, and to what extent does his party officially stand as a high protection party, and is his leader prepared to go back to Alberta, or to any of the other western provinces which historically have had a grievance with Quebec and Ontario, where the textile industry is located, and where the people have said that they have had to pay through the nose in order to provide jobs in Ontario and Quebec when they could have bought this type of goods at a much lower price, and advocate that?

I think it is grossly unfair for the hon. member in this kind of a situation to say that he thinks there is a problem. In some ways I think this motion misses what is the core of the problem, not only in the textile industry but in other industries as well. I agree with the hon. member when he says that the absence of an industrial strategy is one of the problems. The government never has developed an industrial strategy or, if it has, it has been a piecemeal policy that is squeezed out of it from time to time by accident. Nor do I understand why the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi would take off on the personnel of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The fault lies squarely with the government. A government is responsible for policy.

Why is it that whenever anything goes wrong the Conservative party always places the blame not where is squarely belongs on those who have authority but rather on the public servants. The public servants take orders from the minister and the government who are responsible for policy. If there is something wrong with textile policy they should blame the government and the minister if they wish, but they should not blame the public servants who will do whatever the government tells them to do.

Surely the hon. member is not telling us that if his party were to form the government they would not be able to do anything because public servants would prevent them doing it, or that they would have to have wholesale layoffs of public servants in order to have a textile policy. Surely that is not the case.

I think the most serious reason we have this great present difficulty in the textile industry is the high level of unemployment. When you have 7.4 per cent to 7.5 per cent of the population unemployed no one can think straight about what should be done in terms of our responsibilities to our own people as against our responsibilities internationally. Everyone starts looking inwards and tries to protect every single job. That is very understandable. The point is that there can be no solution for the textile industry or any other worthy industry so long as 7.4 per cent of the people are unemployed, because then the first priority of every member of this House becomes one of getting people back to work and ensuring jobs for the future. The danger is that jobs may be found to our detriment as a country living among other countries in terms of our own responsibilities to other people.

[Mr. Grafftey.]

While we have problems in this country and must consider those problems, I do not think our problems are of such a nature that we have to turn our backs on the rest of the world and say Canada will become protectionist and that what happens in other countries is just too bad, that charity begins at home. Therefore it seems to me that the first priority must be full employment in order to get the textile industry going again. Only under conditions of full employment can any rationalization of industry take place. I have been a person who has looked at this industry over many years. The industry has been in trouble as long as I can remember. There has been one trouble or another. When we have a high level of unemployment such as exists now, then of course demand is low in the country and the purchasing power is not there to pick up a lot of the output. But the industry was in trouble as well when we had a fuller level of employment.

It was not so many years ago that representations were being made to members of parliament to open the flood gates of immigration in order to feed the textile industry of Canada because it could not get people to work in the industry. The point is that under full employment, as difficult as that may be, what happens is that change can take place. When you have full employment, when there are alternate jobs, people can move between industries. The industry can rationalize itself. It knows that there is consumer purchasing power.

What has happened is that some of our textile firms have done very well. They have upgraded their products; they have adjusted the kind of products they make to the high style market and to the kinds of things that do not have to compete with the low wage countries or the mass-produced textiles which can be produced in other countries around the world. They have adjusted, but they have done that under conditions of full employment.

The other concern I have about the speaker who preceded me is that the whole tone of his speech up until the very end was one of concern about investment in the industry, about the employer in the industry. We in this House of Commons must be concerned about everyone. I start from a somewhat different premise. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi I guess was saying that what is good for employers is good for the workers. I have come to another conclusion, that what is good for the workers has to be good for the employers because workers are far more numerous than employers and are less able to look after themselves or adapt to employers.

● (1550)

Under conditions of full employment workers in the textile industry have a number of choices they can make. They can be retrained or they can go to other jobs. Because industry is changing they can find employment, and there is a much better future for them and often for their employers as well. It is a disgrace in this country, and I blame the government for it, not the public servants of this

country—I blame the policy makers of this country for the state of our manufacturing industry.

In this morning's *Globe and Mail* there is an article by Wayne Cheveldayoff in which he lists the deficit in our manufacturing industry. He writes:

> Last year, Canada imported $9.8 billion more of manufactured, inedible end products than it exported—more than double the $4.5 billion deficit of 1972.

Part of that, of course, was textiles but all of it was end products, the kind of things that provide jobs in this country. I agree with the mover, or rather the non-mover of the motion, that the government has traded off raw material irreplaceable exports for jobs in Canada. This was just as true when the Conservatives were in office as when the Liberals were in office. They could never make up their minds whether they wanted Canada to be an exporter of raw materials or to develop its secondary manufacturing industry. They were going to please everyone, but the point is that you cannot please everyone and the evidence is quite clear.

To the extent that we export raw, unfinished goods, we have to import something in exchange. You cannot go on exporting without importing. What is there to bring back? We do not need raw, unfinished goods, so we bring back manufactured goods such as textiles, but textiles form a relatively small dollar part of the sum of $10 billion. What we are doing in fact is exporting jobs when we export raw materials. That is the kind of thing over which the bureaucrats do not have any control. That is a policy decision of the government, or the absence of any policy decision in terms of an industrial strategy, and that is what causes our problem.

The effect of continuing the export of raw materials is to raise the value of the Canadian dollar, especially when on top of exporting raw materials we start raising a hue and cry about the vast amount of capital we have to import into this country in order to build things like the Mackenzie pipeline and other kinds of high capital intensive units such as opening new mines and establishing the infrastructure associated with mines. You cannot create jobs that way. The effect of importing capital is to raise the value of the Canadian dollar, and as that happens it destroys the competitiveness of Canadian secondary industry and it creates a high level of unemployment in this country.

I think it is important when we deal with a subject of this kind to lay the blame where it belongs. We call for the appropriate solution, which must be a policy of full employment. The government has obviously turned down that solution as evidenced in its last budget when it is quite prepared to accept 7.4 per cent unemployment in the country. Difficult as it is for the textile industry, it will be equally difficult for every other manufacturing industry in the country. I think the government must stand condemned for its failure to bring in an industrial strategy, its failure to understand the economy of this country, and if it does understand it it must stand condemned for not acting in terms of its budgetary measures to reduce unemployment in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I also wish to thank the sponsor of today's motion which relates to the textile industry and is extremely important, as was said earlier, particularly for Quebec and Ontario. Everyone knows the great importance of this industry for the economy of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario as well as other parts of the country.

As everybody knows, textiles are essential to the life of a modern people. Is it any wonder that Canadians are among the largest users of textile in the world? Annual purchases of textiles in Canada average in excess of 33 pounds per capita. Canada comes second after the United States for the average textile consumption. Canadian textile plants are located, as I just said, in industrial parts of Quebec and Ontario, close to the large urban markets. More than 80,000 Canadians, that is 6 per cent of the entire manufacturing labour in our country works in the textile industry. Every job in the manufacturing sector creates employment for 1.17 other people in the service, maintenance and repair sectors.

Therefore, the textile industry gives employment to more than 175,000 people who themselves support families, which adds up to over half a million people. The annual production exceeded $1.8 billion last year and the industry is 80 per cent Canadian-owned, which is quite important when one considers that any mature country must have its own textile supplies.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are extremely interesting and show how important the textile industry is in Canada. On the other hand, this industry is not a new one. In Canada, during the forties and the fifties, the primary textile and clothing industry came first as regards the number of jobs provided. In 1972, however, it fell to third place and primary textile plays a crucial part in regional development, particularly in Quebec. The textile industry is typical in that it employs mainly a large number of women. This industry, as I just said, is 80 per cent Canadian-owned.

● (1600)

And in the paper published in the February, 1976 issue of the *Canadian Textile Journal,* statistics and solutions are suggested which, I am sure, the officials in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce have or should have taken into consideration. To this date, we have not seen any recommendation from the federal government taking up the suggestions made by the textile industry itself. Whenever you make recommendations to this House, you are told it has not been proved right. It has been said that there were contradictions in the requests filed by certain manufacturers.

And yet, after having read the briefs submitted by the Textile Manufacturers Association, we have still not seen any government action involving the textile industry. Again this week, I asked a question of the hon. Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) on a similar industry, the footwear industry. He answered that the only recommendation he had made was first to ask the Minister of National Revenue to make inquiries under the Anti-Dumping Act. Inquiries made under the Anti-Dumping Act will not now solve the problem of the textile and footwear industries.

His second suggestion was he hoped the footwear industry would fall under the jurisdiction of the textile industry. Now, the February 1976 issue of the *Canadian Textile*

paper said the Textile Board was not as efficient as we believed it would be when it was established. According to the textile industry, it seems to be bogged down in bureaucracy. We have serious ground to believe that, to raise questions and to put some to both levels of government. The Canadian Textile industry is not the only one to blame for a reduced production, because the provincial government and the federal government especially cannot escape their responsibilities. They have an important part to play in promoting development and growth in the textile industry through better control of imports.

This is becoming increasingly important, especially in view of the fact that while the textile trade deficit was $347 million in 1964, it had reached $918 million in 1973. This means that during the 10-year period, the deficit increased 165 percent. The question arises whether some other industries favoured imports to that extent, and which. However, the Canadian textile industry maintained its activities at the best possible level of efficiency. Capital investments by the industry during that 10-year period totalled $1.5 billion. However, it is unthinkable that any industrialized country would accept to import over 50 percent of its requirements, but unfortunately this is what is happening. It is also unthinkable that any industrialized nation should accept to import over 50 per cent of a basic product as essential as textiles. We have experienced a substantial growth in Canadian consumption in terms of pounds per capita.

The Canadian textile industry offers wages and conditions comparable with the best in the world for that industry. In Canada, a worker gets two weeks' pay after one year of service, compared to one week in the United States. On top of that, the Canadian worker gets 10 paid statutory and other holidays each year, while six only are provided in the United States. I say all this to prove that the textile industry is an old industry in Canada, a basic industry, a specialized industry, and that manufacturers are competent, that they have properly administered their industry. Nevertheless imports are their most dangerous enemy.

Here I am going to be told that we cannot avoid imports, that because of the standard of living in other countries, products which cost less in western countries must be allowed to come in and that we cannot prevent the Canadian people from buying less expensive products when they can be imported. We have here, Mr. Speaker, problem of political economy. We have here a problem of dollars and cents. The result is that, if we are to keep our industry in Canada so as to be our own masters in our own house, as we said on many occasions and particularly as the Liberal government opposite did at the last election, by investing at home and having our industries here, we must have a protectionist policy, and we must have protectionist without penalizing the Canadian people. This means that we must protect both our industries and the consumer. But we cannot protect the consumer because the salaries we have to pay make it impossible for us to produce as cheaply as eastern countries which are able to export textile into Canada because even the raw material in cheaper overthere than here because of the differences in living standards and labour cost. Therefore since we cannot compete with those countries we must protect our own industry and adopt protectionnist trade policies and we must also have a protection policy for the consumer and his purchasing

[Mr. Rondeau.]

power, otherwise there is no way out. We shall always be submerged, flooded with those foreign products which we could very well manufacture ourselves. Instead of producing textile, footwear, furniture and other essential products, we shall see our skilled workers, our experts and manufacturers unemployed or bankrupt. As for those people who will be unemployed, we shall have to give them welfare and unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot solve the problem solely by regulating imports. We must have commercial and economic policies which give individuals and consumers the required purchasing power to buy domestic products according to the standard of living and salary conditions that exist in Canada. Mr. Speaker, this economic system would allow us to balance purchasing power, prices and our production capacity. We shall never be able to compete against other countries. This minister, like his predecessor, who is now president of the Anti-Inflation Board, did not solve anything by creating a Textile Board.

Absolutely nothing has been solved and now the same thing is offered as a solution to the problems of the Canadian footwear industry. This is what shoe manufacturers have asked, but for my part, I have absolutely no confidence in a board which was unable to solve from an economic view point the textile situation in Canada and which will be now asked to solve the problems of the footwear industry in Quebec and the rest of our country. This board, which was unable to solve the problems of the textile industry, will not be able to solve those of the footwear industry.

Canadian shoe manufacturers have in good faith asked the government in their brief submitted in February, that the Textile Board control or supervise the footwear industry. Those manufacturers may not then have realized that the Textile Board, like all other boards unfortunately is a sham established to convince the peopel that the problem will finally be examined, that solutions will be found and that the problem will be dealth with. And that does not happen.

● (1610)

They spend time, they spend money, they exchange correspondence, the minister tells the House he will urge the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) to look into the Anti-dumping Act with regard to cheap imports. But for months and years we have been hearing in this House Ministers of Industry, Trade and Commerce repeating the same tune. And each week we see industries that have to go out of business.

As the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) said a moment ago, in my riding and his in particular, an industry with hundreds and hundreds of employees has recently been forced to wrap up its operation; I am talking about Brock Mills. It was a prosperous, well managed industry which had proven its merit, which produced good quality and which was exporting throughout the world. Well, now, that industry, because of the department's inertia in the field of textile as in other fields—they always hide behind excuses such as our international trade—has been forced out of business. The government takes refuge, it always hides behind the problem of our imports.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the government will rely on imports from other countries to provide Canada with the necessary products and to satisfy the Canadian consumer, either our imports will cost millions and billions of dollars or our unemployment and social welfare measures will cost millions and billions of dollars. We cannot indefinitely come up with the excuse of external trade to solve the problem of the textile, footwear, clothing, and furniture industries and those of the other basic industries in Canada. We must have an economic policy which could help balance the national purchasing power of Canadians with the total of prices.

We must also have a protectionist policy for the Canadian consumers, producers, employees and employers, otherwise we won't find any solution. Tomorrow, Japan will not be our main competitor in textile, it will be another country. The day after tomorrow, again it will be another country which does not have the same standard of living, the same working conditions, the same salaries, which does not live like us, Canadians; however, we are obliged to have idle labour or people who live on welfare benefits even if they are experts, even if until now they have made a living in some basic industry in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the government could say; give us the solutions. We offered some time and time again to finance ministers and to industry and trade ministers, but they do not take them into account. Why should we waste our time giving solutions to this government which does not want to know anything, which does not want to hear anything and which relies only on its bureaucracy.

We can only criticize the government. Why? Because it does not want to hear about solutions. They seem to think that the solution is only within the Liberal party. Only the Liberals have received the light from the Holy Spirit and only they can rule the country. In spite of all the solutions we propose in the House, nobody listens to us. The solutions put forward by members of Parliament are not taken into account any more than those put forward by Canadian manufacturers in the footwear, textile, clothing or other basic industries. They are laughed at. For example, the same problem occurred recently in the agricultural field.

Bureaucrats run our administration and, unfortunately, our ministers in the House only repeat aloud what the bureaucrats think. I am sorry, I hate to say this to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) whom I consider as a nice guy, as someone who gives answers in the House, but, on the other hand, I think that the bureaucrats hiding behind the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce do not advise him as they should. I also regret, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as a minister tries to "shake his officials, his bureaucrats and his technocrats and begins to assert himself, he is transferred to another department.

As soon as a minister begins to take control of his department, to know his way around and to assert himself in order to find worthwhile solutions, unfortunately he is transferred to another department, and we are back to square one. When I see a cabinet shuffle, I am sad because I feel the minister being transferred was just about to find the proper answers. Would it be because he has become too troublesome, too much of a nuisance for his officials that he has to be transferred? I am getting very suspicious, Mr. Speaker.

We only have to read the numerous briefs submitted to us to find, for instance, that the Canadian footwear industry lost 46 per cent of its domestic market. During the first six months of this year, Canadian manufacturers shipped 23,158,000 pairs of shoes, or 46 per cent of all shipments on the Canadian market, while imports accounted for 27,628,000 pairs, or 54 per cent of the market.

Mr. Speaker, those figures were given to us by the industry, by those who made that footwear. The brief was presented to the Canadian Committee on Tariff and Trade on October 10, 1975. At the end of the brief, on finds the recommendations or conclusions put forward to the various departments and, in this case, to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Still, those solutions are not to be found in the act. They are no longer acknowledged, nowhere to be found. That means that they are not taken into account, that the arguing and "fooling around" continues in the system that had been set up.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have to speak in this fashion. We are aware of the difficulties our domestic industries are experiencing, we know that every year people come to us out of concern when they realize the industry is decreasing its output by 25, 30 or even 40 per cent. Those people wonder, at 40 or 45 years of age, where, after having worked in the textile industry for 20 or 25 years, they can find a new job when that industry has to fold up.

Those are the problems put to us, the representations made to us by our constituents and we must take them into account. That is why I say that, if we had praise and congratulations to offer the minister, we would be happy to do so. On the other hand, as we have to bear the pressures of the public, of the people who earn their living in the footwear industry, on the employees and employers whose livelihood depends on that industry, we are forced to bring those matters to the attention of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who is responsible for the situation. However, I do hope we will not have to wait ten years till this is achieved, and that the minister will take whatever means are necessary to remedy the situation in an industry that is extremely important to Canada and especially to eastern Canada.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I can undertand to some degree the confusion on the part of hon. members opposite as to who was the mover of the motion before the House, since I think the language is more that of the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) than that of the hon. member under whose name the motion appears. I know there are many humorous stories about "politicians viewing with alarm," but I never thought I would see this language included in a motion moved in this House. In case hon. members have not noted the excessive language in the motion, may I read it to them? It says:

> That this House views with alarm the accelerating collapse of the Canadian textile industry, rejects the fatalistic inertia of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and demands serious action to counter the ruinous pressure from excessive high import levels.

It would be hard to include in that kind of motion many more spectacular words.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I wish I had said it.

Mr. Jamieson: I am glad this motion was moved, because it gives me the opportunity to say some things about the textile industry.

First, of course, the textile industry is a problem sector of the Canadian industrial economy. After listening to hon. members opposite—indeed, I suppose to many people on this side—one might get the impression that this is the only country in the world in which the textile industry is in difficulty; whereas I know, from my travels, that the industry is in great difficulty in all industrialized countries, and in some less developed countries as well. What we have heard today has been, for the most part, largely a repetition of the sorts of things which have been said about the industry for many years. I think it is fair to say that, by and large, they are generalizations.

With the greatest of respect for the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, whose speech I enjoyed immensely, as I always do, he used "textiles" as an all-embracing, all-encompassing word, as if only a single commodity were involved; whereas the textile industry is made up of many different sectors.

Mr. Lawrence: The whole thing is sick.

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member suggests that the whole industry is sick. I do not know where his shirt was made; probably it was made in Taiwan.

An hon. Member: The industry is your responsibility.

Mr. Jamieson: I do not mind if hon. members want a little sparring match, but I wanted to be serious and give hon. members some information. I hope hon. members will do me the courtesy of allowing me to make my remarks.

Mr. Lawrence: We are waiting.

Mr. Jamieson: As I was saying, the textile industry is complex and involves many different sectors, some of which are frequently at odds with each other. I am thinking, for example, of the basic material aspect of the business as opposed to the finished goods aspect. I hope in the time that I have to demonstrate where quite frequently these can be at odds and can make it even more difficult to devise a comprehensive and all-embracing policy.

● (1620)

Let me first put to rest something which the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi said or suggested, that is that in some way or another there is a view in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce that this industry, and I think I use the word he used, is expendable. The simple truth is that that is not so. He asked me to level with him and the House.

I can say that I do not recall a single instance in which anybody has made that point. I might say that is one of the documents at which I was looking, there is a clear-cut comment by the department that a viable textile industry is an important sector for Canada and that it is a large employer. It confirms in fact something which the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi said, namely, that they are an employer of a particular type of worker for whom it is not always easy to obtain alternative employment. For that reason it is even more important for it to be kept in as good a shape as possible.

Statistics that have been thrown around in this debate can be read in many different ways. However, I hope that some I quote will give a rough idea that things are not as bad over the whole industry as has been said. Nor are we as much the victims of imports as has been suggested.

For example, in the total textile market, that is, primary and made up goods, and I make that distinction because it is important, in dollar terms, domestic producer shipments amounted to 77.6 per cent of the total market for 1975. In dollar terms, of total textile imports, and this is an important point, 72 per cent came from industrialized countries and only about 20 per cent from low cost countries. That is something that very frequently gets overlooked.

We tend to assume that the problems of the textile industry are because of large imports from some of the so-called low cost countries. In fact the biggest country from which we import and the largest quantities is the United States, followed by some of the countries in Europe. I make that point because it indicates that the idea of tariffs, or even of quotas in the conventional sense of the word, is not really going to be all that much help in terms of the United States market. For example, in recent weeks a good deal has been said about certain kinds of polyester yarn coming in from the United States. It has been suggested that this has obviously been harmful to the Canadian industry and, in fact, that there might be dumping involved. The truth is that there is no evidence of this. In fact it is primarily because the polyester market in the United States is soft. Therefore prices have come down in that country.

This brings up a continuing problem in this industry. That is the fact that styles, fashions, and public demands change. In this particular case there has been a dramatic decline in the popularity of the double knit market in terms of fashions. There are other members of the House who might be better able than I to comment on this. This has had a very traumatic effect in terms of that aspect of the industry.

There are three factors that exercise the greatest impact on the structure of the textile industry. I should like to address myself to one of these because it relates to something which the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi said, namely, the size of the domestic market. Part of the difficulty we have in this industry, as in many others, is the relatively small domestic base on which we have to work by comparison with, for example, the United States or some of the larger areas such as the European Economic Community, or Japan. In other words, we do not have that very big domestic market on which to draw. This gives us problems in the textile industry in terms of scale and also in terms of the range of the demand of the public.

In Canada we cannot produce the whole range of textile products, apparel, and related items because of our comparatively small domestic base. This is one problem that is related to the question I mentioned a moment ago, that is, that consumers desire variety which tends to fragment the production line and makes it much more costly.

Somebody in the textile industry said to me the other day in one of my meetings that if you stood at the corner of St. Catherine and Peel in Montreal for the whole day, you probably would not find two ladies going by with exactly the same kind of dress or same pattern of dress. That gives some indication of how broad the range is that has to be produced. I repeat, since it is a relatively small base on which they have to work, it adds to their costs.

I already mentioned the proximity of the United States. Incidentally, in comparing the Canadian textile industry with its counterpart in the United States, and I have said this before, there is some validity in the examination. It can also be misleading since the economies of scale which I mentioned allow the United States to get better production runs and better costs.

In this connection it is interesting to note some of the references that were made only recently by one of the largest unions involved in the textile industry. I would like to quote from it because I think it is a carefully thought out study. The union is the Centrale des Syndicats Démocratiques, the CSD. It recently presented a highly professional analysis which I recommend to hon. members who have a special interest in this subject. I quote from the study:

> Imports are the scapegoat of this industry. We do not mean to say that their importance is negligible—we have already noted the increasing part of the Canadian market which they are securing—but rather that, even if the domestic market were completely monopolized by Canadian producers, the rate of expansion in textile industry would still not be comparable to that of the key industries. As we said earlier, the decline in this sector is partly due to its very nature (i.e., the weak revenue elasticity of the demand for its products).

In the same report there is a reference to comparisons with other countries and the base in terms of how we protect our industry versus other countries. Here they quote the industry spokesmen:

> Textile imports, they maintain, are respectively $10, $22 and $9 per capita in the United States, the United Kingdom and the European Community, whereas they are $30 in Canada in 1969-70.

This may have changed somewhat since that time, but probably not significantly.

> According to these figures, Canadian producers seem to have relatively little protection against foreign competitors.

That is the impression given by the statistic.

> In fact, the situation is quite different. Per capita imports in no way indicate the degree of protection; these figures are based essentially on two factors: the size of the country and the relative cost of production of textile fabrics in each country. The size of the country determines its reliance on the outside world;

That is what I was commenting on a moment ago.

> —the larger the country, the lower the figure for per capita imports ... If these comparisons are limited to countries similar in size to Canada, Canadian textile producers seem well protected, per capita textile imports being respectively $78, $63 and $69 in Holland, Belgium and Sweden,—

These are countries of smaller populations, relatively speaking, than ours, but in the same general range. Therefore the suggestion that we are less protective is not borne out by the facts or statistics.

Also there is some real question as to whether short of total abolition of imports, you can carry out the protective mechanisms in terms of textiles very much beyond what we are doing at the present time without increasing costs, as the hon. member said would happen if we let the textile industry die. The same would probably apply if we put on very heavy tariff protections beyond what we have now. When all is said and done, we are going to need and will continue to need considerable fabrics from offshore.

I mention here what I referred to in my earlier remarks, namely, the difficulty between the finished goods manufacturer and the primary goods manufacturer. Obviously in most instances the finished goods manufacturer wishes to get his materials from as wide a range of resources as possible. He likes to have in large part an assured domestic supply, and at the same time to be able to draw on offshore markets.

One of the reasons for continuing studies, and I agree with the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi that they can go on interminably, but unfortunately are necessary, is that we have to get the apparel people and the primary production people together to try to figure out if we are going to go to a global quota system, as has been recommended, and how this would work in a satisfactory way for both sectors and for that whole range of products.

● (1630)

As I mentioned earlier, the industry is not in as bad a shape as some of the worst "doom and gloom" commentators suggest. The fact is that a recovery is now under way in several sectors. Other sectors are, as I mentioned, in real difficulty; nobody quarrels with that statement, and we are considering what additional steps may be necessary, particularly with regard to the polyesters and related products.

Incidentally, I should like to get together with the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi because the statistics I have on employment in the industry differ from those he quoted. In any event, proportionately there was exactly the same percentage of lay-offs in the United States in the year 1973-74 as in Canada. In other words, there was a general recession brought about primarily by the oil prices of 1973; so many of these products have a petroleum base that large inventories were built up world-wide as a hedge against anticipated problems. These did not materialize to the extent expected and there was subsequently, therefore, a sharp decline in production and sales. To a large extent, that situation has now ironed itself out and here in Canada a recovery is in progress in most sectors. Indeed, some are working at effective capacity, so the picture is not one entirely without promise. I have already mentioned the double-knits; I want to see what we can do about the materials used in these.

There is increased capacity in certain low-cost countries which produce garments, and this has resulted in increased pressure from imports, for example in the area of men's suits, shirts, and outerwear. In all those categories, action has been taken by the Textile and Clothing Board. Virtually all the low-cost countries from which we import are subject to some form of quota. The only case in which we have not gone as far as the board has suggested relates to certain types of outerwear, and we have placed these under surveillance to determine from which country these garments are coming so that we may consider in realistic terms what quota arrangements might be necessary. Only last week, for example, we put a global quota on work

gloves. A whole range of other finished goods and materials is already subject to quota. Thus I do not think it is fair to say that no action has been taken or that public servants have not moved as quickly as possible when crises develop.

I do not, however, deny the legitimacy of the claim that the process is on the slow side. I have looked into this and asked that once a report comes in from the Clothing and Textile Board there should be no delay in taking appropriate action. In this connection I am faced with something of a dilemma. We could table the report quite quickly after it is received from the board, but the policy has been to hold off publication of the report until a decision has been made on the action to be taken.

I notice the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) is laughing. My point is that if we table the report without announcing simultaneously a decision as to the action to be taken, a whole new series of representations might be generated, and this might delay the process still further. For the present we think it advisable to receive the report, decide on a course of action, and then make an announcement accordingly. If hon. members believe a variation in that procedure would spend up the process I would be glad to hear their views.

The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi made some comments about studies. While this is not my first line of attack on any problem, I might tell him that we do have a study under way at the present time at the request of the parties concerned. Incidentally, I have appointed a union representative to the committee for the first time. The group to which I refer has instructions to report by the end of this month and its terms of reference, together with the preamble, might be worth reading.

In the light of representations that have been received to the effect that:

(a) the Canadian market for textiles and clothing continues to be severely disrupted by imports,

(b) there is a need for improvement in the administration of the import control elements of the textile policy, and,

(c) the currently employed "selective" approach to special measures of protection against "low-cost" imports is ineffective,

it has been decided to form an ad hoc committee composed of three senior executives from the Canadian primary textile industry, three from the Canadian apparel industry, one representative from each of the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Industry Development and the Assistant Deputy Minister, International Trade Relations of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The Committee will be chaired by the Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Operations, of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

The mandate of this committee shall be to:

(1) review current conditions and prospects in the textile and clothing industries and in their market situation,

(2) review the administration of the policy in relation to import competition,

(3) examine the appropriateness, given existing legislation and instruments, of implementing the policy in terms of Articles 3 and 4 of the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles and Article XIX of the G.A.T.T.,

(4) report its findings and recommendations to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce not later than June 30, 1976.

This committee, I am informed, is working very effectively and is considered likely to come up with firm recommendations for immediate implementation. I have no hesitation in saying that I am prepared to move quickly once some consensus is reached as to what the appropriate action ought to be.

There are many other issues I could discuss if there were sufficient time. One of the things I should like to mention is the whole question of our attitude toward so-called emerging countries. I agree that we must do, as indeed we are doing, a commendable job as Canadians in relating to those countries. I have said to them as recently as March of this year, in the five countries of southeast Asia, that they ought not to think in terms of their industrial development, basing it on such as things as textiles, or one of the problem areas we have, footwear. It will not only make it more difficult for us to be of assistance to them in terms of what they can export to Canada; they will also be competing among themselves in a way which inevitably will be very harmful to their underdeveloped economy.

● (1640)

Having said that, the reality is that for the less developed countries one of the easiest and most labour intensive kinds of activity into which they can move once they start developing economically tends to be textiles. Therefore we have to negotiate with them voluntary quotas in some cases; or, in the last analysis, if they do not work, we must sit down with them and tell them that this is the maximum amount that we are prepared to bring in from a particular country.

Nevertheless we also have to understand and recognize, as one of the committees of the House stated unanimously in a report on international affairs, that we have to provide some kind of access to these countries if we are going to be credible in terms of other things that we are seeking to do internationally. Therefore it is a thin line between protectionism, if you like, in terms of looking after domestic industry, which clearly must be the number one responsibility, and at the same time not talk out of both sides of our mouths at the same time, as it were, when we talk to these undeveloped countries.

I think that up to now we have done a reasonably good job to keep the situation in some kind of balance, particularly, I repeat, since the biggest single source of imports into Canada is still the United States by a very wide margin. There the relationship as to how we work out bilateral agreements, or whatever might be possible under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, is much more difficult and complex than is the case with the less developed world.

While acknowledging that there are major problems in this industry, I have to reject, of course, the idea contained in the motion that virtually nothing is being done and that in some way or other we are allowing a flood of low cost imports to destroy this particular industry. I most emphatically say that whatever may be the case in some sectors of private industry, where I have heard the view expressed, as the hon. member also said, that the textile industry is expendable, I have a complete appreciation of the view expressed by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi that this is an important, indeed essential industry.

It is made all the more so for another reason he mentioned which, by the way, I could broaden beyond his reference to textiles. One of the things that is positively frightening when you contemplate economic development

in Canada is the incredible number of one industry towns, not merely textile towns but towns with industries like pulp and paper and mining. The vulnerability of so many of these communities is really a nightmare to contemplate if we do have some kind of across the board slump in some of these rather basic industries, of which of course textiles is one. For that reason, if for no other, it certainly deserves the support not only of the government but of the country.

From what I have said—and I will be glad to provide a detailed list of protectionist (if that is not too strong a word) actions that have been taken—I think it is clear that where there have been identified problem areas some action has been taken, perhaps not as much as the industry might like in some instances, but nevertheless some action has been taken. In terms of this new study, if the global quota turns out to be a more practical approach, then we will look at it seriously. But remember that the basis of the policy, which was endorsed by every member of this House, was against that kind of concept and was based on a high or relatively high tariff, certainly high by today's standard, of about 25 per cent, and selective action on particular commodities or sectors which were giving trouble.

To go to the global quota would be to move completely away from that concept, which I repeat was universally approved of at the time it was introduced about four or five years ago. But if it has to be done, then there is certainly nothing in terms of the laws of the Medes and the Persians about what we have now. We are quite prepared to look at an alternative approach.

I take it that my time is just about up, Mr. Speaker, and I simply want to say that I believe we are taking as well as moving toward some quite decisive actions in the textiles field, and that as the general recovery goes on I hope this will also be reflected in this particular sector, namely, the textile industry.

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the remarks made by the hon. minister with great interest and I should just like to make one comment. He has on a number of occasions been described as a master of circumlocution, but when it came to his description of how he handles the reports of the textile and clothing board, I really thought he outdid himself.

Mr. Jamieson: Oh, come on. Why don't you give me the answer to the question I asked?

Miss MacDonald: If you listen you will get a few answers.

I rise to take part in this debate for a number of reasons. I first became interested in the problems facing the Canadian textile industry and its synthetic fibres component because it is a major employer in my constituency and the area which surrounds it. But this is not merely an issue of local concern. A number of communities throughout the country are directly affected, and the issue has implications for the secondary manufacturing sector as a whole and for our international trade policy.

The plain fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian textile industry and the associated Canadian fibres industry are in serious trouble. They are losing control of the Canadian market and that has meant and will mean lay-offs, cutbacks in capital and research and development investment, a huge trade deficit, and a shift of new investment to the better protected market in the United States.

The causes are complex—competition from countries whose wage levels permit them to undersell domestic manufacturers in the Canadian market, lack of global quotas, and the situation which currently exists in the United States and which has a spillover effect on Canada, to which the minister referred. Something clearly needs to be done.

That is all very well, the doctrinaire free trader may say, but this industry already has tariff protection, anti-dumping laws do exist, some quotas on imports are in place. If these industries are in trouble even with this protection, it is conclusive proof to the doctrinaire free trader that the industry is not competitive in the market place and should be phased out so that the resources allocated to it may be transferred to more productive sectors of the economy. Moreover, he would agree that by opening up our market to imports from Third World countries we not only ensure cheaper prices for the consumer but we assist in the development of those nations' manufacturing sector.

I have heard these arguments repeatedly, and at first hearing they sound very persuasive. Why worry about the demise of the textile industry? To hear this argument one would think its passing would be a national blessing that would, in one fell swoop, bring us a step closer to industrial rationalization, cheaper consumer goods and a fairer distribution of wealth with the developing nations. But it is not quite that simple. We are talking here today about an industry which directly employs 200,000 people, which contributes $5 billion to the Gross National Product, and provides the main economic base for many communities in this country.

Let us be clear about it; we are not talking about the phasing out of an industry as part of some national industrial strategy which will provide alternate employment for its workers and new industries for the communities affected. No, indeed, we are talking about an industry which is in danger of being phased out by default. Indeed we are talking about a situation which has developed in large part because the government has failed through procrastination and inertia to take the steps necessary to fulfil the expressed intent of the Canadian textile policy as it was set out in 1970.

● (1650)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: We have a policy on paper which pledges to create conditions to provide a framework for planning, investment, and development in the industry, and to reverse the decline which it experienced during the 1960's. Yet this policy has been applied with such a lack of conviction, with such procrastination, and in so irresolute a fashion it has disrupted planning, discouraged investment, and cut back on development in the industry. The government vowed to help save the industry, and then has acted as if that expression of its good intentions was sufficient to carry out this difficult and complex task. That simply is not good enough.

A chronic weakness of the government has been that its departments often work at cross purposes to one another. Here we have something even more appalling; a ministry whose implementation of a policy works at cross purposes to the announced intent of that policy.

It is time the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Commerce decided whether or not it wants a strong textile industry in this country, regardless of what the minister had to say this afternoon in his obsequiously expressed concern for the industry. It has to make up its mind whether or not we want a strong textile industry in this country and, if it does, whether it is prepared to take the steps necessary to give that industry a reasonable chance to survive and grow. If it concludes that this industry should be phased out, then let it say so directly and accept the consequences of that decision. If that is what the government intends, let it plan now to cushion the blow to the employees and the communities that will be affected. Let it assess the adverse impact of that step on the balance of trade; let it calculate the effect of that balance of trade deficit on interest rates. Let it investigate the spinoff effects on such related areas as the petro-chemical and synthetic industries. In short, let it cease its present inconsistency between its theory and its practice.

Consistency is the least we should expect, but it is not enough that the government make a decision on this matter. It must make the right decision. In my considered opinion we do need a strong textile industry in Canada. We need it as part of a strong secondary manufacturing sector, both to provide employment and to enhance the strength of the national economy.

Nobody but the most shortsighted nationalist or the most doctrinaire protectionist wants to gouge the consumer to shelter artificial and inefficient industries in this country. But the Canadian textile industry and the synthetic fibre industries associated with it do not fit that stereotype. They are efficient and they are productive. Their annual level of price increase during the past decade is 2 per cent less than that of the manufacturing sector as a whole. Considerable capital investment has been undertaken; $1.7 billion in the last decade, to modernize plant and machinery, and productivity in that decade has gone up 5.1 per cent a year compared to 4.2 per cent for all manufacturing.

The Canadian textile industry is in trouble today not because it is inefficient and unproductive, but because it pays substantially higher wages to its employees than most of its international competitors, and because it is not possible for it to negotiate global quotas. Far from being heavily sheltered or heavily subsidized, the Canadian textile market is relatively wide open. We have only a minuscule part of our market covered by import quotas, 6 per cent as compared to 7 per cent in the United States, and those quotas which amount to only 6 per cent are often short-term as opposed to the three to five-year import quotas many other countries impose. Moreover, they have to be negotiated item by item for each sector of the industry, a time consuming, complex, and frustrating procedure which places the Canadian textile industry at a great disadvantage compared to other industrialized countries which do utilize the global quota system. The result is that when some country wants to engage in distress selling, the natural dumping ground is Canada.

Canada is certainly doing its share to provide export opportunities for Third World countries. We hold a smaller percentage of our domestic market than any other country, and that would be the case by a margin of some 15 per cent even if the recommendation of the Senate committee, that 65 per cent of the Canadian market be held for Canadian manufacturers, were accepted without amendment.

I have great sympathy for the cause of economic development in the Third World, and I agree with many of the proposals they put forward at the recent UNCTAD conference in Nairobi, Kenya, to ensure fairer prices for the commodities Third World countries produce. But let us not delude ourselves into thinking that the Canadian market alone is big enough to provide an outlet for all the developing world's textile industries and all of their produce.

If we really want to help these countries, let us work to get the European Economic Community and the United States to open up their textile markets somewhat wider as part of an international agreement. That would be one way in which we could help developing countries. We cannot, as the former minister of industry, trade and commerce said when he brought in the Canadian textile policy in 1970, "assume alone the responsibility for an unliberalized textile world." By attempting to do so we may progressively destroy our own industry while providing only marginal benefits to the developing countries. That is not enlightened compassion, it is senseless sacrifice of a key sector of the national economy of little use to the nations on whose behalf the sacrifice is made.

If we were to abandon every sector of the economy which cannot compete with international competition because of labour costs then we would indeed be embarking on a journey down a slippery slope. Except in a few resource based industries, and those in which transportation costs provide natural protection, we have very few industries in this country which are immune to the plight in which the textile and fibre industries now find themselves.

It used to be that we could overcome labour cost differentials by having better access to technology than the low wage countries, but that advantage is fast disappearing. Let me give you some figures in this regard. In salaries and research facilities, a basic two-person research team composed of a scientist and a technician costs between $65,000 and $90,000 a year. For research and development to be warranted there must be a stable domestic market that will offer the kind of dollar return in business that warrants this expense. But because the textile industry has been losing control of the domestic market, it has cut back on research and development. The situation in my own area illustrates this trend.

● (1700)

Prior to 1970 in Kingston and the Islands and in Frontenac-Lennox and Addington there were three Canadian research organizations devoted to the synthetic fibres manufacturing business. Since then Celanese has closed down its Canadian research facilities. DuPont has closed two labs related exclusively to fibres research and has cut

its personnel in research and development fibres work by 70 per cent, leaving only some research and development work at its central research facilities in Kingston. All these cutbacks and shutdowns resulted directly from market conditions. In other words, our major competitive advantage, that is, better technology, is being eroded because we are losing control of our market. Surely this is a vicious circle which is of serious national concern.

But the danger goes deeper than that. Technology can now be transferred around the world more and more rapidly. It can be moved at a fairly early stage of its life cycle to lower wage-cost countries. This has special significance to Canada. Because our domestic market is smaller—and the minister referred to this—than that of the United States or the European Economic Community, manufacturing is frequently only warranted several years later than in larger market units. If this market size delay closely corresponds to the time delay in applied technology transferred to lower labour cost situations, then Canada will be in a uniquely disadvantageous position in the future.

We have been discussing the plight of the Canadian textile industry. This is a matter of legitimate and great concern. But the greater concern must be as to whether the same syndrome of drift and indecision on the part of the government will make what is happening to the textile industry a preview of what will happen to the whole of secondary manufacturing enterprise in Canada. That sector is usually one of the more stable elements in our economy. If it goes, we are left with only the resource based industries and the tertiary service sector. More and more we would revert to the colonial-type economy, hewers of wood and drawers of water, which we rejected 100 years ago. More and more we would be dependent on our non-renewable resources to make our way in the world. As a nationalist I cannot consent to that kind of future. The first leader of this country made it his life's work to prevent such a future, and that is one tradition we on this side intend to maintain.

We are paying a price now for moving by default in the direction I have just outlined. Our textile trade deficit last year was $1.1 billion. To balance that outflow of cash Canada is maintaining high interest rates. And with what result? Escalating costs for running the federal and provincial governments and for building roads, schools and hospitals across the country; high interest rates on mortgage loans, and high rents for apartments; unemployment in areas where it is difficult to find alternative employment. The result is that depressed communities and regions in this country will wither and stagnate even more.

Taking all these consequences into consideration we are paying a big price for slightly cheaper clothing and it is symptomatic of a deeper malaise. Through drift, inconsistency, procrastination, and inertia the government is slowly but surely eroding Canada's economic base. There is no challenge to national purpose, and fundamental issues are being treated with bandaids. There can only be one result, Mr. Speaker, national mediocrity. Let us turn away from that road. Let us begin by setting the textile industry in order and let that be the first step toward ensuring the continued growth and development of a strong, efficient, and productive secondary manufacturing sector of which Canadians can be proud.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate and to deal with two specific points. First of all, I should like to point out the government's positive record of assistance to the textile industry since May 1970 and secondly, to deal with the present conditions in an important Drummondville textile plant, the Celanese Canada Limited.

With regard to the history of the textile industry in Canada, allow me to briefly recall the following facts: we know that early in 1970, a study of the textile and clothing industry was carried out by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. This study was conducted with the co-operation of other departments concerned after consultation with officials in the industry, the unions and the provincial governments directly involved. The study was undertaken for three main reasons: first, important basic changes in technology, production and demand have created new competitive conditions in those industries in Canada as well as abroad.

Second, the policy designed to settle the problem created by cheap imports had become most difficult to administer, causing undue delays and concerns detrimental to both producers and workers. Third, textile plants, unions and provinces had expressed strong reservations regarding the existing policy in terms of employment and future investments in the industry as well as their impact on regional expansion.

In its review of the situation, the government has taken into consideration the possible contribution of those industries to the whole economy, the need for employment stability, the regional and local implications, the consumer interests, the importance of our export trade and of our international responsibilities. The resulting policy has been set out following the review of the textile and clothing industries. The textile policy has been formally announced by the then Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, namely the previous representative of my constituency of Drummond, on May 14, 1970. This policy had four main items. First, gradual recovery of the industry towards viable production sectors capable of sustaining ever stronger competition at the international level; second, improvement of legal mechanisms and administrative procedures to deal effectively with the problems of prejudices suffered by Canadian producers because of imports; third, transitional assistance to corporations and workers; fourth, assistance in the areas of technology and marketing.

In the course of the implementation of this policy, the following steps have been taken by the government: The establishment of the Textile and Clothing Board was announced on November 5, 1970 and its three members were appointed on the same date. As everyone knows, the board must make an investigation at the minister's request and it can launch an investigation at the industry's request or on its own. Since its inception, the Textile Board has conducted inquiries on 18 textile and clothing products, for a grand total of 45 inquiries, studies or reviews of these products. Further, it is now looking into two products that were not reviewed previously and reexamining three products that have already been the subject of an inquiry.

Textile Industry

● (1710)

At the present time, eight low cost countries or countries that have nationalized trade are subject to various export restrictions involving 12 products, over and above total restrictions on imports of shirts for men and boys. Other actions have also been taken. A number of programs are being used to help the textile and clothing industries restructure their operations, improve their efficiency and expand their markets. First, from the financial assistance view point, we have the General Adjustment Assistance Program which has been amended to include measures particularly tailored to textile and clothing manufacturers who are now applying their restructuration plan.

Since 1970 44 companies received grants under this program for a total amount of $22 million guaranteed by the government. In addition, 11 companies received grants totalling $45,000 during the same period. Under the Productivity Enhancement Program—PEP—grants covering up to half the cost of feasibility studies were made available to 97 companies for a total amount of $762,000.

Research and development were encouraged: 25 to 30 businesses received assistance every year under the Industrial and Research Development Incentive Act—the IRDIA program. The marketing of products or methods resulting from research work since 1970 brought about expenditures of $2.7 million under PAIT, the Program for Advancement of Industrial Technology.

A second program to promote exports: Canadian companies in the export business received considerable support and produced good results. A third program—manpower training and rehabilitation—and a fourth program—assistance to fashion design—under which millions of dollars were spent by the federal government to help one way or another the textile and clothing industry in Canada. There is also the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. We know that under the Regional Development Incentives Act assented to on July 9, 1969 to promote the creation of productive jobs in designated areas in Canada needing special measures to promote economic development and social progress, textile companies received between 1970 and 1975 grants offers of over $29 million.

Recently, the Senate had a special inquiry, and the minister appeared before the Senate committee. The following points were made: first, that the recent representations made by the industry to the Senate committee as well as to the minister personally contain elements of truth but are not accurate on the whole. It was also determined that when the industry singled out imports from low-cost countries statistics show, as the minister pointed out earlier, that the great majority of imports come from developed countries, particularly the United States. Third, it was shown that imports from low-cost countries are an important factor in the problem as a whole. It was also shown that industry hires a large number of people difficult to retrain. Finally, it was pointed out before that committee that industry showed vision, imagination and that its efforts to rationalize and modernize structures were successful. I am happy with the suggestions of the minister who says that in his opinion the textile industry is essential, that it is an important industrial sector, that he is aware of the legitimate desire of the industry for stability and that he has no thought whatsoever of sacrificing the textile industry to increase Canadian imports from developing countries.

There was some reference to an ad hoc advisory committee of clothing and textile industries which was recently established. The minister spoke in detail of the mandate of that committee, and I am glad to find out that following my intervention in the House on May 19 last, asking for the representation of employees from the textile sector on this important committee responsible for reviewing the whole textile policy in Canada, this request has been agreed to and the minister confirmed today that spokesmen for textile employees are now members of that important committee so as to express the constructive views of the employees from that important sector of industry who want to protect and keep their jobs.

This leads me to talk about the specific problem now prevailing at Drummondville, in the riding of Drummond which I represent, in the plant of Celanese Canada Limited. The dispute in this plant is no longer a private confrontation between management and labour. More than 1,600 textile workers having been without their regular jobs for several weeks, almost two months now, it is clear that the situation has become dramatic for them, their families and the whole community.

As soon as I was elected member of parliament for Drummond nearly two years ago, I asked local employers to make a special effort to improve employment conditions and wages in a region where wages were among the lowest in Canada. Most businesses in the area reacted well and made an effort, and the situation is now improving. I warmly contratulate all those employers and I thank them for their cooperation.

As concerns the Celanese plant, which is the largest employer in Drummondville, I must say that I am disappointed to see that it does not seem to want to react favourably to my appeal. In view of the constant and increased efforts on the part of the federal government to help the textile industry, as I have just shown, it would be normal that Celanese Canada of Drummondville demonstrate a greater social conscience. This long lockout by Celanese is an insult to the population.

I find it completely unacceptable and scandalous that a multinational company can so deny its responsibilities as good citizen and can betray so arrogantly not only its employees, which make up a high proportion of the local manpower, but also the rest of the population in an area which is desperately trying to increase its low economic growth rate. In view of its importance and of the evolution of Drummondville, this plant should cooperate, offer itself as an example, and consequently, not abuse a right conferred by the Quebec Labour Code. In the present case, this radical position is clearly irrespectful of the rights and qualities of the textile employees who have certainly not been among the best paid workers in the past and who are now nearly defenceless and resourceless.

It is more than time for Celanese to show, as an important citizen of Drummondville, a true social conscience, like it should in a society which wants to be just and needs to renew itself. It is because I am concerned for my constituents' economic and social welfare which is now in danger that I make an urgent appeal to those responsible: 1—for this lockout to stop immediately; 2—for negotiations

to take place in good faith and without delay; 3—not Celanese employees to be granted the excellent working conditions that they deserve and that the employer can give them.

I finally succeeded in reaching the general manager of this company last Thursday, June 10, and I asked him to put an end immediately to this lock-out. He told me that he could not then promise me that he would do so in the near future, but that he would talk about it to the other managers and his superiors. Today, June 16, the lockout is still on and nearly 1,600 employees are deprived of their means of subsistence. Incidentally, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all those, and there are many of them, who make peaceful demonstrations in good faith or who help Celanese employees in other ways. I urge all the population to support morally the employees who are victim of the lockout at Celanese, and I hope that landlords, businessmen and creditors will be patient with those people who are now without any means of support. Those humanitarian gestures can only add to the pride and credit of my fellow citizens.

If, today, for the love of strategy, the big employers want to use lockouts systematically in their fight against big unions, for God's sake let them avoid doing so on the back of the vulnerable textile sector, on the backs of 1,600 workers at Drummondville, and above all, let them choose another battlefield than a city like Drummondville where efforts are being made to improve the low rate of economic growth. My stand, in view of the circumstances, is definitely not incompatible with the spirit of the anti-inflation act and its regulations, quite the contrary.

The Celanese Company at Drummondville which employs, as we know, over 500 employees, benefits from the exception provided by the act. The workers' contract was signed before January 1, 1974. In addition, the contract expired some time in April 1975, that is before the anti-inflation act became effective on October 14, 1975. Consequently, in view of the act and resulting regulations, and especially regulation No. 44, the Celanese workers are considered exceptions and are not limited to 12 per cent salary increases; so they can negotiate without any ceiling; when an agreement is reached with the employer for an increase of 18 per cent, 25 per cent or more this agreement must be submitted to the Anti-Inflation Board for approval. The board can endorse the agreement as submitted or change it; if it does change it there is an opportunity to appeal since an amendment was made recently to the Anti-Inflation Act.

As we can see, a special consideration criterion applies to labour groups who signed their last contract before January 1, 1974 if that contract expired before October 14, 1975 and a new contract was not signed before October 14, 1975. In other words those contracts were signed before the fast escalation of the cost of living that started in 1974. So protection is given to those employee groups like those of Celanese in Drummondville.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) who restated today the importance of the textile sector of the industry and who declared to be ever more prepared to support that industry. I thank him for heeding my intervention in the House of Commons on May 19, 1976 and allowing the spokesmen for textile workers to participate in the important ad hoc committee responsible for reviewing the whole textile policy in Canada and presenting a report before June 30.

I for one intend to continue to fight fiercely for the improvement of the textile and clothing industry situation in Canada and I do not intend to stop making interventions in the House of Commons as I have been doing in the last two years and particularly on November 18, 1974, November 28, 1974 and May 19, 1976. I wish to continue interventions like those I made one month ago before the regional economic expansion committee to get better wages for textile employees through subsidies from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to the textile and clothing industry in Canada. I intend to have more meetings like those I had last year with representatives of all textile industries in Canada, here in Ottawa, and the many other meetings I have had in the two last years with textile employee representatives here in Ottawa or elsewhere in my riding. Lastly, I wish that Celanese Canada Limited revise immediately its radical strategy in Drummondville, as I asked earlier, in the interest of the people I have the honour to represent.

● (1720)

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to make some remarks on a subject which is so important and, having heard a few speeches, I am deeply convinced that some hon. members are really interested in this problem. I would like to congratulate in particular all my colleagues who agreed to take this day to discuss this subject, because we recognize the importance of this industry. I extend special words of praise to my colleague the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) who made some very interesting remarks.

At the same time I listened to the minister who himself attempted to prove that it is not a matter of ill will, but it would seem that answers and solutions are not forthcoming today. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the absence of the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) who told me he would have been really pleased to take part in this debate but he is out of the country with a parliamentary committee. He is particularly concerned for the workers of his riding.

Other members have dealt with the hardships faced by the textile workers in their respective regions. Well, I wish as well to refer to those of my own region, and to a large city of my riding in particular, the city of Joliette. As everywhere else, claims have been made there both by the management and the unions, and for several years, even though it has been emphasized that since 1970 the government has made special efforts for the recovery of this area for the benefit of this class of workers. It seems that the effects are not as yet being felt and consequently, in Canada as everywhere else, there has been a drastic cut in two industries of my riding: their staff have been reduced from 210 to 160 and from 75 to 20 respectively.

Mr. Speaker, imports seem to be one of the major issues. I could not miss this opportunity to make a few comments to urge the government to take more efficient action than was taken in recent years.

I know, Mr. Speaker, there are some commercial trade agreements. We all know that but we wonder, and rightly so, whether the government should not attempt to secure Canadian production. In my view, it is important to secure at least this minimum requirement which the people concerned and even the unions have discussed with the responsible minister and the board. They have met the representatives of the political parties and the unions expect a minimum of production in the textile industry and its by-products.

I suggest that it is important to remind the government that it is vital to maintain a minimum of our Canadian production, made by Canadians and for Canadians. It would be dangerous and we know it too well, as the same thing is happening in other areas, to see that the Canadian people are under the obligation to buy foreign products. We have seen the aftermath of such a situation in the oil industry, and we will see it in other areas. Because of the lack of a well-defined policy, we will have to rely on foreign products and God knows what price we will have to pay then.

Therefore, even if it raises some difficulties, I believe it is important for the government to commit itself to support the industry, and the textile industry in particular, to encourage it, to attempt to find proper remedies and to have the courage to impose the necessary controls unless we are prepared to see it disappear on a national scale. In brief, Mr. Speaker, this must be our goal.

We on this side of the House could accuse the government and limit our debate to these accusations but we know that since 1970 the government has shown an interest in this matter. But one thing for sure, Mr. Speaker, even if the government does its best, what is happening? If some hon. members claim that the government did find solutions we still are in a difficult position and the textile industry workers are far from being satisfied: employees, management, members of the unions and union leaders alike. What is clear is that the actions of the government and the investigation committees have unfortunately taken much too long in providing us with the analyses and giving us the appropriate answers.

It is clear that the situation is deteriorating and that things are getting tough not only in the textile industry but in many other areas. So, the question we should ask ourselves is what sort of economic performance can the government offer the country? That is the whole question. Recently, Mr. Speaker, we had the visit of thousands of milk producers. We had hundreds and hundreds of workers from all walks of life over the last few years. Today, we are dealing with one topic: textile. The government has been saying for a decade that it will improve this area and find solutions. It set up commissions yet no one is satisfied. I personally believe that the government has lacked the courage to implement the controls which are necessary to save a Canadian industry. They may boast about and point at the massive investments poured by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion into several industries, I still think that we had better first preserve those which exist already. And when an important class of workers is allowed to be dismissed, are we sure we are in a position to recycle them for other fields? Those are questions that we must ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker?

[Mr. La Salle.]

Therefore, from the discussions we are having today, it is obvious that we do not have the power to solve the problem, but we believe that as representatives of our constituents and considering that those 250,000 workers are deeply concerned as are the owners who invested heavily, it is our duty to press the government into taking more effective measures. We hope that we will be able today to point out specifically those difficulties and entice the government to consider them more carefully and to find solutions, which is their reponsibility. The government has the power to administer this country and to find the required solutions.

In view of the lack of satisfactory measures, are we allowed to think that the government has run out of possibilities to create and find the initiatives that are required? We ask ourselves certain questions, precisely about that absence of reasonable and necessary solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I know that some of my colleagues wish to take the floor after me and I will limit myself to these comments, and refrain from repeating certain statistics already put on record by other speakers. But I dare hope that we can straighten out one point in particular, whenever mention is made of a Canadian trade balance showing a deficit of some $875 million in the field of textile alone. This shows, I believe, a special lack of interest for that industry.

Under the circumstances, and taking in account those problems and the representations made by the representatives and the union workers particularly involved, I would believe that the government will listen more carefully still; and I would like also to point out that recently unions were able to have a discussion with the minister and the Commission. The member for Drummond (Mr. Pinard) has pointed out earlier that it was most interesting to note that the minister has seen the need to invite union representatives in order to discuss such important and alarming issues.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this day will have well served the interests of this class of workers and I hope that the government will respond more efficiently than he did today. While recognizing the good will of the minister, I believe that the desire and the efforts of the government, if there were any, were clearly inadequate. Should the workers and industry owners be asked that question?

Let me go back to this objective, which I feel is essential, that is to save our Canadian industry and to maintain a domestic production for Canadians; the government in that area will have to do something more significant and more effective than whatever he has done up to now.

● (1730)

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I, with others in the House, am indebted to the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Balfour) for the opportunity to debate this important subject. I am indebted to all who participated in the debate not only for their contributions but also for observing the time limit on speeches. I am particularly indebted to the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) who preceded me for limiting his remarks. I shall try to finish before six o'clock, to allow one more government

spokesman the opportunity to speak. I understand that an hon. member opposite wishes to make a few remarks.

I, and I suppose most of my colleagues in the House, always enjoy hearing the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) speak; this afternoon was no exception. But I know that others share my view when I say that this afternoon the minister's remarks lacked conviction. I was disappointed by his speech, disappointed because the minister used as an excuse the fact he was getting conflicting views from within the industry. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) likes to use a similar phrase, which is without validity.

I suggest that if the minister is getting conflicting views from within the industry the fault lies solely with our selective import policy. Inevitably, if the government is to impose selective tariffs and controls, it will obtain conflicting views from within the industry. Each manufacturer in the industry, whether he manufacturers yarn, fibre or finished goods, will want to look after himself and his employees. Therefore if the government pursues a policy involving selective controls or tariffs, it should not be surprised when it receives conflicting views from the industry.

I agree that originally the present policy was initiated with the blessing of hon. members in all parts of the House. But the policy has not worked.

I was also disappointed by the way the minister used statistics, supplied presumably by his department; I was disappointed to hear him talk about the textile industry in terms of dollars, when for generations the output of the industry has not been measured in dollars but in pounds of yarn, or the equivalent. Therefore it did the minister no credit when quoting statistics to speak in terms of dollars and cents. Perhaps his departmental officials are at fault; I do not care. That industry's production has always been measured in pounds, and the measurement has not changed. Let us speak properly in this debate and talk in terms of pounds.

There is no question in the minister's mind about the serious condition of the textile industry. He and I may disagree about the degree of seriousness. Be that as it may, we on my side of the House think this is a matter of extreme urgency and attach great importance to any proposals for solving the difficulties of the industry.

Hon. members have spoken of volumes of production and the percentage of the domestic market served by domestic producers. I do not think there was much discrepancy between the figures the minister used and those used by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey). I have always used the same statistics to which the minister referred, statistics which were tabled in the standing committee. They show that we have gone from the position where we supplied 64 per cent of our domestic market in 1964 to a position of supplying but 46 per cent in 1975. That drop in itself is alarming. But it is all the more alarming when we compare figures for this country with those pertaining to our trading partners. I believe that the United States industry supplies 88 per cent of its domestic market, and in Common Market countries, indigenous industries supply about 80 per cent of those markets. The statistics concerning pounds of production are enough to alarm anyone. They show how serious the situation has become; it warrants immediate consideration.

I do not quarrel about the establishment of the ad hoc committee but agree with the minister: the mere establishment of a committee will not lead, inevitably, to the solution of the serious difficulty. I appreciate the minister's frankness in saying that while he respects the committee and looks forward to a report he does not think it will solve the problem. Hopefully the committee will make the extent of the problem clearer. No industry in Canada has been subjected to more surveys, questionnaires, investigations, and reports than the poor textile industry. I would hate, as a manufacturer of textiles, to face tomorrow morning yet another inquiry into by business. I think the industry is sick and tired of this procedure. I think the same can be said for that part of the industry based in Quebec. I do not think conditions in the textile industry in Quebec are much different.

I know the difficulties large textile manufacturers face in creating the basis of the economic life of their communities. Most of the members of the association in my part of Ontario, myself included, are manufacturers who employ, generally, fewer than 100 people. Usually our manufacturers are located in small, rural-oriented communities and provide a small but firm but economic base for those communities. I wish to express my concern on behalf of those people.

● (1740)

In terms of employment in the whole industry, I do not think the statistics need too much elaboration. Forty-six per cent of the domestic market employs roughly 200,000 people, according to statistics I have received. That means for each 1 per cent of the market we have we provide roughly 4,350 Canadians with jobs. Seventy-five per cent of the market would result in an increase of roughly 125,000 positions within that industry. At the Senate committee it was clear that the minister felt that Canada could not expect to supply 75 per cent of its domestic requirements. He may be right, but I am not prepared to agree to that point.

When one talks about employment in the textile industry it is often discouraging when one hears the accusation that this is a low paying industry. I have to reject that. It may have been historically true. I do not know. My first job as a 12-year old student was in a textile plant. I think I got 33 cents an hour, which was pretty good pay in those days.

In terms of current industry I notice that we pay substantially higher than, for example, the United States. In terms of productivity, it is extremely serious in terms of economic conditions today when an industry is failing to produce to its capacity, or reasonably approaching its capacity. The lack of reaching capacity is as equally inflationary as increased prices and wages. In other words, if we are losing the potential to contribute to our Gross National Product, that is equally as inflationary as substantial pay increases or price hikes. Therefore in terms of an entire industry, if Canadian textiles are producing at roughly 60 or 70 per cent of existing plant capacity, we are contributing that loss of potential to the inflationary pressures besetting our economy.

The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi mentioned the potential loss of this entire industry. The minister says that is simply not true. I do not doubt his word. However, certainly many of those in the industry perceive this to be government policy. That is terribly serious, particularly for a small businessman. If he perceives that government policy is such as to permit the eventual elimination of the industry, whether his perception is right or wrong, there is no possible way that he is going to make capital investment in his company either to create more jobs to maintain a satisfactory level of efficiency or to increase his production. Therefore I say to the minister that while that may not be the policy, and while he was very clear on that, that is the perception among many in the industry. The fact that that perception exists is in itself a very serious matter.

The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi talked about what would happen if we lost an industry and were at the mercy of exporting countries. I have been through that with regard to baler twine, which was also mentioned. It is a simple fact of life.

Those who have spoken have touched briefly on the relations between the department and the industry. Again, it may be a fact or it may be a perception—to me, it makes absolutely no difference—those in the textile industry perceive their relations with the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as confrontation. Whether that perception is correct or incorrect, it matters not. If that is a broadly accepted fact by those in the industry, it is an extremely serious matter. Those in the industry believe they are not being consulted. They believe they are not being consulted before trade negotiations take place. If that is a fact, and frankly I believe that it is, the minister has a very serious problem within his department. I wish him well in the solution of that problem. I do not want him in any way to minimize how strongly small businessmen, at least those I know, feel that they are in a continual confrontation program with the department. That is not the minister's nature and I urge him to direct his mind to that particular problem which exists among people in the textile industry.

We have been talking about tariffs today. I suggest they are not the answer. In my opinion, many of them have been simple window dressing. The eventual answer has to be quotas. They have to be global. It has to be comprehensive. I do not know what other way to approach the matter.

The minister is considering that. I look forward to his remarks following the report of the ad hoc committee at the end of this month. The minister knows the problems. They are set out in the preamble to the terms of reference of the ad hoc committee. The first deals with the import situation. I know that we import from both developing countries and the United States. I know the share the United States has in the market. I know and accept as a fact that the minister has warned the developing countries they cannot continue indefinitely at this level. I acknowledge, as the minister said, that we have international obligations and a fine line to walk.

What impressed me about the testimony in the Senate committee, and I wish he had said it today, is that we should be thinking more in terms of exporting expertise to these developing countries. There are trade commissioners who have retired, and I believe that is one example the minister gave before the Senate committee. We should have been doing this for years in agriculture. Instead we played the role of Lady Bountiful and handed out a few million here and a few million there, without making any effort to make the developing countries self sufficient. I agree that instead of increasing our import levels from them, it is equally important to send them that expertise, whether it be in agriculture, industry, urban affairs, or fighting pollution. I encourage the minister to develop that particular line of thought and that particular policy.

With respect to our self sufficiency and reliance on other countries, the department is prepared to accept that Canada may not be self sufficient, if I read the evidence correctly in the transcript of the Senate hearings. I do not know why it accepts that. I become terribly discouraged when I see how counterproductive the DREE program in relation to the textile industry have become—and the minister is very familiar with this—in the Maritimes. People from Ontario and Quebec went into the Maritimes when those businesses failed and picked up machinery and inventories at bargain prices. I know how discouraging that must have been. I make this as a personal observation.

I urge the minister to consider developing some form of short-term freeze, and I mean by that three, four or five years, on the level of imports. He set the groundwork by warning the developing countries about this in order to give the industry a gradual opportunity to increase to a reasonable level its share of the domestic market. I think the minister can do that without betraying our international obligations and without an adverse effect on the consumer. I would give the industry an opportunity, which is so important to it, to plan its capital investment for the future.

I realize that may be a rather dramatic action. It may not be as easy as a stroke of the pen saying we are freezing imports at current levels. However, I urge the minister to consider that one short term approach to this problem. It would certainly give the industry some confidence in the sincerity of the government in so far as its problems are concerned.

The second item in the preamble to the terms of reference of the ad hoc committee is better administration of those import control elements that we now have. I suggest the mechanics are there. I believe the Textile Institute has said frankly to the minister, "Yes, you have the mechanics; We are satisfied with what you have; It is just the way you are implementing the system." The minister has acknowledged that the system is too slow.

● (1750)

The other day I got a list of references made this year to the Textile and Clothing Board. The date of the brief regarding acrylic yarn was January 6, the report was made on February 11, and the public announcement on April 14. A brief in connection with sweaters was submitted on January 19. No report has been issued. Nylon and polyester fabrics, March 15, no report; worsted fabrics, April 5, no report; knit fabrics, May 7, no report; polyester yarn and hosiery, updating of reports earlier released—I do not know the date of the brief.

Another aspect of the subject is this: when some form of control is imposed, what measures do we take to enforce it?

I suggest to the minister that while we have the necessary mechanism at our disposal we do nothing to enforce it. On the other hand, when the authorities in our neighbour to the south hear of a ship halfway between Taiwan and the U.S. carrying a cargo the discharge of which would breach the control measures established by the United States, that ship is directed not to unload those goods at a U.S. port. The whole world knows that this is U.S. policy, and that is why it is so effective.

The third item in the preamble has to do with the present "selective" approach to special measures of protection against low-cost imports and the suggestion that it is ineffective. I mentioned this earlier. I cannot agree that the prohibition of the entry of fabrics solves anything when one may import the yarn on the one hand and the finished product on the other. My view is that, unhappily, the present approach has not worked. It is obviously not the approach taken by the United States or by the Common Market. Unfortunately, although I agree it received the approval of all concerned, it has not proved to be effective enough.

I wish the committee well in its deliberations. I look forward to its report at the end of the month. In conclusion I think I can do no better than quote the minister, if he will forgive my bad manners. This is what he said in another committee:

> There is no view anywhere in the government that the textile industry is dispensable. It is an important industrial segment in Canada and it is our intention to do whatever is possible to give it a degree of viability.

In that regard I completely support the minister's position. But I have not seen him put his money where his mouth is to this date.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have listened closely to the suggestions made by opposition members, and I have taken some notes. I was somewhat amazed to see the phrasing of the motion introduced by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey). As the minister stated at the beginning of his speech, when the phrasing and the remarks by the hon. member from Brome-Missisquoi are considered, and this is literal, he supported the federal textile and clothing policy.

Overall, I believe he mentioned twice he was satisfied with the current textile and clothing policy. However, some other members referred to the possibility of reviewing the level of imports, and some referred to the need for certain protectionist measures. In my view, the textile situation is not as gloomy as certain would have it or would imply, as the minister indicated. I suggest the goals are quite clear and the minister stated he was about the textile industry, a vital one in Canada. This was an important segment of manufacturing industry, and he was aware of that industry's hope for stable employment. I think that these points are made up of basic points excessively important for the employers and especially the employees of the textile industries. One of these is that we should not sacrifice the textile industry to increase our imports from developing countries. Again, I think this is an excessively important point. Mr. Speaker, everybody makes reference to figures or statistics and I could follow along on this line because everybody here says that everything depends on the basis chosen for the comparisons, whether they are made on a money, pound or shipping basis. By the way, from 1970 to 1975, our clothing exports increased by 44 per cent. During the same period, our textile exports increased by 34 per cent.

So everything depends on the figures and the comparisons which we want to make. There is one point which has not been raised today—and I think it should be—it is that we should promote some kind of enthusiasm within the consumers. We should develop some kind of advertising campaign to incite the consumers to buy made-in-Canada products. I think that this point is extremely important even if we ask that protectionist measures be taken and, here again, all kinds of solutions may be proposed but I think it is necessary to create a certain feeling in Canada so that in the stores the Canadian consumer may buy and demand products made in Canada. I think this is extremely important and if each one of us behaves according to his own conscience, we could see how we could bring our own excessively imprtant solution if we really believe in this industry.

I made my own experience, I do not know much about the textile industry but, considering my new responsibilities, each weekend I try to go either to a shopping centre or to a department store to see how many products made in Canada I can find; I realize that there are many but that, here again, Canadians themselves are not aware of the purchasing potential they represent to promote the textile and clothing industries in Canada.

[*English*]

An increased willingness to buy Canadian would be one element in the solution of that problem.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is the last contribution to this debate which seemed to me very useful. The minister detailed all the various policies being applied and I think that a report prepared by an ad hoc committee with representatives from the three provinces, the manufacturing industry and department officials will soon be tabled. The minister indicated also that the unions will take part in that committee which will review the whole textile and clothing policy and which is expected to produce a report on that question before June 30.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 58(11) proceedings under the motion have expired.

It being six o'clock, the House stands adjourned until Thursday at 11 a.m., pursuant to special order of Monday, June 7.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 17, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed from Tuesday, June 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I intend my remarks to be brief, probably only to reiterate the arguments that I have made in the past as a retentionist. However, whether my view prevails or that of certain other people in this chamber who are in favour of abolition does not concern me as much as the fact that we achieve a decision. I hope we will do that next Tuesday morning so that the country will know where this House of Commons stands with regard to the question of capital punishment. I would certainly resist any attempt to put off a decision for longer than that. In other words, our debate has perhaps lasted a little bit too long. It has been interspersed with so many other things that the country must wonder about the procedure of this House of Commons. I am not going to get into that.

I am not going to question the sincerity of those who believe in views directly opposite to my own on this important matter. I might question the attitude of certain members, including the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), with regard to the law for a number of years. I think people are entitled to do that. Even so, I resist that temptation and try to get myself to the main question: Are there circumstances under which one would be entitled to take away the life of another human being on this planet that we call earth? I think that such circumstances exist. I have not heard any argument that had made me really change my attitude, horrendous and barbarous as the act of taking another life may be.

A considerable amount of thought has been given to the question as to whether capital punishment in itself is a deterrent. Some years back I reached the conclusion that, in itself, it probably was not a deterrent. However, the former hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, in one of the few speeches in all of these debates that I recall, pointed out his own wartime experience and how the fear of imminent death had a great motivation for those who were undergoing the experience of war. I suspect the same fear would exist amongst the criminal element. When I read about the hostage incidents in prisons, I say to myself that if there were some method by which the people who would dare take other people's lives so lightly could be made accountable with their own, probably there would not be as many hostage incidents in prisons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCleave: I thank hon. members for their approval of that particular point. I realize that in many cases we are dealing with psychotic people. Many acts of murder are psychotic acts rather than deliberate and planned ones, calculated long in advance. In other words, they are impetuous acts. Apart from that, I think there is a question in the mind of the public, at least, as to the effectiveness of the punishment to be imposed. Prison terms, I suppose, could be considered a deterrent with respect to anyone who went shoplifting. Yet the amount of shoplifting in our society is extensive. Prison terms could be considered a deterrent against drunken driving, but the fact is the extent of this crime remains substantially unchanged.

• (1110)

So it seems to me one has to look to a more basic motive for the consideration of the type of punishment which is suitable. I did think that the Fulton formula of a number of years ago, the division between capital and non-capital murder, should have been given a fair run. However, it was simply repealed by the use of the recommendation for clemency. Successive governments have used this means to repeal, in effect, the will of parliament. This is what bothers me. Even if I were an abolitionist and there were a law in force, I would want the law to be carried out rather than a practice which, in effect, negates that law. This is something which has bothered me over the years—the fact that successive governments—and I do not wish to point a finger at any of them in particular—have used this technique to flout what is the undoubted will of two out of three of the people in Canada. Most of the polls bear out that figure.

I have just been talking to my hon. friend from Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir). His poll was taken more recently than mine, but his figures are substantially the same. There was a survey made by the reporters of the *Chronicle-Herald* and here again the results were substantially the same. It seems to me that in Nova Scotia two out of three people—the proportion is actually slightly higher—think there should be some form of capital punishment. We are not a province noted for way out abberations in our thinking and I would imagine we are in the mainstream with regard to this question whether human life should be taken or not.

Capital punishment is, of course, barbarous.

An hon. Member: It is murder.

Mr. McCleave: Somebody says it is murder, but it is not murder in the sense that the victim of the person who is faced with capital punishment has been murdered. I hear an interjection from one of my seatmates; the point was being made that murder, too, is barbarous Of course it is. And capital punishment is barbarous. I suppose the slaughter of an animal in an abattoir is barbarous. When I am asked whether I would be prepared to push the lock to send somebody to death, my answer is that I am not. Nor am I prepared to cut a cow's throat in an abattoir. And I am not prepared to perform an appendectomy on anyone in this chamber, either. Those are tasks which can be set aside for others. But there are times when things have to be done whether they appear barbaric or not. So I reject that line of thinking as an argument against capital punishment.

At this point, may I put in a word for Hammurabi? I have made the argument before. It has never appeared in the press, as far as I can see, but it is not something I have invented. The Hammurabic code prescribing an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth was not the idea of a barbaric society; it was the idea of a civilized society. What Hammurabi and others who preached that code were telling us was this: if society has to extract some kind of punishment it should be an eye for an eye but not more than that; it should be a tooth for a tooth, but not a whole mouthful of teeth; it should be one person for one person, but not a thousand. It still seems to me it is a pretty good code to follow and the ordinary person in the street would be a lot happier if, after reading about the Calgary incident or the Moncton incident, or the Dartmouth incident or the sad things that have happened in Saskatchewan, he could have an idea that the people responsible, those who were so callously indifferent to the right of others to live that in some cases they even laughed when they shot down their victims, would be brought immediately to justice. If there were some minimum extraction of justice in such cases as these, he might believe there was, indeed, a strong basis of law in Canada.

Nobody is trying to be excessive, I think, in applying punishment. The trouble is we are not applying enough punishment where punishment could matter. So people, after a while, shrug their shoulders and say: Really, we are a country which does not believe in the law, or even have a law.

For these reasons I intend to continue voting as a retentionist and will resist any attempt to change the law in the way proposed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peter Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, the debate on Bill C-84 goes far beyond the specific clauses and details before us. The emotions of millions of Canadians are stirred by the question of where Canada is headed—where the government is taking us. This bill to abolish capital punishment is just one further example, one of many in recent years, which places the stamp of permissiveness on Canadian society.

It is clear that no other issue in many years has moved so many Canadians to speak out, to write letters to their newspapers. Most members of this House can attest to the feelings of their constituents, for the issue of capital punishment has undoubtedly resulted in more mail to parliament than any other. The reason is that most Canadians believe this important ingredient in our system of law and order must be retained, and it is clear to them that the policy of the Trudeau government is to abolish it.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of the forthcoming division on Bill C-84 is that Canadians have been told by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that members are free to vote as they wish. There are some members on the government side who have exhibited a good deal of courage by speaking against the bill, and against the wishes of the Prime Minister, such as the member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) who, it appears, has had a good deal of practical experience in dealing with criminals. I fear, however, that her outspoken views on this and other questions will not please her party masters.

Why, then, Mr. Speaker, is this not a truly free vote? I can only surmise that if the pressures were lifted from members on the government side and strict control on the cabinet were removed, a number of Liberals would vote against the bill and in favour of capital punishment. It is becoming clear that a very small shift, perhaps even three or four members voting against the bill rather than for it, would defeat it; it is that close. This is a government bill. It is clearly not a free vote and those who say so are deceiving the Canadian people.

● (1120)

Canada, Mr. Speaker, is undoubtedly unique in the world when our record of violence and crime is compared to most other countries. We have escaped the ravages of war which the countries in Europe, Japan, Russia and so many others experience during the Second World War; and since then there have been wars in Korea, VietNam, the Middle East and Africa. We in Canada have been very fortunate. We have often looked at the cities of Detroit and Chicago and said crime like that could not happen here. Our cities seemed safe, and violence seen in so many places happened here only occasionally.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all that is changing. Canada will in the remaining years of this century, more than ever before, be faced with problems of lawlessness, violence and murder. Statistics clearly show the rapid growth of crime in our country. We will, I fear, be faced too with growing numbers of threats by terrorists and hijackers, all of the things which have become fact in other parts of the world. Terrorist activities are now taking place in such civilized countries as England, Holland, France and Germany. If anyone wonders about the government's concern for this happening here, let him look at the number and cost of our police and military forces being assembled for the summer Olympics in Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is that if there was ever a time when we should be taking steps to strengthen our law enforcement and strengthen the support for our police forces, the time is now. We will in but a few weeks be going through one of the most critical security periods in many years in Montreal, and this is obviously clear to the government. It has drained virtually every able man from our armed forces bases everywhere. They could not cope if any serious problem arose anywhere else in our country at the same time. Just this week, support

was requested to assist in a serious forest fire in Ontario. No help was possible; our armed forces were stretched to the maximum. In spite of the tensions of the Olympic weeks and as well the visit of Her Majesty the Queen to Canada at that time, this government has chosen to attempt to abolish capital punishment in advance of that event, which can only be viewed as the height of stupidity.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) participated in this debate on Tuesday and made a melodramatic appeal to the House for the government's bill to abolish capital punishment. The Prime Minister said that he wanted to make it very clear that, if a majority of hon. members voted against abolition, some people were going to be hanged. He went on to say that 11 men are being held in Canadian prisons under sentence of death for the murder of policemen or prison officials.

I think it is fair to say that our Prime Minister has led a sheltered life. He seems to be a gentle man but a gentle man completely out of touch with the real world, and particularly with the ugly reality of today's criminal element. Our starry-eyed Prime Minister and Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) do not, I presume, recall the brutal and grisly murders of the Moncton policemen or the gunning down in cold blood of two members of the Calgary police force, Detective Boyd Davidson and Staff Sergeant Keith Harrison, so very recently. I will never forget, Mr. Speaker, the tragic picture that appeared in the Toronto *Star* of Pauline Maitland with her two very small and tearful children. Constable Leslie Maitland who was gunned down at point blank range and his killer is one of the 11.

The Solicitor General, the Prime Minister and his government are responsible for the present law. They argued for abolition of the death penalty but retention for the killers of policemen and prison guards. That bill was passed only 32 months ago. Since that time the federal cabinet has in every case failed to carry out that law. Canadians and members of this House were clearly deceived by the government as well; the example of law-breaking set by the government was surely a horrible example for all Canadians.

I believe, regardless of the arguments made to the contrary, that members of parliament must have regard for the opinions of their constituents on all matters. Surely, this is the essence of our whole system. I find it impossible to ignore the fact that eight out of 10 of the citizens of Calgary South who responded to the question last year favoured capital punishment. The percentage of all Canadians who favour capital punishment is just about the same. Recent mail received in my office indicates some 98 per cent favour capital punishment for premeditated murder. Why, then, is this government attempting to impose something that an overwhelming majority of Canadians do not want? I can only believe that it is just one further example of the arrogance of this government. A truly free vote or a secret vote, and only that, would prove the sincerity of the Prime Minister's claim.

Canadians everywhere are demanding stronger law enforcement. They have seen too much of the soft attitude which places the rights and concerns of the criminal ahead of those of law-abiding citizens. They have had enough of the loose administration of justice whereby criminals, rapists, murderers and child molesters are introduced to country club living and then let out on holidays, weekends and parole, when the safety of society seems to have been completely forgotten in our headlong rush to demonstrate our humanity for criminals, but with little concern shown for the victims of crime.

Canada has been a good place to live. Under this government we are changing that. We are not backing up our excellent police forces with rules and laws that enable them to carry out their responsibilities. Under this government the man who obeys the law and the man who works for his living is taking a back seat to the law-breaker, to those who will not work and to those who are indeed encouraged to live off the system. Added to this unfortunate ethic in our country are the government's unfortunate immigration practices.

Many arguments have been made in this debate and elsewhere that the death penalty is not a deterrent. This was the very thrust of the Prime Minister's remarks on Tuesday. I believe that common sense, which I think motivates most Canadians, will tell us that the death penalty is a deterrent. Canadians who write and speak on this issue believe that it is a deterrent. They speak on the basis of their own feelings and how they would face the threat of the death penalty. That is how I judge the deterrent value as well. There have been many examples quoted from the mouths of would-be murderers which indicate that they too have clearly planned their actions having regard to the penalty.

The government has attempted, Mr. Speaker, to "snow" the members of this House and the Canadian people by offering Bill C-83, the so-called peace and security legislation, hopefully to sneak through the abolition of capital punishment by arguing that appropriate and sufficient safeguards and deterrents exist in the package presented. The bill falls back on 25 years imprisonment; that is to be the replacement for the death penalty, and the cornerstone of the deterrence.

There are two problems with this approach. The first is that, should such sentences be carried out, they may well remove any chance of reform and rehabilitation. But, equally important, I do not believe the government will or even intends to stick with such a commitment. We may well see further legislation brought forward in the next two years to reduce substantially these terms. If there is any doubt about this possibility, I would ask why the minister has seen fit to change the present law now, when the legislation which he brought before the House and which was passed in 1973 does not expire until the end of 1977. The government urged members to support that bill at that time, when all along it had no intention whatsoever of obeying the law which provided for the death penalty for the killers of prison guards and policemen.

● (1130)

In 1974 there were 545 murders in Canada and in that same year six policemen were murdered. In the year 1962 to 1975, 53 policemen were murdered and, according to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), the murder rate since 1962 has exactly doubled from 1.2 murders per 100,000 of population to 2.4 murders per 100,000 of population for 1974. The Solicitor General attempts to explain this away by saying that all violent crimes have increased by just

about the same amount. This is just what Canadians are concerned about, and if anyone thinks that patsy treatment for hardened criminals is going to deter them or protect society, he is wrong. It take force to deal with force and it takes brutal consequences to deal with brutal people.

As things stand now, an armed robber or hijacker is prone to murder because he knows he can only be given a prison sentence. He also knows, under our present system, through either parole, holidays, temporary leave, or even escape, his sojourn in custody may well be just a few years or even a few months. The risk of killing someone is truly worth it, especially if a key witness can be wiped out. We must make it clear to the potential murderer that he risks the chance of being executed for the crime. I believe that criminals value their lives as much as anyone else. Many have families and they enjoy living just as anyone else. Many would think twice before plotting murder if faced with the possibility of being hanged. The absence of capital punishment in Canada since 1961 has directly contributed to the violent crime statistics and the murder statistics cited by the Solicitor General.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said on Tuesday that restricting the availability of guns, as proposed in Bill C-83, gives every reason to believe that such measures will effectively inhibit criminal activity, whereas he suggests capital punishment offers no such assurance. Most practical people who have studied the proposed gun control law believe it is a farce, that it will force costly and unnecessary restrictions on law-abiding citizens; it will be a restriction on freedom in Canada and it will do absolutely nothing to keep weapons from those who are bent on pursuing criminal activity.

There is something I believe is known to police and prison guards as well as those who work with prison inmates but which is not known or understood by the average Canadian or member of parliament. It is that the person or persons who plot premeditated murder, terrorist killings and other types of murder are not ordinary people; they cannot be treated in an ordinary way. Let us face facts. These human beings are brutal, savage and cruel people, and no ordinary rules are applicable when dealing with them.

In conclusion, I believe that capital punishment should be extended beyond the present limitations to include all those convicted of premeditated acts of murder. Persons who take the life of another while committing such crimes as child molestation, rape, air piracy, political assassination, treason and robbery, if convicted should also face the death penalty. After all levels of judicial appeal have been exhausted and no recommendation for mercy is forthcoming from the judicial process, the federal Cabinet should be prohibited from interfering with that sentence and subsequent punishment. Where a recommendation for mercy is forthcoming from the judicial process, the federal Cabinet should be permitted to commute the death sentence.

I believe, as do the large majority of Canadians, that the death penalty is a deterrent to murder, just as is any jail sentence or punishment of any kind. It is clearly a deterrent, but no amount of research will ever prove the degree. The people of this country want parliament to reaffirm that we are prepared to take a very strong stand on the vital question of law and order in Canada. I intend to vote against this bill and thus support the retention of capital punishment.

[Mr. Bawden.]

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, I have already made known my intention to vote against Bill C-84 on second reading. Statements made in this debate, and particularly the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the House this week, make it necessary for me to clarify for my constituents who are interested, and possibly also for my colleagues, why I will be voting contrary to the expressed wishes of the Prime Minister.

Let me say first that there is no weakening of my party allegiance. If there had not been a decision to call a free vote I would have voted with the government. I do not today agree with the Prime Minister, but I would have been prepared to accept the majority opinion of my party, since my position is not a matter of conscience but of calm and very profoundly calculated reasoning.

Many speakers in this debate have made reference to the basis on which a member should cast his vote. Before I was elected to this House in 1972 I made a commitment to cast my vote on the issue of capital punishment according to the majority opinion of my constituents, if there were to be a free vote. I can tell my constituents that I would be reluctant to make such a commitment today, and since that might take a lengthy explanation I will leave that for discussion with my constituents.

A recent poll asked the question: If a member's opinion is not the same as the majority opinion of his constituents, should he vote according to his own opinion or according to that of his constituents? Of the more than 90 per cent who expressed an opinion, of the English-speaking residents, 28 per cent only said that he should vote according to his own opinion, and 72 per cent said according to that of his constituents. However, among French-language responses to the questionnaire 60 per cent said that he should vote according to his own opinion and 40 per cent according to that of his constituents. It was of great interest to me that this poll underlined another of the differences in attitude between the English and French-speaking constituents in my riding. My intention to vote against the bill is thus both a personal decision and a reflection also of the large majority opinion of my constituents.

In response to a questionnaire in my constituency, only 22 per cent voted for abolition, some 13 per cent voted for restricted use of capital punishment and an overwhelming 65 per cent voted for capital punishment for all first-degree murderers. However, my reasons may not be the same as the reasons of my constituents and it is, therefore, important that I outline the thinking that brought me to this decision.

Let me first get to the real issue and the reason I shall vote against abolition. It is certainly not because I want every murderer to hang, but it is a decision that some murderers must not be allowed to live.

The Prime Minister made four references to the consequences of our actions, and I quote:

—we will actually be deciding, when we vote on this bill . . . whether some human beings will live or die.

He also stated:

—if a majority of Honourable Members vote against abolition, some people are going to be hanged.

He said:

—the defeat of this bill would eventually place the hangman's noose around some person's neck.

And he said:

—those who vote against the bill . . . cannot escape their personal share of responsibility for the hangings which will take place if the bill is defeated.

● (1140)

The Prime Minister can be assured that we fully appreciate the seriousness of the decision we are taking. May I add on a personal note that this will not be the first time I have made a decision to participate in the killing of other persons. This applies just as equally to those who vote for abolition, for the passage of the bill. They must accept their responsibility for the consequence of their action.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Herbert: The Prime Minister stated:

Any discussion of capital punishment must begin with the identification of its intended purpose, which is clearly the security of society, the protection of innocent people against the ultimate criminal violence . . .

It is clear that the protection of innocent people against assaults on their lives and liberty is one of the highest duties of the state.

However, it is at this point that my disagreement with the Prime Minister starts to become apparent. He says:

The question is whether state execution is an effective deterrent to murder . . . one's moral view of the justification of capital punishement is entirely—

I want to repeat here the word "entirely".

—determined by one's judgment of its deterrent effect . . . The crux of the question before us is whether execution is an effective and therefore justifiable weapon for the state to use in order to deter potential murderers.

Again, the second word I want to underline is "deter"—deter potential murderers.

Mr. Speaker, I received from the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) a detailed response to the recently expressed views of Professor Ernest van den Haag of New York University. This was an extensive response for which I thank the Solicitor General. As a result of his argument and the arguments I have listened to in the House I am not convinced that capital punishment is a deterrent. Accordingly, deterrence is not the basis for my decision. If there is a deterrent effect, so much the better. However, the arguments of the Solicitor General have certainly convinced me that there is more than a reasonable doubt of deterrent effect.

The Prime Minister goes on to say:

Our law, from its earliest beginnings, has always recognized the rights of an individual to kill another when there exist reasonable grounds for believing that killing an aggressor is necessary to the protection of one's own life or that of another.

That obviously applies in his view in the context to which the Prime Minister referred, but it applies also in police actions where a group of policemen are having a shoot-out with a bandit. It cannot be argued that every one of those police officers is using his weapon to protect his own life. In fact, it is a calm decision which is being made that this is a means to save the life of another innocent victim be it one of the police officers themselves or some other person who may be killed as a result of this particular shoot-out.

Again quoting from the Prime Minister's statement:

. . . there are those who say execution is justified because it prevents a murderer from ever again committing the same crime. It certainly does . . . But if you rely on that reasoning, . . .

And, Mr. Speaker, I am relying on that reasoning.

. . . you are killing a man, not because his death may deter others from following in his footsteps but because of what he might possibly do at some future time. To justify such a preventive execution there would have to be some reasonable grounds for believing that a convicted murderer, if released into society . . . would murder again.

Again I take issue with the Prime Minister for including in his remarks "if released into society". Whether or not he is released into society is irrelevant because after all surely a prison guard or a police officer can be considered an innocent victim.

I placed on the order paper a question which clearly indicates the direction of my thinking. I should like to read this question:

For each of the last ten years, how many persons who have previously been found guilty of murder or of manslaughter after having been charged with murder, are known to have participated in the killing of another person?

If I were rewording that question today I would change the last part to read: "are known to have participated in the killing or attempted killing of another person". My thinking obviously is along the lines that innocent persons are being killed because we have made the decision to allow murderers to live. The Prime Minister goes on to say:

We know of only four people who have been found guilty of murder by a Canadian court, and convicted of murder a second time.

I suggest this is playing with statistics. It may be true in the circumstances but it does not get to the basic point. How many innocent persons suffer today because of the decision to allow a person who has committed murder to live? Mr. Speaker, again I am quoting from the Prime Minister's remarks which I found to be excellent throughout except for the insertion of the few words to which I have referred previously in my remarks. He said:

My concern is for the society which adopts vengeance as an acceptable motive for its collective behaviour . . .

We will have chosen violence as a weapon against the violence we profess to abhor.

Who is so confident that he knows for sure that such an official endorsement of violence will not harden the society we were elected to improve, will not pervade gradually many different relationships in our society? Who is so confident that he knows for sure that acceptance of state violence will not lead to the greater social acceptance of lesser forms of violence among our people? Vengeance and violence damage and destroy those who adopt them, and lessen respect for the dignity and rights of others among those who condone them.

I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed in those remarks. If we are to logically follow through, then the first thing we should do would be to disarm our police forces. I can imagine the reaction of the police in this country if such a move were introduced. What I am suggesting simply, in my possibly somewhat ruthless fashion, is that personally I do not consider the lives of ten convicted murderers to be worth the life of one innocent person.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, I said ten. In fact it does not matter to me how many. So far as I am concerned the lives of innocent persons that are taken by persons who have been convicted of murder should be just as much on the conscience of those who vote for abolition as, in their argument, are the lives of the murderers if we go ahead with capital punishment.

Mr. Speaker, I say sincerely—and I have given an awful lot of thought to the decision I have made—that it is with sadness I realize that the society in which we live is not perfect and that sometimes brutal decisions have to be taken. I think I have made it clear that I do not believe that the deterrent effect is sufficient reason for voting against this bill. In that respect I appreciated the remarks of the Prime Minister. Nevertheless, I hope I made it very clear where I stand and the reasons that I, personally, with considerable sadness, will be voting on second reading against the passage of Bill C-84.

● (1150)

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak in opposition to the latest government attempt to abolish the death sentence. I find this topic a very difficult one with which to deal, as I know many members have. On the one hand, those who would have capital punishment abolished once and for all have come up with some fairly convincing data and arguments for that cause, while, on the other side of the coin, those who are in favour of retaining the ultimate punishment have also arrived at a convincing set of arguments based on a good deal of empirical evidence. In many cases, the two opposing viewpoints effectively cancel each other out. That is why we are in the midst of debate now. This is a subject that lends itself very well to polarity, and that is why the outcome never has and probably never will be totally conclusive.

After a great deal of introspection, I have taken a retentionist stand on this delicate issue. I asked myself questions such as: What if my son were accused of murder. Or, what would I, as a close friend or family member of a murder victim, want as justifiable punishment for the one who had committed the most degrading and unjustifiable crime of all? I am sure that these are the questions that we have all asked ourselves in preparation for this debate. Once having reached a conclusion in my own mind, based upon moral, ethical, religious and philosophical grounds, I asked my constituents for their views and opinions on this controversial issue.

It has been argued that members of parliament should disregard the views of their constituents on capital punishment and be governed entirely by their conscience. This is what the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) would have us do. That comment was made on the TV news on March 6, 1976, by the Solicitor General. I can only partially agree that members of parliament are simply representatives who are chosen to make decisions on the basis of their own common sense, knowledge and morals without consideration for the people they represent. In most cases, public sentiment demands that elected officials truly represent the feelings of the majority of citizens. Although hon. members must exercise caution and discretion when public sentiment runs high—as with this particular legislation—they must always keep the views of the citizens in mind. A member's constituents are, after all, the ones who elected him to office. Admittedly, it is a rather difficult position when one is called upon to provide both personal leadership and public representation, but it is ludicrous to suggest that the views of the electorate should be disregarded entirely.

A random survey of my riding of Churchill in northern Manitoba has fallen in line with my expectations as to how constituents feel about this subject. Give surveys of this nature whatever credence you like, but 87 per cent indicated they did not favour the total abolition of the death penalty. This is from local survey results found in the March 28, 1976 edition of "From Parliament Hill to Churchill". This is in keeping with the rough national average. The national average varies from 80 per cent to 90 per cent, depending on the source of information. How could any member of this House who espouses the belief in responsible government and true representation of the electorate of Canada not take into consideration figures which show that people are overwhelmingly in favour of retention. Highly charged emotional reaction, you say? Or, perhaps it is a case of "herd psychology". I say, hogwash! The people of this country are fed up with a government that is insensitive to their views and needs.

The government has not had the courage to enforce the laws of the land over the last eight years. The result has been that no one, including the prospective killer, has any reason to be deterred by fear of the ultimate penalty being carried out as prescribed by previous parliaments for taking the life of another person. The House of Commons passed legislation in 1967 with provisions that any person guilty of murdering police officers or prison guards shall be subject to the death penalty. Sentences have been imposed by the courts in good faith that the law would be upheld. But each decision has, without exception, been summarily commuted. I have to say that a mockery has been made of the law. I say this because in every case the prerogative of mercy—and I hold nothing against it by itself—has been invoked automatically. No potential killer is deterred when he knows only too well that there is little or no chance that the ultimate sanction will be levied upon him.

Not only do the majority of private citizens of Canada want the law in this area restored, but many policemen and prison guards have spoken out strongly in favour of retention of the death sentence for the cold-blooded, premeditated murder of those in their profession. Even the Canadian Law Reform Commission came out strongly against sentences of life imprisonment. These individuals and associations are speaking out, and for good reason. It concerns me when those in favour of abolition of the death penalty which is to be replaced by longer prison sentences use the words "inhumane", "vicious", "barbaric" and other epithets when describing the act of capital punishment. Do those who promote total abolition ever consider what it means to lock a human being in a cage for 25 years like some animal—a term spent in agony without a glimmer of hope? They would no doubt re-examine their rationale if they seriously thought of the cruelty involved in the lengthy incarceration of a prisoner. This, to me, is a far more cruel and torturous punishment for the ruthless mur-

derer than that of quick death. Perhaps a quote from a great social critic of his time, George Bernard Shaw, is appropriate. I do not want to embarrass those to the left of me, but I could not let this relevant expert pass without some mention.

In his preface to "Major Barbara", Shaw, while speaking of the social injustice of his time, compared criminals to dogs. His often practised sardonic analogies may offend some of you. But he gets his point across through the use of this and other literary devices. In that passage, he says, in part, and I quote:

> We even take the chance of their dogs' first bite. But if a dog delights to bark and bite, it goes to the lethal chamber. That seems to me sensible. To allow the dog to expiate his bite by a period of torment, and then let him loose in a much more savage condition (for the chain makes a dog savage) to bite again and expiate again, having meanwhile spent a great deal of human life and happiness in the task of chaining, feeding, and tormenting him, seems to me idiotic and superstitious.

What he is stating, in effect, is that to incarcerate a prisoner is to torment him, and to send a tormented person back into the society is to invite further trouble brought about by that torment.

We are dealing here with human lives. I think it is a far more humane punishment for a murderer of the kind of which I am speaking to receive the death sentence than it is for him to be incarcerated for 25 years. The point I am trying to get across is that we have a situation where we have a choice between the lesser of two evils: long prison sentences or capital punishment.

● (1200)

No utopian method of deterrence has come into practice in the Canadian penal system. Similarly, there is no sure method of rehabilitation. Leading criminologists have proven, through studies based on empirical evidence, that there is little hope for the rehabilitation of those who have been imprisoned for lengthy periods of time. Until our society advances to the stage where these problems can be dealt with in an adequate manner, the only alternative, in my mind, is the death penalty for those who have committed cold-blooded, premeditated murder or for persons whose clinically proven volatile nature makes them dangerous second-time killers.

With our modern court system and the safeguards inherent in that system, we can be assured that no one would receive the ultimate sanction unless it was proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the accused was, indeed, guilty. This is one of the major concerns of the abolitionist, and rightfully so. But as I have just explained, this would never happen. If I thought for one minute that there was any chance guilt could be disproved after the fact, I would not have taken the stand I have.

I am of the strong conviction that it is society's responsibility to see that the murderer of the worst kind—and I described that a bit earlier—is treated in a manner according to his crime. By the same token, it is the responsibility of society to see that the family and dependants of the victim be properly compensated financially in whatever way possible. There are those who argue that to do away with a murderer does not compensate the relatives and dependants of the victim. I do not see any logical argument there. A victim's loved ones are not compensated if the murderer is incarcerated, either.

I also feel strongly that the crime rate in Canada—and that includes cold-blooded and well planned murders—is such that it calls for action by this government. I was not surprised to hear the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) say that all offences, including violent crimes, have increased substantially over the past ten years. However, on May 5 I was shocked to hear two pro-abolitionist members of this House say that Canadians perceive more violence in society than actually exists. They invited controversy—and I feel that they have received a fair amount of it—when they said that news reports and violent television shows reflecting conditions around the world tend to make Canadians feel less safe than they really are. I think this is balderdash, and it is an easy way out. That is a very shabby argument. Why do they not tell that to the families of the Moncton policemen who were brutally murdered only a short time ago? Why do they not tell that story to the family of the policeman who was killed in a hostage incident in Calgary in March of this year, the second such murder in only a matter of months, or why not to the families of the children so brutally murdered only recently in Saskatchewan? Then I would like those two hon. members to come back to this House and tell all of us how violence in our society is just a figment of our imagination.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate, until this week. I have been involved in a number of capital punishment debates during the time I have been a member of this House. I have reached the conclusion that at this stage in time the country desires, and has the right to expect, hon. members of this House to support the retention of capital punishment. I do not come to that conclusion with any great feeling of exhilaration. If anything, I come to that conclusion with a feeling of great disappointment because, as a long term member of this House, I could have supported abolition. Indeed, I started down that road a few years ago because I felt that we were developing a form of penology in this nation which would allow us both to protect society and produce a more humanitarian approach to crime and punishment as a result of some of the things which were happening in our society.

Unfortunately, because of things which have happened in the last decade, Canadians, by a substantial majority, have indicated a very strong belief that we can only have law and order if the death penalty is retained. Surely, if this parliament is to reflect the mood of the nation—and if members of parliament are anything, they are the reflectors of the mood of this nation—it should be indicating to the people that parliament does reflect their point of view. It is germane to the national point of view, and it should believe, as the people believe, that we can only have law and order in this nation if we retain the death penalty.

I do not think that Canadians, any more than members of parliament who believe in retention, are barbaric individuals because they feel that the punishment should fit the crime. Indeed, I believe that Canadians, by and large, would have accepted a limited form of capital punishment if the government had lived up to its commitment to the public when the temporary reform of the criminal law was presented to parliament and murder was broken down into two classes—capital murder and non-capital murder—and when it related to extra protection for law

enforcement officers and penitentiary employees. But the government duped parliament and got it to support a bill which the government implemented, in effect, as total abolition when neither parliament nor the people wanted that.

As a result of that, we have done great damage to the belief that abolition could some day be achieved. You do not fool people, and you do not make people respect the law if governments do not respect it themselves. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stood in the House this week and suggested to members of parliament who will vote for retention that, by voting for retention, they will have blood on their hands because men on death row at this moment will be hanged if parliament approves the death penalty. That was nothing short of ludicrous, because if the law as it now stands had been put into effect, there would not be anyone on death row at this time. They would have met the penalty that the courts of this land, in interpreting the law, said should be the penalty. Therefore, if those individuals on death row are awaiting the carrying out of the penalty imposed by the courts, it is not the fault of this parliament; it is the fault of this government—and it is nothing short of that.

● (1210)

It is nothing short of ludicrous for the Prime Minister to come here and try to blackmail members of parliament who are retentionists into voting for abolition because the government has placed certain individuals in the untenable position of not knowing whether they are going to live or die. The law says they should die and the government has said they can live—at least until parliament makes up its mind whether the death penalty should be continued.

As the previous speaker, the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) stated, nothing worse can be done to an individual than to remove hope. It is better to remove a person's life than to remove all hope of returning to society after a crime has been committed. There are people in this nation who would suggest that a criminal should be incarcerated for the rest of his natural life rather than be punished by having his life taken from him. If there is one thing that would make it completely impossible for penal systems to operate, it is to put people in institutions, without hope. Without hope, there is no way that people can operate logically in the world of today.

Lack of hope destroys everything that is human about an individual. The only way we are going to make our prisons work successfully again is by giving to those who are in them the hope of being rehabilitated and returned to society. We cannot do that with the system that exists now. That is why so many Canadians are urging members of parliament to retain the death penalty. The system as it is has not worked for at least ten years. It has not worked because there has been no driving force that eliminates the problem that puts people in the institutions in the first place.

One of the things that inspired me as a new member of parliament when I came to this House 19 years ago, and the Diefenbaker government was formed, was the approach that the Hon. E. Davie Fulton took to criminology and criminal law in general. As minister of justice, he put in place a completely new concept of penology. He broke down the penal system into three phases. He realized that there were inmates in the institutions who were impossible to rehabilitate, and he believed there should be maximum security institutions for them. He believed that other inmates were there probably because of their environment, more than anything else, who could be rehabilitated.

Among the latter, he believed there were two classes, the young offender, the boy or girl who gets into trouble over and over again, who still needs guidance and direction in order to develop the discipline that is required to operate in society. So he suggested there should be two kinds of institutions for inmates who were capable of being rehabilitated: one, the young offenders' type of institution, and the other, a minimum security institution. The latter would be capable of handling older inmates who still had some hope of rehabilitation, but they would not be mixed with the younger inmates and perhaps teach them the kind of tricks that rehabilitation experts did not want them to learn. They knew that if they learned these tricks they would return to the institution.

Then there was a third institution, a minimum security institution that took the inmate almost back to society, but not quite. All the bars, guns and things that were associated with penal institutions in our mind were removed and inmates were allowed to operate in a daily routine that would get them back close to society. A parole system was established to assist them when they returned to society. Things were moving along in a very satisfactory manner when suddenly a group of individuals gained control of the penal operations of this nation. They came up with more kooky ideas about rehabilitation of inmates than could be imagined by anyone with any common sense. Unfortunately, many of those individuals are still in positions of influence within the Department of the Solicitor General and the Canadian Pententiary Service. The thing that disturbs me about these individuals who have all kinds of schemes about how to rehabilitate inmates is that they neglect the reason the individual is in the institution in the first place. Individuals go to penitentiaries because they cannot accept the disciplines of society. In one form or another they reject the disciplines that society demands and they break the law; in the worst form, they kill people, but they do a lot of other things as well.

When you get planners in the Canadian Penitentiary Service who want inmates in institutions to have no more discipline there than they had outside, you get a complete breakdown within the institution. We have seen it over and over again, Mr. Speaker. Ther has been riot after riot after riot, kidnapping of personnel, wanton destruction of institutions and complete failure of the rehabilitation system as it is in effect at this time. Those who are in, come out, go back in and it is a repeat performance.

When Mr. Fulton was minister of justice, the Canadian Penitentiary Service carried out an operation where discipline was the number one criterion. An inmate who went into an institution knew he was there because he had committed a crime against society. He was not there listening to apologists telling him it was not really his fault he had done something wrong, that it was society's fault and society was going to try to mend its ways so that he would be in a better position to blend into society in the future. The inmate was told that first of all he had to learn to

discipline himself, and if he showed that he could, then the Canadian Penitentiary Service would try to assist him to secure the training that would enable him to find his place in society.

That system worked, and worked well. Then suddenly we got these kooks in the Canadian Penitentiary Services who talked about the therapeutic programs they would introduce that will delve into the minds of the inmates. They were going to develop a philosophy and a psychology which would eradicate forever the criminal mind of the individual. It eradicated it very well: as I said, we have had a complete breakdown of control! Inmates are allowed to roam around the institutions, wearing anything they want to wear and as little as they want to wear. They are allowed to let their hair and their beards grow and look as dirty and despicable as possible. Nobody says a word, because they do not want to hurt their feelings.

● (1220)

You cannot expect to create, in the minds of inmates of institutions, the fact that they are being punished for the crime thay have committed against society if you let them operate in that way. In addition, all too often drugs are as prevalent within the institutions as they are outside. There appears to be a complete breakdown of constructive programs because there is no discipline within the institutions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: Unfortunately, those who are really getting the dirty end of the stick are the employees in our institutions. The Springhill institution, in my constituency, was originally constructed as a young offenders' penal institution during the period this party held office. There is now a mix of every age. They tell the guards—possibly I should not use the title "guard" because it is distasteful and might upset the prisoners—

Mr. Alkenbrack: They do not say "warden" any more.

Mr. Coates: No, they do not say "warden" any more. Those titles are very distasteful to those who believe in the therapeutic approach to penology. You must have the right title and the right sound to the words so that you do not offend the inmates. You must not hurt their feelings, because that would be wrong, even though they are in the institution because they did something quite serious, and probably did it a number of times. The guards at the Springhill institution were told that they should not wear uniforms, that they should look like every one else in the institution. Imagine what would happen to guards without uniforms if a riot were to take place within that institution. How would you distinguish between the inmates and the guards? There would be no way. That is the degree of lunacy of some of the programs put forward by the so-called experts in penology.

The reason I talk about this is that I do not think you can separate a rehabilitation program from the death penalty. It is all part of the same package. If we can get back to sanity and produce realistic rehabilitation programs in our penal institutions, we will get farther down the road with the public as far as capital punishment is concerned.

There is little value in a government endeavouring to impose upon the public a point of view that the public does not accept. Surely, this government should know, from every semblance of evidence that is available in our nation at this time, that the public does not want the abolition of capital punishment. If the government could put in place a rehabilitation program that was workable, the public would accept abolition of the death penalty. However, until we reach that point we cannot expect the public to accept the government's view on abolition which is completely out of step with the point of view of the public. By pushing us farther down the road of abolition before the public is ready to accept it, all the government is doing is making parliament that much more of a non-essential item in the eyes of the public. If parliament does not reflect what the public thinks, then parliament is redundant.

If this House supports the abolition of capital punishment, it will be just one more nail in the coffin of this institution as far as public acceptance is concerned. If members of parliament feel that the public gets upset when we are asking for an increase in indemnity, there would be no better reason for the public taking that point of view than parliament completely ignoring the wishes of those who pay our salaries.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: Surely those who pay the bill should have some say about what is done for them with the money that they pay. If this parliament ignores the opinion of more than 70 per cent of the public, it is just asking for more difficulty in the future in so far as the people of this nation are concerned.

I hope that in future the people of this nation will come to the conclusion that our system of justice can allow us to abolish capital punishment. However, we have not yet arrived at that point. We will not arrive at that point for a long time, because it will take at least a decade to undo the damage that has been done by the permissiveness and liberalism that exists within the penitentiary service at this time.

We have to reach a conclusion that is both logical and sensible within the environment that is Canada today, that is, that the death penalty should be retained, certainly for the type of heinous crimes committed in Moncton, Dartmouth, Calgary, and in the British Columbia institution. Those crimes demand that the death penalty be imposed. I can have no sympathy for two individuals who slaughtered in the way Hutchinson and Ambrose murdered in Moncton. Why should anyone in this nation have compassion for the individuals who took those two police officers out to a country spot, forced them to dig their own graves, and then killed them. They were able to resort to every protection which the law and the courts offer. But they were found guilty.

● (1230)

No one has asked that mercy be accorded to them, and I suggest they should now be assigned to the same fate as their victims. It would be brought about in a much more humane way than the deaths of the two officers, even though it might not be the ideal way. They should be dealt with in accordance with the sentence which was passed,

and the same principle should apply to others who have been judged by their peers to be guilty of the crime of murder, when no recommendation for mercy has been made. It is as simple as that. That is what the law demands. That is what society demands. That is what I hope parliament will say to these individuals and to others who might be considered performing the same acts as the persons who are presently on death row.

That is what the law should say. That is what the courts will say, according to the law which is on the statute books at this time. And that is what parliament should say. The people have spoken. They have said they want the death penalty retained. Parliament should confirm that the death penalty will continue to exist in this nation so long as the people desire it as the ultimate punishment for the crime of murder.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to place on record my own thoughts, in a limited time, as to why I shall vote for the retention of capital punishment in the very limited statute we now have on the books. On previous occasions I have voted for legislation which would retain capital punishment for the murder of policemen or prison guards. The alternative was the wider application of capital punishment which was prevalent in years gone by. I have been in favour of a very limited form of the application of capital punishment, mainly on the basis that sometimes mistakes were made which resulted in innocent people being put to death. However, under the present legislation the chances of this happening are extremely limited—I would say almost non-existent. With this factor in mind, I feel the limited form of capital punishment presently provided for should be retained.

I have other reasons for wishing to see the retention of capital punishment in the case of the murder of police officers or prison guards. I feel that if there is no provision for the retention of capital punishment, then police officers will often, by themselves, carry out a form of capital punishment. When the minister spoke a few days ago I took the opportunity to ask him a question, and he was kind enough to reply. He stated that he did not think police officers in this country would carry out this type of retribution. But I do not think that view is a reasonable one. In cases where a police officer is killed in what his colleagues feel is an unfair way, particularly during the commission of a violent crime, it is very easy for them to respond when the occasion arises by carrying out a form of capital punishment on their own. I think it is significant, when reading reports of violent crimes taking place, that they often contain details of the criminal having been shot to death when apprehended and that many more shots were fired than would appear to have been necessary in the apprehension of that individual.

So I think we have our choice. Do we support a very limited form of capital punishment, with a jury, with judges and, in the final analysis, the cabinet making the decision on commutation, or are we going to risk the very real possibility that capital punishment will be carried out to a certain extent by our own law officers perhaps much more often than would happen under our present laws? I feel this point has more importance than it has been credited with. We impose duties on our law officer and also dangers, but they are human beings. It would be nice to think they always look at the law dispassionately and would not use their guns unless it were absolutely necessary. But we have to recognize the personalities of our law officers and the personalities of murderers.

There are some people in our society, no matter what one does, who will never change their ways. They only understand being hit as hard as they would like to hit. In the final analysis, criminals do have, under this legislation, the benefit of trial by a jury which decides whether or not to make a recommendation for mercy. As I understand it, juries may make a recommendation for mercy of they may decide not to make such a recommendation. Imperfect as it might be, in the final analysis the decisions of juries probably are as good a basis as any to decide these very difficult questions. With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate my point of view as to the reason I shall vote for the retention of capital punishment in its limited form.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I can remember back in 1973 when we first debated this bill after I had been elected. It seems to me a shame this time that the government, on a free vote, one in which members are supposed to have total freedom rushing this bill through the House of Commons and trying to get it passed quickly to take away some of their embarrassment because of the fact that they are abolitionists and the majority of the country is not.

On January 26, 1973, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) spoke to the measure to abolish capital punishment except in cases of the murder of police officers and prison guards. Debate on that bill did not end until October 8, 1973. Yet this time around we debated this bill on May 3 for the first time. A budget has been introduced since then, and we have a number of opposition days. The government has done a tremendous job of diffusing this debate in the country so that the people do not really know there is a very short time until the vote. Thus, I do not think we are getting the response from the public in this debate that we should. Certainly, six weeks is not, to me, long enough to have the debate before the House of Commons. I just want to put that on the record at the very beginning.

● (1240)

A number of the speeches that have been made on capital punishment seem to indicate that most people who are retentionists are in favour of hanging people or of disposing of them in some form or other for just about every kind of murder. As one who has done a lot of talking in the area of capital punishment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make it very plain that the majority of the retentionists I know are only in favour of capital punishment for the most serious types of murder, that is to say, for the hardened criminals and Mafia-types who go out and kill.

So far as some of the people who are on death row right now are concerned, some of whom are from my area, I think the death penalty should be applied. First of all, there is Elery Steven Long, who killed staff sergeant Ronald McKay of the Delta police force. This was a vicious type of crime, the type for which I think the law should be carried out. There was no recommendation of mercy from the jury, and under the present law I think this man should suffer the consequences. Then there are James

Lawrence Hutchison and Richard Joseph Ambrose who killed constable Michael O'Leary and corporal Aurele Bourgeois of the Moncton police force, another grisly murder case with no recommendation of mercy. John Harvey Miller and Vincent John Cockriell killed constable Roger Pierlet of Surrey, which is adjacent to my riding, another case where I think the law that this parliament passed on the last occasion should be upheld.

I shall be talking about the speech made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) later, but I suggest that the last debate in the House on this issue in 1973 was a fraud. There was no intention by the Prime Minister to let his cabinet carry out the law that this parliament willed, and I think this is part of the problem we are facing today.

I should also like to say something about what people who are serving life sentences in jail for murder have to say about capital punishment. There was an article in the Vancouver *Province* of last Saturday, June 12, concerning an interview with six different murderers. I should like to quote some of the statements that they made. The first was Larry Corbett. I cannot say I have had the pleasure, but I have had the opportunity to meet this man inside jail and also to talk to one of the persons he tried to kill. He was unsuccessful in killing the woman I talked to, but he did kill her husband. I should like to quote what he said:

Given the choice between capital punishment and spending 25 years in prison as the federal government proposes, convicted murderer Larry Corbett replies unemotionally: "Drop me".

The words come out matter-of-factly. These is no doubt in his mind that after spending a quarter century behind bars, he might as well be dead.

I should also like to quote, from the same article, some of Mr. Corbett's thoughts on capital punishment as well as on spending some time in jail. He begins as follows:

It doesn't matter at this point whether you're guilty or not because they assume you are and treat you just the same. If I thought about it I'd drive myself across the road—

I think that is funny, that he would drive himself across the road.

—(to the psychiatric centre). Who wants to listen to a bleeding heart all the time?"

What bothers him most about his life sentence?

"Basically the thing that tears me up anyway, and eventually tears up most lifers especially if you're a family man, is that the longer you do, your family slides further and further away from you."

Corbett's wife and children live in the Prince George area and he sees them only a few times a year.

"Your family has certain needs and there's nothing you can do to help because you're put away. Theoretically, you're dead and you can't expect them to die just because you're in this position. Their needs and functions are the same as they've always been.

"And this is hard to accept. It's the jealousies and hurts that end up getting to you. My wife must continue functioning in a normal manner and although we've been married for 17 years, after five years in prison we're getting further and further apart. It can't help but work any other way."

Anyone who has any sense of compassion would feel sorry for an individual like this who is spending his time in jail, seeing his family only three times a year. But the one thing that the reporter did not report in this article was what the family of the murder victim has to go through. I can remember a few years ago getting a call from a lady who said that she had to see me about something very important. She would not meet me in my office, which is where most people come to meet me, but wanted me to meet her inside her apartment building. I thought this was rather strange, so I called the RCMP and asked them to accompany me on the visit. When I got there, Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised, as was the RCMP officer who was with me, to find another RCMP officer sitting in her apartment having tea with this lady.

She was the one whose husband was killed by Larry Corbett. He was killed in a trailer park. Apparently, this man knocked on the door of the trailer in the middle of the night; this lady answered the door, the man put a gun to her face, pushed her into the back bedroom and started to rob her. Her husband woke up, and Corbett just shot him in cold blood. Then he shot the woman and left her for dead, too. Fortunately, she managed to live, and after some months moved back into the Vancouver area. She was threatened all during this man's trial by various people, had to change her name a number of times and move from city to city to avoid some of the people who did not want to see this man convicted. That is not mentioned in the article.

I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because we all have compassion for a person who has to spend some time in jail. However, we forget too often about the victims of crime and the relatives of the victims of crime. In cases such as this, of proven, premeditated murder, people should have to pay the supreme penalty. I should like to quote further what Mr. Corbett had to say. I could go on and on because this article runs for several columns, but I just want to quote what he said about spending 25 years in jail:

"You know, normally speaking he'd never do that but now he's only going to get one chance."

He was talking about escape.

"Like, when you drop this 25 on a guy and he gets into a position where he can escape, he's not going to get another chance for years. They're going to swallow him up in one of these 'penthouses'"

Should a prisoner be successful in escaping, he becomes desperate to stay on the loose and this puts the public generally in greater danger than before, Corbett says. If he has a heavy murder term to return to, there isn't much more that can be done to him.

Inside the prisons, Corbett says, there will be a considerable buildup of tensions resulting in more jail killings and suicides.

"It takes a hell of a lot of self-discipline to walk away from a simple little thing now. But what about when you turn around and there's absolutely no hope of me getting out for 25 years. What good am I even to myself?

"Any initiative I might have is totally lost. So now rather than restraining myself I'll be more aggressive. This guy over here isn't going to restrain himself and he's going to stick it to me. So now the paranoia sets in and you figure well, okay, I've got to get him first".

One provision that is not in the bill, and which I think should be, is this. What about the man who is sentenced under this legislation and who kills a second time while inside the penitentiary? Do we just slap him on the wrist and put him in a "penthouse"? What if he kills a third time? The Solicitor General knows full well that this can happen, and probably will, under our present penitentiary system. I now want to refer to the speech of the Prime Minister the other day. As reported at page 14499 of *Hansard*, he said:

I want to make it very clear that, if a majority of hon. members vote against abolition, some people are going to be hanged. Their death would be a direct consequence of the negative decision made by this House on this bill.

Then on the same thought he said:

While members are free to vote as they wish, those who vote against the bill, for whatever reason, cannot escape their personal share of responsibility for the hangings which will take place if the bill is defeated.

The people of this country gave the Prime Minister a mandate in 1972 and again in 1974. In 1973 this House passed a bill that provided that people who kill policemen or prison guards were to be hanged. Yet the Prime Minister has not taken it upon his conscience to live up to that law. He is now trying to say that those who want to retain capital punishment will have these hangings around their necks. I cannot go along with that kind of logic.

The government is now proposing to institute bilingualism in air traffic control and among pilots. The Prime Minister says he is concerned about the safety factor, yet bilingualism is being forced upon these people. Will he take that personal responsibility if an airplane crashes? I do not think he will, Mr. Speaker. He also says, and I will quote him on this because I do not want to get him wrong:

● (1250)

Longer mandatory sentences, and the tightening of parole regulations in relation to convicted murderers will give society the assurance it needs that those who have unlawfully taken the life of another will be removed from our midst for a very long time.

I have been looking at the present situation in our penitentiaries in respect of temporary absences for murders, and I wonder if we can really take the Prime Minister seriously when he talks about removing them for a very long time. I was told on May 27, when I phoned the Solicitor General's office and spoke with Mr. Dave Tobin, that unescorted lifers are eligible for temporary absences three years before their parole date is due. That is, if the judge sets the lifer's pardon date at 20 years, he is eligible for temporary absence or day parole at the 17-year mark of his sentence, and not before. I wanted to check this out this morning to make sure I was correct, and I phoned and was told that seven years would be the earliest for unescorted temporary absence. This would mean a ten-year minimum sentence a man must serve who was sentenced to life, and he could not get one before seven years. Just before I came in here at 11 o'clock—in fact, I was here and was called out to the phone—they had phoned my office and said, "Well, we wanted to make sure Mr. Reynolds has got it right. Now we find out that they can get a temporary absence, unescorted, after only three years in jail after being sentenced to life for murder".

I wonder how secure we are going to be, with what the Prime Minister has said, when you look at some of the people who are getting out on temporary absence passes. I have the record here in response to a question I placed on the order paper. It gives the number of murderers who received unescorted temporary absences from January 1, 1974, to June 30, 1975. In that group, Mr. Speaker, there is a man, right off the bat, the first man on the list, who was convicted of murder in 1972 and has had one unescorted temporary absence. A man convicted in 1969 has had 23 unescorted absences. A man convicted in 1970, last year had 30 unescorted absences. Another man convicted in 1970 has had two unescorted absences. Another one in 1970, convicted of murder, has had eight unescorted absences. Another, in 1971, has had two. These are all individuals who were sentenced to life for murder.

[Mr. Reynolds.]

There was another man convicted in 1972 who has had 17 unescorted temporary absences. Another, in 1971, has had four temporary unescorted absences. Another one, in 1970, has had one unescorted absence. Another one, in 1971, has had one unescorted temporary absence. A woman convicted of murder in 1970 has received 17 unescorted absences. Another man, convicted of murder in 1970, received 17 unescorted absences last year. There are a couple in my own area. A man convicted in 1970 received 13 temporary unescorted absences last year. Another murderer in the B.C. penitentiary received 18 unescorted absences. Another one, convicted in 1969, in Dorchester, has had 27 unescorted absences. I could go on and on, as I have pages and pages. These are murderers who have served less than seven years and are out on temporary absences, as free as can be.

That is what we are looking at when the Prime Minister tells us that people are going to be safe under this new law. It is just a bunch of boloney, and we all know it. That is why I will vote against this bill. I will vote against it for a lot of other reasons as well, but that is one of the main reasons. I cannot trust this government to make sure that the people in my constituency, which is right next to a penitentiary, will be safe. The Solicitor General knows about this, because we have had a number of escapes from that penitentiary in the last couple of years.

The Prime Minister talked about not being able to take a life without proven necessity and without proven need. I think the Prime Minister should have more faith in our courts system and in the law we have had since he has been Prime Minister. He has had a law on the books that says people shall receive the death penalty for killing policemen and prison guards. He has not lived up to that law. He has not trusted the courts and he has not trusted the jury system in this country. He should be ashamed of himself for not having lived up to the present law, and ashamed that he is forcing this bill through the House so quickly so that he does not have to look at his responsibility for the people sitting on death row in this country. The last thing the Prime Minister talked about was deterrence, and I should also like to quote him in this respect:

I don't want to hear your guesses about the deterrent value of capital punishment. I don't want to hear about gut feelings. I want proof. Not absolute proof. Not even proof beyond a reasonable doubt. A preponderance of evidence will do. A preponderance of available evidence showing that executions are likely to deter other murders would serve as an adequate justification for the act, an adequate guarantee that a human life was not being taken capriciously.

Show me the evidence that capital punishment anywhere, at anytime, has deterred other people from committing murder. My own reading of the speeches made here on this issue since the first week of May, together with the Solicitor General's daily monitoring of the debate, have indicated that no such evidence has been placed before the House.

The evidence does not exist, neither in the Canadian experience nor in the experience of any other jurisdiction. At best, the statistics are inconclusive. They prove nothing. There is no evidence proving that the use or non-use of capital punishment has had any effect whatsoever on murder rates anywhere in the world.

I would say, in response, that the Prime Minister has not really spent enough money with people who might be on the other side of the issue. I know he has got his friend, Professor Fattah, of Simon Fraser University, with whom he has spent an awful lot of money, writing on capital punishment. In fact, Mr. Fattah phoned me a couple of times to have discussions. He is a confirmed abolitionist.

Pretty well everybody the government has given money to has been a pretty strongly confirmed abolitionist.

I would suggest that the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General's department have not spent a lot of time or money with people who might be on the other side of the issue, in order to get their viewpoints and their statistics before the Canadian people. I noticed one booklet that came out, called "Deterrence and the Death Penalty", described as a critical review of the research of Isaac Ehrlich, which was funded by the Solicitor General's department, and one of the few that may have been on the other side, published in March, 1976, and done by Robert G. Hann. The author states, and he is talking about whether or not there is a deterrent effect:

> However, this wisdom is replaced not with "punishment does deter crime", but rather with "we don't know".

That is the crux of this matter. None of us really knows whether capital punishment is a deterrent. We can argue about it. I know of a case where it was a deterrent, and I am sure it would be an isolated incident and somebody might tell me of a case on the other side. We do not really know. I am wondering why this government, after having a number of years with, really, a ban on capital punishment, can say that. The government can say that it is on the books, but every murderer and every criminal knows that there is no capital punishment. Why can we not have a five-year trial with capital punishment and see how the statistics are during that time? I think this government is a little afraid to try something that the majority of the people might want. I would like to quote something the Prime Minister said a long time ago when speaking about what the majority of the people want in this country. He said:

> I have never been able to accept any discipline except that which I imposed upon myself—and there was a time when I used to impose it often. For, in the art of living, or in that of loving, or of governing—it is all the same—I found it unacceptable that others should claim to know better than I what was good for me.

I find that very strange, because the Prime Minister now is saying he cannot accept things, yet he is expecting the people of this country, 80 per cent of them in favour of capital punishment, to accept his wish to abolish it. I think that is unacceptable. I have not quite finished, Mr. Speaker, so I will continue later and call it one o'clock now.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TRANSPORTATION FOR MEMBERS IN VIEW OF POSSIBLE STRIKE BY AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the terms of Standing Order 43. In light of the fact that the air controllers could go on strike at any time, and in light of the fact that the vote on capital punishment will be on Tuesday, June 22, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway):

> That the Prime Minister assure the House that DND flights will be available for all M.P.'s on Monday June 21 to assure full attendance in the House for this important vote.

Mr. Speaker: The provisions under Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

EDUCATION

SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF ROYAL COMMISSION TO STUDY FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL ROLES IN UNIVERSITY POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, because this is a matter of urgent and pressing necessity I ask leave to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin):

> That this House urges the government to agree to the request of the Canadian Association of University Teachers for the appointment of a royal commission to consider the funding of higher education in Canada, and to study in particular the relationship between federal and provincial governments with respect to university policy, it being clear that such an informed study should precede any far reaching changes affecting higher education in this country.

Mr. Speaker: The provisions under Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

AGREEMENT WITH MR. MORRIS ON SUBJECTS TO BE DISCUSSED AT CONFERENCE—POSSIBILITY OF NATIONAL STRIKE

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour I should like to direct my question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. On Monday, June 14 I asked the Minister of Labour about the agenda and specific items to be discussed between the government and Mr. Morris of CLC at their meeting this morning. I also asked whether the government was prepared to offer concessions to the CLC in order to lessen the threat of a general strike. The minister responded at that time that it would be presumptuous for him to state what was on the minds of the CLC representatives. After a full morning of discussion with CLC representatives, does the Prime Minister still feel it would be presumptuous for the government to inform the House and the people of Canada what plans the government has for labour-government relations during the control and post-control period, and if any concessions were offered to the CLC this morning in order to avert a general strike?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the short answer is no, and the answer would not be presumptuous but it would be premature. I apologize for not being able to answer the hon. member directly but the meeting has not yet taken place; it will take place this afternoon. Perhaps the hon. member could ask his question tomorrow.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

METHOD OF FULFILLING COMMITMENT ON REFORM OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS WITHOUT PARTICIPATION OF CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): I thank the Prime Minister for his answer, and I apologize, through you, Mr. Speaker, for not realizing that the meeting did not start until this afternoon. However, my supplementary question to the Prime Minister is the following. The government has stated that it is committed to the reform of industrial relations. Similarly the October anti-inflation white paper invested the Canadian Labour Relations Council with the mandate of considering the appropriate avenues for this reform. Has the government had any indication prior to the meeting this afternoon that the CLC is willing to re-enter the Canadian Labour Relations Council and if the CLC is not, can the Prime Minister inform the House how his government is going to fulfil its commitment toward industrial relations reform without that very body which has been invested with fulfilling this commitment?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I believe it is correct to say that there has been no firm indication by the CLC that it would want to re-enter that body, certainly not insofar as I know and I do not believe the Minister of Labour has heard that either. The reason we are meeting with the CLC is to pursue their own desire expressed at the Quebec convention to have consultations with the government with a view to being able to play a larger role and have a larger input into the processes of government administration and policy setting. This is precisely the subject we want to discuss with them. One way of doing it would be to have them re-enter the council, as the hon. member, I believe, suggests. There might be other bodies or other ways in which this might be pursued. This will certainly be in the forefront of our minds this afternoon as we meet the CLC.

[Mr. Speaker.]

● (1410)

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS MANIFESTO

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): I want to thank the Prime Minister for his answer and ask him if he is prepared this afternoon to discuss with the CLC the ultimate ramifications of the CLC manifesto, which calls for a type of labour-government dialogue based on social corporatism, which, of course, is the antithesis of the past democratic practices within the CLC and the labour movement in Canada, which would be the antithesis of democracy in this country and which would make this House completely irrelevant.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I share the hon. member's concern on that score, and I imagine the New Democratic Party shares that concern, too. Certainly, our position with any group in discussions with the government, whether it be labour, management or any other sector of society, would be that the government is answerable to parliament and through parliament to the country, and not to any particular group, so to the extent that labour, or any other body, would want to have a firm hand on the decision making process, the answer would have to be no, we answer to parliament. We do not answer to any one movement.

However, of course, this does not preclude us, as we hope, from establishing ways in which the labour movement particularly could have a greater say in the input of the government in determining policies. We think it would be useful if, for example, the labour movement did not tend to be identified with any one party, but rather came as a movement representing the workers, and in so far as it did, would want to make sure the government understood the point of view of the workers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

EFFECT OF ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Labour. After eight months in operation it is apparent that AIB regulations are having a marked influence on the traditional methods of collective bargaining. For example, with regard to the Thompson strike, Mr. Tansley is there or will be there shortly. I would like to ask the minister if he is now prepared to outline in full to employers, employees, unions and their representatives exactly what they can expect in

their collective bargaining relations during this period of restraint and while the AIB is functioning.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think the history of events since the government brought in the regulations and the anti-inflation program indicates to labour and the business community—but the hon. member is speaking particularly about labour—that indeed they are limitations, in a sense, of the collective bargaining process, but it is not a denial of it. I can only point to the tremendous number of collective agreements which have been entered into and signed which are within the guidelines and to those which have gone to the AIB for rulings which have resulted in the resolution of disputes. I might also indicate that in terms of man-days lost through strikes, they have been decreasing over the last few months.

GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE INDUSTRIAL HARMONY—NUMBER OF STRIKES THIS YEAR

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): In view of the fact that 1974 was a disastrous year for labour strikes and that 1975 was somewhat worse, can the minister tell us what his department and the cabinet are doing to rationalize the aims of the AIB and the goal of industrial harmony so that our 1976 record will not be worse? What statistics does the minister have to show that we are actually better off than we were last year?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): I can endeavour to supply the hon. member with some statistics over the course of the last few months to indicate, as I already have, that man-days lost to strikes are decreasing. I also point out to the hon. member some significant good news which I related to the House the other day with regard to the railway industry, which involves 95,000 men. It would appear that there is every hope for a settlement based on the recommendations of the Hall report. That means no strike in that particular industry for two years. I think there are other examples of this across the country.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

POSITION OF PRIME MINISTER ON PATRIATION—PROTECTION OF PROVINCIAL RIGHTS IN AMENDING FORMULA

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister. I understand that the question of the patriation of the Canadian constitution was discussed, at least informally, with the first ministers of the provinces earlier this week. Will the Prime Minister tell the House what progress, if any, was made and whether he is still determined as I think he was before that if consensus cannot be obtained he will seek a resolution of parliament to ensure that the full power of control of the constitution of Canada can be exercised in Canada and not by any outside power?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the discussions we had earlier in the week were not conclusive in the sense that no premier took the absolute position of saying we should not patriate or conversely we should patriate and the federal government and parliament should do it alone. The positions they want to establish are still uncertain, I believe. They have indicated to me that they would have further meetings amongst themselves at ministerial level as they did a few weeks ago and they, as first ministers of the provinces, would want to discuss the matter in the final sense at the annual meeting of the premiers to be held this year in Edmonton in August. They undertook, as a result of that meeting, to report to me. Therefore, any answer I could give to the hon. member's second question would be conditional and hypothetical.

We still believe that the government, and I think the view is shared by all parties here, should, during the course of the life of this parliament, ensure the results that the hon. member just described, that every part of the Canadian constitution should reside in Canada rather than in some other country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I do not think it is necessary at this time to appeal to other parties to share that resolve very vocally with this party because it is still possible, and I would think hopeful, that the provinces will agree on the position I have just described.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question. May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether he indicated to the first ministers of the provinces that some such formula as was proposed at the Victoria conference, whereby changes that affected the distribution of power between the federal and provincial authorities, could not be carried through without the concurrence of either the province of Quebec or the legislature of Quebec or the province of Ontario or its legislature or a combination of other provinces? Did he indicate it was the intention of the government to put into any change that was made, such protection of provincial rights as would be involved in some such formula as that?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I am dealing with the question. If I understood it properly perhaps the simplest thing would be to indicate that in my letters to the premiers a month of two ago I indicated three possible means of proceeding with the patriation of the constitution. Perhaps I would answer the hon. member more clearly by indicating whichever of the three means is chosen or if any four or five means is found, it would be with the clear intention of the federal government not to affect the distribution of powers between the federal and the provincial governments. Even in the act of patriation, or indeed in the situation which would exist after patriation, it would not be our intention to have any greater potential federally for acting against the provinces than we have now. I think that was made quite clear in my letters. I repeat, if I misunderstood the purport of the question I should certainly welcome a supplementary.

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

INQUIRY WHETHER DEATH PENALTIES WILL BE COMMUTED

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Following his speech on Bill C-84, which tends to blame hon. members who will vote against this bill, does the right hon. Prime Minister intend to ask the cabinet, first, to commute the death penalty of those who are on death row and, second, to comply with the legislation which will be voted on in the next few days?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is mistaken. My speech did not tend to blame hon. members who would vote against Bill C-84. I simply reminded hon. members that if this bill was not passed by the House, those who would vote against it should certainly take on their shoulders the burden of reinstating capital punishment in Canada, and I am sure this is a responsibility they would not want to evade and they could not evade. In other words, hon. members must not expect automatic resort to commutation of the death sentence, as the hon. member seems to fear.

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

My question relates a little to the second part of my previous question, when I asked the Prime Minister whether he intended to ask the cabinet to comply with the legislation which will be voted by this Parliament in the next few weeks.

* * *

● (1420)

[*English*]

FISHERIES

ALLEGED EXTENSION OF FISHING ZONES AROUND ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON BY FRANCE—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT CANADIAN RIGHTS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister, a question which is not only important to Atlantic Canada, but indeed all of Canada since it deals with international treaties. In light of the enabling legislation covering a 200-mile limit for its territories and possessions as announced by the Republic of France, were any arrangements made by the present government to cover this contingency when phasing-out fishing agreements were signed with France? If not, what steps will now be taken to protect Canadian rights on our continental shelf which include a large part of the prolific fishing grounds on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and which will, if not resolved, make the phasing-out agreements signed with other countries fishing within our 200 mile limit impossible to implement?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I should first put on the record that according to our information it is the intention of the government of France to bring in enabling legislation. Contrary to press reports, France has not proclaimed a 200-mile limit. It is obvious that the particular situation of St. Pierre and Miquelon will cause difficulties in the boundary question which remains to be settled. This question has already been the subject of some discussion. When the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and I were in New York, we talked to the head of the French delegation. Other contacts have taken place at ICNAF. The 1972 treaty covers the fisheries reciprocal arrangement quite well. It will be a question of negotiations and discussion, as it will be with other countries where geography will not allow us to move away from each other. We share the oceans and, therefore, we will have to come to some arrangement.

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE CONCERNING ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the reply just given to the House by the minister, I wish to ask him a supplementary question. Assurance was given to the House or the fisheries committee of the House in 1973 by Ambassador Beesley with regard to negotiations with France that "the position has developed to the point where we could be on the verge of an agreement vis-à-vis St. Pierre and Miquelon." What happened to these negotiations? What is the position at the moment? If France does pursue legislation to unilaterally take action on her own with respect to her boundaries, what does that do to Canada's timetable of January 1 next year?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member, who has had much more experience than I, would not expect me to answer a question starting with "if". I will simply tell him that one of the complicating factors in the negotiations with France is that of the position of France, as a member of the community and its impact on upcoming negotiations with Canada, is not yet clarified for the French themselves. I am not an international lawyer, but the possibility of having to negotiate with not one but a whole series of other countries in the community obviously complicates matters. We have underlined this problem to the French authorities.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of State (Fisheries). St. Pierre and Miquelon are now claiming 20,000 square miles of continental shelf. If the French extend the 200-mile limit, this will cause serious implications with regard to the location of St. Pierre and Miquelon. There have been no negotiations since 1972. What position is Canada going to take? Also, what negotiations have taken place or are now taking place with regard to resolving this very delicate problem which not only affects Canada, but the whole Atlantic region?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Apparently the hon. member did not hear what I said. There have already been discussions, there has been agreement to accelerate those discussions and enter into formal negotiations. This will be done after the ICNAF conference in the coming weeks. There have already been talks to identify the problem areas and try to find an accommodation. I believe both

sides recognize that reciprocal arrangements and *ad hoc* arrangements could be made until the long term boundary problems are settled.

Mr. Marshall: In view of the fact that Canada has taken the rightful position that the size of the claim of St. Pierre and Miquelon is out of proportion to the size of the blob of land existing there, may I ask whether this has been the subject of negotiation?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): The hon. member talks about Canada's rightful position. I agree with his description of it and that is the position we take.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

USE OF MERCURY-CONTAMINATED FISH BY NATIVES IN AREA OF ENGLISH AND WABIGOON RIVERS—PROVISION OF OTHER SOURCES OF PROTEIN

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development but in his absence I will direct it to the acting minister. On Friday, June 11, the hon. member for Greenwood referred to a report prepared by officials of the Department of Indian Affairs and the Department of National Health recommending that subsidies be paid to Indians on the English-Wabigoon River systems to enable the provision of protein substitutes for mercury-polluted fish. The minister said the contents of the report were being discussed with the Indian people and the provincial government concerned. In view of the seriousness of the situation, can the minister now report on the progress of these discussions and can he also tell us whether he is prepared to offer aid to such a subsidy program?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): I understand that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development will be here later on in the question period, but if he is not, I will undertake to bring the matter to his attention.

ACTION TO INFORM NATIVE GUIDES NOT TO EAT MERCURY-CONTAMINATED FISH

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Perhaps at the same time the acting minister would bring another matter to the attention of his colleague. It concerns a problem of which he is aware—the difficulty of implementing an effective educational program to convince native people, in particular, native fishing guides, who have been identified as a high-risk group, of the danger of eating mercury-polluted fish. Can the hon. gentleman inform us whether this aspect of the matter was discussed with the native people and the provincial government? Would he tell us, also, whether he has made recommendations with a view to correcting this serious situation?

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF THE ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance; I assume he has now had an opportunity to review the past and present activities, at least in part, of the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. I want to ask the minister whether he is satisfied that the chairman is in full compliance with the provisions of section 21(7) of the Anti-Dumping Act. Also, I want to ask the minister whether he has perused a memorandum to file dated October 17, 1975 which contains, among other things, the following in which the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal appears to indicate to Swedish lawyer Sture Hoveden: "I would not think of risking my reputation for $200,000; I would prefer to risk it for $5 or $10 million, as the opportunity exists in the case of Auto-Chemist". He went on to talk about that subject. Can the minister clarify this matter?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I did have an opportunity of seeing Mr. Gauthier this morning and I shall be making further inquiries in relation to this matter. It would, of course, be of great assistance to receive from the hon. member and, indeed, from any other persons who might have information on this particular transaction. I shall, of course, be glad to pursue it. In any event, I hope to bring this affair to a conclusion and report to the House at an early date.

Mr. MacKay: I shall be pleased to give the minister whatever data I have. Is he now in a position to assure the House that the research capabilities, facilities and personnel of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal organization have not been used for any purposes other than those for which they should be used, or for the benefit of persons other than that of the government of Canada?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would prefer not to give piecemeal answers to these questions until I have had an opportunity to canvass it fully.

* * *

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

ALLEGED ATTEMPT BY CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL TO OBTAIN FROM CORPORATION RIGHT TO SELL FISH ROE

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): A supplementary directed to the Minister of State for Fisheries. Would the minister tell us whether or not he has been apprized either by the Minister of Finance or by any other source that the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal appears to have contact with business interests wishing to obtain exclusive rights to fish roe sold by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and, if so, does this meet with the minister's approval?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): I am informed there have been press inquiries about the existence of a letter and I have asked the president of the Corporation whether a letter which was described to me

over the telephone had been received. He has not seen it. I will, of course, inquire into this. On the other hand, if the hon. member has information I hope that he will make it available to us so that I can share this information with the Minister of Finance.

● (1430)

Mr. Whiteway: In that case perhaps the minister will be interested in a letter indicating that these interests appear also to be willing to work against the efforts of the corporation. I want to quote from this letter, if I may, Mr. Speaker, so that the minister will understand. It is a letter from a company by the name of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure that the hon. member will have an opportunity to provide the minister with that letter.

* * *

HEALTH

POSSIBILITY OF REGULATIONS CONTROLLING ASBESTOS OPERATIONS—STEPS TO MONITOR WORKERS LEAVING CLINTON CREEK MINE

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and concerns the federal asbestos standards which were announced in December of 1975. I want to refer the minister to the Clinton Creek situation. At the time that it was announced that asbestos standards in the ambient air would be two per cubic centimeter, there was an indication that we would soon receive regulations to deal with mine tailings. In the Clinton Creek area, as the minister knows, mine tailings are continuing to be simply dumped in that area, at some hazard to both the residents and the workers.

My question is, first of all, would the minister advise when we are going to get regulations from the federal government controlling other areas besides ambient air standards, including tailings, drillings and other matters which were referred to earlier?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to look into this matter, but unless I am mistaken this is rather a matter for the Department of the Environment. I will check into the matter and will be pleased to report to the hon. member, but I think this type of regulation would not come from my department but rather from the Environment or even from a provincial government.

Mr. Leggatt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would point out to the minister that his department received a report from the asbestos working group in February. In view of the fact that the incubation period for cancer resulting from exposure to asbestos is some 20 years and in view of the fact that the Clinton Creek mine has announced that it will close in 1978 and that these workers have been there for less than 20 years, what steps is the minister proposing to take to follow up and monitor the workers leaving the area, so we can have some kind of monitoring system for people who have been exposed to asbestos after the mine has closed and they have dispersed all over the country?

[Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent).]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, the fact that a group has submitted a report to my department does not necessarily mean that my department is responsible for enforcing some regulations.

As for the second question put by the hon. member, concerning more particularly the case of Clinton Creek, I will check with my officials to see whether there is a special follow-up program for the miners concerned when the mine will be closed. I am not in a position to give an immediate answer to the hon. member about that.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON RECOGNITION OF TRANSKEI

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, of which I gave notice this morning. Can we be assured that no present circumstances exist which would persuade Canada to recognize the Transkei, a so-called Bantu homeland, as a separate and independent state, recognition which would involve a de jure acceptance of a fundamental deprivation of human rights, including loss of citizenship?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for the notice but I have just arrived back in Ottawa. I can assure him that the Transkei, which would be the first so-called independent state under the "Bantustan" policy, will not be recognized by Canada, surely not at this time. Canada shares the international community's skepticism, and deep concern that this is a continuation of the racial policy of apartheid, which Canada opposes without any reservation. We would need a good deal of convincing evidence that the black population of this supposed independent territory is going to receive its due rights before we make any move at all on this question.

* * *

MANPOWER

POSSIBILITY OF ERROR IN INFORMATION SUPPLIED ON LABOUR SUPPLY AND DEMAND—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCIAL EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the minister of manpower and it has to do with the speech that he delivered on June 4 to the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute in which he indicated there were some 200 nursing vacancies in Ontario and some 3,500 nurses graduating this year, an obvious mismatch of labour supply and demand. The minister went on in his speech to say this:

In the past few years, my department has developed programs to make forward-looking labour market information available. If this

information is faulty, then we at the federal level must bear some of the blame.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem here. Can the minister advise whether he is looking into the information that he has been supplying and has he in fact found any fault with respect to it?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member might have chosen to go on and quote the next sentence, I think it is, which said that if people do not use the information that is available then they are to blame. It was in that contrast and context that I made the comment, which I think is self-explanatory.

Mr. Alexander: With respect, Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer my question. He put it as a question in his speech. He said "if this information is faulty", which means that it calls for further study. In light of the seriousness of this matter, both for locations and professions, would he meet with the provincial ministers of education to determine how up-to-date information about jobs, locations and projections for the future can be compiled and distributed to the schools, and thus deal with this very serious and obvious mismatch of labour supply and demand? Does the minister not believe that this calls for some consultation and co-operation with his provincial counterparts responsible for education?

Mr. Andras: Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed I do. I have made announcements to the effect that this has already been arranged, prior to the suggestion of the hon. member. To wit, we met in Toronto three or four weeks ago with my counterparts responsible for manpower in the provinces and we agreed on six or seven very good principles of consultation, including consultation mechanisms which will result in a federal-provincial conference this fall. In addition to that, it is my plan to meet with the council of education ministers to deal with these very questions, and incidentally to find out from them why this information is not being used fully at the provincial level within their jurisdiction for education.

* * *

ENERGY

DATE OF CLEAN-UP OF NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL SITE AT EAST BRAINTREE, MANITOBA

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources I should like to direct a question to his parliamentary secretary. A number of months ago the minister indicated that steps would be taken to clean up the nuclear waste disposal site at East Braintree, Manitoba. The minister indicated that the site would be checked for radioactivity and either fenced and warning signs posted or the material transferred to another containment area. In view of the time that has now elapsed and since nothing has been done by the department, when does the minister intend to follow up the commitment that he has given?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, that particular site is under review by the task force looking into radiation problems in Canada. I will be pleased to look into the matter and report back to the hon. member; I cannot give him a definitive answer today.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

POSSIBILITY OF UNILATERAL ACTION IN PATRIATION OF CONSTITUTION—AMENDING FORMULA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister on the subject of the constitution and the repatriation formula. Is it still the position of the Prime Minister vis-à-vis the first ministers of the provinces that in the absence of agreement on an amending formula the constitution will be repatriated, or a resolution will be presented to repatriate the constitution, on the basis that no amendments will take place following that in any area, excepting that area which the federal parliament can now amend, without the universal approval of all the provinces? Has the Prime Minister had an opportunity to consider the views and concerns expressed as to rigidity by Senator Forsey of the other place?

● (1440)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have considered those views and, as a matter of fact, as the hon. member will remember, I alluded to them or actually stated them rather specifically in my letter to the premiers. Of course, my suggestion there was that the rigidity we would end up with would not be very different in practice from the rigidity we have now in areas which are of joint concern to the federal and provincial governments. I am thinking particularly of the areas which are excepted in Section 91(1) of the BNA Act. In practice, the federal government does not act alone, but after agreement with all of the provinces. I realize that this is not a constitutional obligation, but it is the practice in fact. For that reason, and though I would regret that kind of rigidity, I suggest it would not be all that different in kind from the rigidity which exists now.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, even failing some agreement on an amending formula, is there not some way in which the Prime Minister could, in a sense, repatriate the constitution without locking the country into such a completely rigid situation as that, which would mean not even the slightest amendment could be adopted without the unanimous approval of the provinces? Is there not some way by which the Prime Minister could avoid locking the country into such a rigid situation as that?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, of course the hon. member realizes that the rigidity would apply to a very limited number of areas, those, I repeat, which are singled out in Section 91(1) by way of exceptions, because the constitution now and the constitution hereafter, assuming it is patriated, would still permit the provincial governments to amend their constitutions unilaterally in every respect except as regards the office of the Lieutenant Governor, and would still permit the federal government unilaterally to amend the constitution in every aspect which concerned

the federal constitution as opposed to the constitution of Canada except, and I repeat, in that small number of areas outlined in Section 91(1).

However, if the concern is about the rigidity in these areas, my answer is, yes, we could patriate the constitution with agreement, unanimity, partial agreement or no agreement at all—all these are possible—and impose the method agreed to at Victoria. I see the hon. member indicating he would not want that. It is not what we want either, but that would be one way of having less rigidity. It would be patriated on the formula which was agreed to at Victoria, with the suggestion we are assuming everyone wants it. I think that would probably be a less desirable method than having some form of agreement, with the suggestion that following the agreement we will give the provinces the occasion, after patriation, to indicate their adhesion to the new proposal.

I want to thank hon. members opposite and, indeed, on this side, for the concern they are showing in respect of this matter. Indeed, I was pleased with the reaction of the provincial premiers the other night because I think there is a growing realization among all Canadians that all that is really needed is the political will to become independent in every sense.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I think there is a realization that, while the technical details we are discussing are certainly important, they can only be addressed if there is a clear political will to achieve this thing about which we are talking.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF OLYMPIC LOTTERY TICKETS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General of which I gave him notice a few days ago. In answer to a previous question I put to him a week or so ago regarding improprieties and irregularities in the sale and distribution of Olympic lottery tickets the minister acknowledged in the House, without expounding, the fact that there was an investigation into this matter, but only in the province of Ontario. Is the minister now in a position to report to the House on the RCMP investigation into these fraudulent practices, and can he at the same time advise the House whether the RCM Police investigation is taking place in other provinces besides Ontario?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the RCMP has been investigating certain aspects of the Olympic lottery. This investigation began in March and has been limited to the province of Ontario. So far two individuals have been charged within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General for Ontario. The investigation has not taken place in any other province.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, is the minister then not aware that certain improprieties in the sale and distribution of these tickets are taking place in other provinces than Ontario, more specifically in the Alexis Nihon Plaza in Montreal and elsewhere? Perhaps the minister could either deny or confirm the fact that certain RCMP officers and other local police authorities are indeed looking into this specific matter or, if not, Mr. Speaker, would the minister assure this House that he will look into the matter and make all findings public prior to the implementation of Loto-Canada in order to avoid the continuation of any fraudulent practices within this new lottery program?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, during my recent consultations with the RCMP they told me that the investigation was limited to Ontario and they did not know of any investigation or complaints originating in Quebec. However, I will check into this from time to time.

* * *

EDUCATION

PROPOSED ROYAL COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE FUNDING AND POLICY AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the urgency and reasonableness of the request of the Canadian Association of University Teachers for the appointment of a royal commission to consider the funding of higher education in Canada, and in particular to study the relationship between federal and provincial governments in respect of university policy, will the government give consideration to this request?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but this damned thing was not working too well.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I am sure if I could stick—

An hon. Member: You should stick it in your ear; It works much better that way.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I heard some obscenities from the other side.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: It works much better if you stick it in your ear instead of in your pocket.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: In any event, I caught the end of the question which was, would I consider something. I can assure the hon. member that I will.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I had better leave it at that.

ENERGY

PROPOSAL FOR LOCATION OF URANIUM PROCESSING PLANT IN SASKATCHEWAN—PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN SITE DECISION

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources I should like to direct a question to his parliamentary secretary, of which I have given notice. In view of the fact that Eldorado Nuclear Limited is now in the process of reviewing different possible sites for a uranium processing plant, I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary is in a position to indicate whether a final decision has been made, particularly in respect of the location of that plant in Saskatchewan, and if he will give the assurance that before any plant is located in any part of Canada the fullest possible investigation and an inquiry among the citizenry and general public in the proposed site area will be held by Eldorado before making a final decision?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. I cannot give a definitive answer as to the location of the proposed refinery in Saskatchewan, although I can confirm that Eldorado is evaluating several sites in the province in co-operation with Sedco, the provincial economic development commission, that they are planning to refine the uranium that is mined in Saskatchewan in that province, and that Eldorado when it does make a final decision as to the location of the refinery will have a full public information program.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CUBA—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF AGREEMENT ON LEASING OF DC-8'S

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

An hon. Member: Watch your language.

Mr. Paproski: Will he be tabling today the agreement between Canada and Cuba regarding the lease or purchase of the DC-8's?

● (1450)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): What was that?

Mr. Sharp: A report on the DC-8.

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I asked a serious question and the Prime Minister refuses to answer.

Oral Questions

ABORTION

POSSIBILITY OF TIGHTENING REGULATIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Justice. Since the Prime Minister attacked the question of capital punishment with such zeal indicating his deep concern for life, I wonder if in view of the fact that about a year ago a petition was presented which contained over one million signatures expressing concern over what appears to be a government policy of abortion on demand, whether the Prime Minister and his government intend to demonstrate a further concern for life by tightening up the regulations pertaining to abortion.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should realize that the government is opposed to abortion on demand. This is the substance of the legislation we passed some years ago which is now in application in the country. I fail to see the logic of the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, since the government further demonstrated its concern over murders involving guns by ramming through legislation which was supposed to curb deaths involving guns, and in view of the fact that in the last five years the ratio of murder by guns to abortion is one to 200 or approximately 1,000 deaths to 200,000 abortions, I wonder why deaths through abortion, in view of the numbers involved, are not given the same attention as death by guns or is the whole exercise on gun control intended as window dressing and aimed at appeasing rather than solving anything or saving lives.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member would agree there is some element of argumentation in his question.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

SUGGESTION OLD AGE PENSIONERS BE GIVEN EXPLANATION OF REDUCTION IN SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFIT CHEQUE

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In light of the fact that the annual reductions which take place in some old age pensioners' supplementary cheques every spring cause a great deal of confusion and concern among the many thousands of pensioners because they are unaware of the cause of the reductions which take place is the minister prepared to consider revising the procedures for making those reductions whereby any pensioner whose old age pension supplement cheque is to be reduced would also be given an explanation of that reduction by the government.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to consider the hon. member's suggestion. Evidently it has considerable administrative and financial implications, so that I will very carefully examine it.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister might be able to confirm whether or not Bill Teron has been moved from the Chairmanship of CMHC to deputy minister in the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs and that Raymond Hession has become President of CMHC, both effective June 15?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will inquire, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LOCKOUT OF AIR CANADA FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES—POSSIBLE RESUMPTION OF MEDIATION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. It is with regard to the Air Canada lockout of its employees in the finance branch in Winnipeg. In light of the fact that more than 250 serious work disruptions have taken place during the last six months at the finance branch and as the talks between the federally appointed mediator, management and labour were adjourned on May 21 after only two weeks of discussions, could the minister inform the House this afternoon if he intends to ask the mediator to have the talks resumed or will he be appointing a new mediator.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this stage, in terms of the interests of everyone concerned, be specific as to what we will be doing in the way of mediation other than answering in the general terms I did to the hon. member yesterday that certainly we will inject ourselves in terms of mediation at the precise time we think it will be helpful in resolving this unfortunate dispute.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PURCHASE OF LEOPARD TANKS FROM WEST GERMANY—VERBAL OR WRITTEN AGREEMENT—NUMBER OF CANADIAN FIRMS BIDDING ON CONTRACT

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. In light of the fact that the minister is negotiating a deal to purchase Leopard tanks from West Germany, would the minister inform the House whether or not the deal has been completed and whether it is a verbal or written transaction? Would the minister also inform the House of how many Canadian firms were given the opportunity to bid on this large contract?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as I informed the House shortly before leaving for Europe and also as I informed our NATO partners, the negotiations for the purchase of 28 Leopard tanks are proceeding satisfactorily, but there is no conclusion at this time of the negotiations and the contract has not been signed. In answer to the second part of the question concerning whether or not Canadian firms were given an opportunity to participate, the answer is no because there are no Canadian firms in the tank manufacturing business. However, we are negotiating offsets from the German manufacturer and there will be a substantial amount of work done in Canada as a result of the contract.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the minister. Could he advise the House if the negotiations for the contract are proceeding as usual on a purely verbal basis or is he taking the trouble to get some of it at least on paper?

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I wonder whether the Prime Minister could inform the House today what reception the President of the United States gave in respect of Canada's official gift to the United States on the occasion of the Bicentennial—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Corbin: —and if in the course of his visit to Washington he crossed paths with or knows the whereabouts of the Leader of the Opposition, his shadow.

Some hon. Members: Order.

* * *

CUSTOMS

REASON FOR PERMITTING ENTRY INTO CANADA OF JULY ISSUE OF "PENTHOUSE"

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. According to news reports the July issue of *Penthouse* has been taken from the news stands not because the Revenue Department has done so but because the distributors themselves have felt it so bad that they will not distribute it. I know the government operates on an "anything for a buck" policy, but I wonder how this periodical got into the country when the people who are accustomed to peddling pulp will not even sell it.

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting all this time for an opportunity to visit the porno room in the customs office. I had some difficulty explaining to my wife that this is part of my responsibility. I guess all I can say now in answer to the hon. member's legitimate question is that we are probably a little more liberal with a small "l" than are those who distribute this from foreign markets where more strict censorship is imposed on the distribution aspect.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I know the minister would like to carry on the research on this himself, but I wonder if he could establish guidelines for his departmental offi-

cials that will be at least as rigid as those of the porno peddlars themselves?

* * *

FINANCE

PROPOSAL THAT CAPITAL GAINS TAX NOT APPLY TO SALE OF FAMILY FARM

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. It relates to the capital gains tax on family farm property. A family farm operator, during his lifetime, directs all his profit to the improvement of his farm and equipment. When the farm is sold upon his retirement, the proceeds become his sole private pension fund. It is therefore grossly unfair to use capital gains tax to seriously reduce this pension. Will the minister consider amending the Income Tax Act to permit a once-in-a-lifetime sale of a family farm without attracting capital gains tax?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, there are certain provisions now with regard to family farms but I do not see at this time the opportunity to be able to expand those.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, since the capital gains taxes collected on family farm property amount to only 10 per cent of the total collected on property generally, would the minister weigh the appraisal and accounting costs, plus the major irritant effect of this tax, against the net revenue derived and hopefully remove this unfair and unjust tax all together?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it of course has to be relevant also to the question of equity to other taxpayers.

* * *

● (1500)

HARBOURS

CHURCHILL—SUGGESTION PORT MANAGER BE GIVEN REASONS FOR REQUESTING HIS RESIGNATION

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport but in his absence I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary. Now that the minister has appointed a port manager for the port of Churchill—an appointee from eastern Canada—will the minister advise the departed port manager why his resignation was requested by the minister?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers to the appointee who was named yesterday or today, Mr. Lauzon, as a person from eastern Canada. I suppose that is intended to carry some negative connotation in the context of Churchill—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Goodale: —but in any event the reference in that regard is inaccurate because that individual has had extensive experience in harbour management, particularly in the port of Churchill. So the hon. member's description of that person is incorrect.

In the case of the previous appointee in that position, Mr. Scharf, he submitted his resignation earlier this year. He was given a full and fair hearing before the National Harbours Board and the decision to accept Mr. Scharf's resignation was made by the National Harbours Board after that full hearing.

Presence in Gallery

Mr. Speaker: Presenting Reports from Standing or Special committees.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to appear overly self-righteous, but I have a problem with regard to giving notice of questions and perhaps the House leader will want to consider it. This is not in any way criticism of the work of the hon. member for Saint-Michel.

It took considerable pain this morning, and three telephone calls, to alert the Department of External Affairs on this question. Probably I was considered by the officials of the department to be somewhat of a nuisance, but if one of them would stumble over my remarks in *Hansard* he would see that surely it is legitimate, when notice is given of a question, that ministers and parliamentary secretaries be given answers. I do not even criticize the answer of the deputy minister, but I resent being told that someone has just arrived back in Ottawa and therefore has not been briefed by the department. The department is in an excellent position to brief ministers and parliamentary secretaries, despite the nuisance that we make of ourselves.

[*Translation*]

Miss Bégin: Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, if I said that, if I began my remarks with that expression, it is precisely because I read very quickly, due to my other responsibilities, the detailed answer prepared for the hon. member. I wanted to apologize in advance, if I may say so, for not giving him all the details contained in the prepared answer, in case I made a mistake. Therefore, it is because I wanted to answer more correctly that I made that preliminary remark, and not in the sense understood by the opposition.

I may add that if a supplementary question had been put to me, which I hoped, I would have had a great deal of information to give to the House, which I believe is fundamental. I thought the answer would have become a speech and would have been too long. I shall therefore send it in written form to the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM UNITED KINGDOM

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if at this time I might be permitted to draw the attention of the House to the presence in the gallery of a distinguished group of parliamen-

tarians from the United Kingdom. They are members of the defence and external affairs subcommittee of the expenditure committee of the British House of Commons. The chairman of the subcommittee is Colonel Sir Harwood Harrison MP.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES

Thirteenth Report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, in both Official Languages—Mr. Langlois

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

* * *

[*English*]

PERFORMING ARTS

PETITION BY WORKERS IN ANGLOPHONE FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the table the thirty-first report of the Clerk of Petitions, stating that he has examined the petition presented by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) and finds that it meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are marked by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,585, 5,162, 5,167, 5,293, 5,385, 5,413 and 5,476.

[*Text*]

CONSULTATIONS ON VOLUNTARY QUOTA AGREEMENT WITH MAJOR FILM DISTRIBUTORS

Question No. 4,585—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Were representatives of the Canadian motion picture industry consulted respecting the decision to proceed with the voluntary quota agreement with the two major film distributors and, if so, with whom were the consultations held and to what extent did the government decision reflect their views?

2. What specific mechanisms have been established to monitor and report on the agreement?

3. Are low budget feature films made in Canada included within the quota?

4. What specific advantages accrued to the Canadian film industry as a result of the previous voluntary quota agreement negotiated in 1973?

[Mr. Richardson.]

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Film Development Corporation as follows: 1. Representatives of the industry are consulted on a regular basis by the CFDC and have expressed their support for quotas and levies. The specific arrangement with the two major film distributors was not discussed with the industry.

2. Reports are received from Famous Players and Odeon and analyzed by the CFDC staff. There are regular meetings held between the companies and the staff of the CFDC. Results of the quota are made public and the provincial governments in particular are informed of progress in this area. The first quarterly report from Famous Players was tabled in the House of Commons on March 3, 1976.

3. Yes.

4. During the period August 1973 to April 1975, 815 weeks of Canadian films were shown by the two major chains covering 20 titles.

TAXATION DATA CENTRE—VOICE COMMUNICATION SYSTEM AND/OR FIRE ALARM SYSTEM

Question No. 5,162—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was a voice communication system and/or fire alarm system installed in the Taxation Data Centre in Ottawa and, if so (a) on what dates (b) are both systems functioning and, if not, in either case, for what reason?

2. Are trained personnel available to operate the voice communication system and, if not (a) for what reason (b) is the Dominion Fire Commissioner aware of this (c) has such a situation existed for over three years?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. (a) A fire alarm system was installed in the Taxation Data Centre in Ottawa at the time of construction. Acceptance tests of this system were conducted on June 22, 1970. An integrated voice communication and fire alarm system was completed and a final acceptance test was conducted on August 25, 1975; (b) Both systems are functioning as designed.

2. Three volunteer Emergency Telephone Operators and three volunteer Emergency Voice Communication Operators from the Data Centre have been partially trained. Four additional volunteers are required to complete the organization. (a) The reasons for not having trained personnel available to operate the Voice Communication System are as follows: Fire Emergency Organization personnel in high-rise buildings over 12 stories in height receive training priority. D.F.C. Training staff limitations. A staffing program to recruit training officers for each of the Regional Offices of the Department has been initiated. The personnel hired in this competition will be responsible for training voice communication system operators in all Federal Government buildings equipped with voice communication equipment, throughout Canada. A top priority has been assigned to this requirement and Training programs will be undertaken immediately; (b) Yes; (c) No. The situation has existed since the acceptance of the integrated system in August 1975.

SMOKE CONTROL MEASURES—GRAIN EXCHANGE BUILDING, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,167—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Have the smoke control measures in the Grain Exchange Building in Winnipeg ever been operable and, if not, from what date?

2. Is the situation being rectified and (a) if so, what is the date of such rectification (b) if not, for what reason?

3. Was a voice control system installed in the building in 1972?

4. Are there properly trained personnel to operate the system and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, as of what date?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. The smoke control measures were installed during construction of the building and were tested by the Dominion Fire Commissioner January 22, 1973 before the building was occupied. They have been operable from this date. After the test a modification was recommended to shut down air handling fans on the operation of the fire alarm system. This modification was carried out early in 1973 shortly after smoke tests were carried out.

2. (a) Improvements have been carried out; (b) Not applicable.

3. Yes.

4. No. (a) The whole question of control and evacuation of occupants in high-rise buildings, which includes the operation of voice communication systems, is a relatively new one and prototype techniques and programs have had to be developed, tested and evaluated. So as to take advantage of proximity to the major and senior elements of the Dominion Fire Commissioner organization, Ottawa was selected for this developmental work which is now largely completed. Having recently obtained the requisite additions to the Dominion Fire Commissioner's establishment, the department is now in the process of hiring regional training officers to carry forward this and other types of fire safety training in federal government offices across Canada, including such as the Grain Exchange Building in Winnipeg. To date it has only been possible to provide introductory and orientation training on a limited basis. A top priority has been assigned to this requirement and an intensive training program will be undertaken as soon as the training personnel can be recruited; (b) Not applicable.

GUY FAVREAU COMPLEX, MONTREAL

Question No. 5,293—**Mr. Masniuk:**

1. Is the government presently building the Guy Favreau Complex in Montreal and, if so, what is its purpose?

2. What is the projected cost of the project?

3. At what stage of construction is the project at the present time?

4. How much has the project cost to date?

5. For which government department is the project intended?

6. How was the name of the project chosen?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Department of Public Works is planning to construct the Guy Favreau office complex under the accommodation program for Montreal.

2. Estimated at $172,000,000.

3. Land assembly and a conceptual design have been completed.

4. As of April 27, 1976—$8,617,537.59.

5. The project will provide space as a general purpose building for many departments.

6. By Cabinet decision.

CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS FOR 1975

Question No. 5,385—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. What was the total amount of Canada Council grants for the year 1975?

2. How much of this money was received by (a) British Columbia (b) Alberta (c) Saskatchewan (d) Manitoba (e) Ontario (f) Quebec (g) New Brunswick (h) Nova Scotia (i) Newfoundland (j) Prince Edward Island (k) Yukon (l) Northwest Territories?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows. The following figures are for the 1974-75 fiscal year. Figures for 1975-76 will be published in the Council's 19th Annual Report, now in preparation. 1. $44,236,000.

2. (a) $4,538,000; (b) $2,174,000; (c) $793,000; (d) $1,932,000; (e) $15,576,000; (f) $11,683,000; (g) $636,000; (h) $1,104,000; (i) $454,000; (j) $234,000; (k) and (l) $35,000.

NOTE: These figures do not include an amount of $5,077,000 awarded to organizations described as national in scope for purposes of statistical reporting, or used by the Council for programs that cannot be divided by province, e.g. Art Bank purchases and touring grants to performing arts organizations.

TRANSLATION SERVICES AT "LA CITÉ" PROJECT IN MONTREAL

Question No. 5,413—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a full description of the type of translation services to be provided by the Secretary of State in the new premises to be rented in La Cité project in Montreal including specifically (a) the general nature of documents involved in translation (b) for what government departments will the work be done (c) what is the estimated percentage of the total translation work that will be (i) English to French (ii) French to English (d) how many employees is it estimated will be (i) Francophone (ii) Anglophone (e) how many public servants will be employed on the five floors to be occupied and what are their estimated annual salaries (f) what will be the estimated total cost per year of this operation including salaries, rent and all other factors?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Secretary of State—The translation services to be provided by the Secretary of State Department in Montreal will consist of two divisions under the Regional Operations Branch and a terminology service and central library under the Terminology and Documentation Directorate. Division I will be made up of four translation sections and the administrative support services for both divisions. Section IA of Division I will be located in Ville Saint-Laurent in the same building as the Atmospheric Environment Service and will include a subsection providing twenty-four-hour-a-day translation of weather forecasts and bulletins for all of Canada. Division II will be composed of seven translation sections, including the Saint-Jean section, which, together with its Saint-Hubert and Collège militaire royal field subsections, will provide translation services for CFB Saint-Jean, the College and CFB Saint-Hubert, where the Canadian Forces Mobile Command is located. In Montreal there will also be a

French-to-English translation subsection under Section I of the English Translation Division, General Operations Branch, located in Ottawa. This subsection will consist of three translators and one reviser. The composition of the Montreal staff of the Terminology and Documentation Directorate is contained in the reply to question no. 5,412. The translation services of the Secretary of State Department in Montreal will be used to meet the needs of the federal services in the Montreal area. In addition, some of these sections will specialize in various fields to meet the translation needs of the whole federal government. Other subsections or sections will function as extensions of departmental or headquarters sections in Ottawa. (a) and (b) The foregoing and the list below give a good idea of the general nature of the documents to be translated and the departments or agencies which will be served. Weather forecasts, Meteorology (extension), Environmental protection, Plans and specification, Agriculture (extension), Medical and paramedical (extension), Unemployment insurance, Environment, Customs and Excise and Taxation (extension), Solicitor General, Data processing, Post Office, English translation, Legal and quasi-legal, Economics and finance, Psychology and mental health, Management, Metric Commission, Socio-economic: Immigration, Indian Affairs, etc., Statistics (extension), Natural sciences, Military, Electronics; (c) and (d) The bulk of translation from French into English for the federal government is done in Ottawa. In Montreal the percentage of translation into English and into French corresponds roughly to the percentage of Anglophone and Francophone translation personnel. Excluding Terminology and Documentation Directorate staff, there will be four employees translating into English out of some 152 employees in the TR group at the time of the move; (e) The space to be rented will accommodate approximately 380 employees, including about 260 translators, terminologists, librarians and administrative officers, and 120 clerks, stenographers and typists. The average salary of the first group will be roughly $17,000 and of the second group roughly $8,000 per annum, (f) On the basis of 1976-77 constant dollars, the estimated total cost per year of this operation with 380 employees will be as follows: Salaries, $6,205,043.00; Other operations, $390,556.00; Total annual cost chargeable to program, $6,595,599.00. Plus: Rent paid by Department of Public Works $857,126.67; Cost of other services provided by other departments, $147,557.00; Estimated total cost per year $7,600,282.67.

USER/BENEFICIARY PAY PRINCIPLE TO SHIPPING INDUSTRY

Question No. 5,476—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Will the government consider isolating from all monies spent for icebreaking and dredging services in the St. Lawrence basin, those of benefit only to shipping and apply the user/beneficiary pay principle to that industry and, if not, for what reason?

2. Is the government aware that CN and the National Harbours Board apply the user/beneficiary principle in respect of shipping using the Port of Halifax?

3. Is the government aware of competition between Halifax and the River Ports in respect of the movement of bulk, general and containerized cargoes?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Transport Canada is committed to the principles of cost recovery from users and beneficiaries of transportation services as consistent with other national objectives and the anti-inflation program. As indicated in the transportation policy framework announced in June 1975, when national policy requires departure from this user/beneficiary pay principle, the costs imposed should be clearly and specifically identified and assumed by government. Consistent with these principles, in the study of Coast Guard revenues referred to in the response to Question no. 5,105 of March 5, 1976, consideration is being given to the shipping industry, in the St. Lawrence basin and nationally.

2. The pricing principles that are applied by CN and the National Harbours Board at Halifax are consistent with the objective of commercial viability for these corporations and with the more general user/beneficiary pay principle as applied on a national basis.

3. The Government is aware that competition exists between various port regions, and modes of transport as well as between operators within a single mode. A healthy competitive environment is a safeguard against deterioration of services and escalation of costs. As indicated in the policy framework, intermodal and intramodal competition should be encouraged where economic and technical characteristics permit.

[*English*]

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

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 5,169 and 5,170 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

PUBLIC SERVICE—SECOND LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

Question No. 5,169—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1970 to date, have any departments or government bodies negotiated contracts with Centre de langues Feuille d'érables Ltée for the teaching of a second language to public servants and, if so, in each case (a) what was the contract (b) how many (c) for what amount?

2. For each year, what percentage of the money granted to the school was directed to salaries of (a) teachers (b) administrators?

3. Are the requirements for (a) formation (b) experience of the teachers only under the school and, if not, is there a link between such requirements and those that prevail when hiring teachers of a second language for the Public Service?

4. For each year, how many (a) French speaking (b) English speaking public servants have followed courses offered by the school?

Return tabled.

Question No. 5,170—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1970 to date, have any departments or government bodies negotiated contracts with Centre Linguistique Cartier for the teaching of a second language to public servants and, if so, in each case (a) what was the contract (b) how many (c) for what amount?

2. For each year, what percentage of the money granted to the school was directed to salaries of (a) teachers (b) administrators?

3. Are the requirements for (a) formation (b) experience of the teachers only under the school and, if not, is there a link between such

requirements and those that prevail when hiring teachers of a second language for the Public Service?

4. For each year, how many (a) French speaking (b) English speaking public servants have followed courses offered by the school?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*Translation*]

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 5,455?

[*Text*]

*CANADIAN PRODUCTION OF CRUDE PETROLEUM

Question No. 5,455—**Mr. Woolliams:**

1. In the years 1962 to 1975, what was the total Canadian production, in barrels, of crude petroleum?

2. For the same years, what was the total crude petroleum (a) exported (b) imported?

3. For the same years, what was the price differential between off-shore crude petroleum and Alberta crude petroleum used in Montreal or the Maritimes?

4. For the same years, was it cheaper to import barrels of crude petroleum east of the Ottawa Valley than to transport it from Alberta and what approximately was the ratio?

[*English*]

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in responding to this starred question I would like to say that it is about two pages long and it is statistical material. I would like to ask that it appear in *Hansard* as read.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: The answer to the above question follows.*]

	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
1. Production Mb/d	715.0	766.1	819.3	876.1	956.1	1,044.8	1,125.3	1,228.9	1,382.1	1,476.0	1,698.4	1,962.9	1,843.3(P)	1,575.6(E)
2. (a) Exports Mb/d	236.0	248.3	277.9	295.6	347.6	414.8	462.4	555.3	669.8	750.8	951.3	1,138.6	910.9	707.3
(b) Imports Mb/d	368.5	404.8	392.3	395.0	434.4	446.8	485.6	529.1	568.9	671.1	769.6	897.4	797.6	817.1

(P) Preliminary
(E) Estimate

3. During the years 1962 to 1975, western Canadian crude was used in Montreal or the Maritimes only in the fall of 1973 and the early part of 1974. According to figures supplied by the Manufacturing and Primary Industries Division of Statistics Canada, the relative average costs of crude oil receipts of domestic and foreign origin at refineries in eastern Canada were as follows during those two years:

	$ per barrel	
	Domestic	Imported
1973		
Province of Quebec	4.81	3.84
Atlantic Provinces	—	3.36
1974		
Province of Quebec	6.96	6.74*
Atlantic Provinces	7.47	6.29*

4. See No. 3. A statement prepared by the National Energy Board for the Committee of Public Works and Natural Resources dated 21 February, 1973 compared the cost of crude oil at Ontario and Quebec refineries over the years 1962 to 1972. An accompanying estimate suggested that imported crude oil would on average have been between 25 and 35 cents a barrel cheaper than domestic crude at Ontario refineries during those years. On the basis of that estimate, it may be computed that at Quebec refineries imported crude was in national terms, 20 per cent cheaper than domestic crude oil would have been during that period; this assessment takes no account of differences in the quality of the crude oils or in the mix of product demand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I think I took up about 20 minutes of my time this morning, and I hope to conclude my remarks in five or ten minutes. There are a few other points which I would like to make in this debate before concluding. One of them came to my attention this morning. I would like to mention the fact that the government has been holding back information which could have been used by all members of the House in this debate and which might have been of assistance to members in quoting statistics.

There is a booklet that came out from Statistics Canada called "Homicide Canada", of which the Solicitor General is aware. It was listed in the pink sheets which come to our offices regularly. In a debate of this type, when we are deciding such a serious question, the Solicitor General's department must have known that this booklet was being prepared for information. It was available a week ago, so it could have been made available to hon. members a month ago so that they could use the correct figures. There is good material here for both abolitionists and retentionists, and we can hope the figures are correct.

If one goes through the debate on capital punishment since the start, one finds that every member seems to have stated different figures for different types of murder, and none of the figures seem to correspond. If this material had been put in the hands of members of parliament at the start of the debate, instead of being mentioned on a pink sheet in the hope that each member would notice it, it would have been helpful to us. I think it should have been sent to every member's office with a letter from the Solicitor General's department saying that this booklet was available and should be read before the debate. It would have helped the debate come along a little further, and I think it would have made a little more sense than some of the speeches I have read. I condemn the Solicitor General's Department for making sure that that booklet was not available to the people taking part in this debate.

● (1510)

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member has made some serious allegations against me with respect to the publication of this report by Statistics Canada. I want to point out that my department, and I as the minister, had absolutely no control over that report. It was prepared and put out by Statistics Canada, and as hon. members know, it would be completely wrong for a minister to interfere with the publication date or with the content of any report put out by Statistics Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: I was advised by Statistics Canada that the report would be ready last week. Statistics Canada asked me if I wanted to be briefed on the report. Unfortunately, I had no time. I was in committee with Bill C-83, and in the House with this debate. So Statistics Canada said that it would publish the report in the ordinary course of its business, and that was done. But my department had nothing to do with the publication or preparation of the report.

I might say that most of the statistics in the report have been available in other reviews and publications which I did put out, in particular, the ones which were tabled by the Minister of Justice and myself at the beginning of the debate.

Mr. Reynolds: I do not think that is a question of privilege. It is a bunch of garbage.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Reynolds.]

Mr. Reynolds: It is a pity this government cannot keep things together when we are debating such a serious issue as capital punishment, and that the minister can stand in this House and tell us that he does not know what is going on with regard to a document which is very important to the debate. I think his department should have some contact with Statistics Canada and should have known when this document was to be made available to the House.

I put a question on the order paper on May 14; I asked the following:

1. How many persons in Canada have been charged and/or convicted of murder or manslaughter more than once?

2. In each case (a) what are their names, (b) how was the sentence disposed of, (c) when was each eligible for parole where prison terms were involved, (d) what was the length of the sentence served?

I think those are important questions to this debate.

Mr. Allmand: Available for years—months.

Mr. Reynolds: I do not know why the minister could not answer it on the order paper in the last couple of weeks. The Prime Minister quoted the information. There are one or two other things I would like to quote before I finish. I mentioned in my speech this morning a gentleman named Dr. Ezzat Fattah, chairman of the Simon Fraser University criminology department. I would like to quote a couple of things he said about this bill, as follows:

On February 24, 1976 the Liberal government tabled one of the most retrogressive pieces of legislation ever presented in the House of Commons—the so-called "Peace and Security Program" . . .

Among the studies and programs to which the government is committing itself in the explanatory notes to C-84, one tries in vain to find anything that might allow a better understanding of the phenomenon which the bill seeks to control—the phenomenon of criminal homicide, or, put more simply, why people kill and how killing can be prevented.

And among the so-called peace and security measures one finds no mention whatsoever of any steps aimed at correcting or improving the social injustices and the social conditions that are inducive to murder.

I am happy to agree, for once at least, with Dr. Fattah and his points. I hope the Solicitor General did not use Dr. Fattah just for his abolitionist views, but also for some of his other ideas, in presenting this bill and Bill C-83. I would like to finish by talking about the committee to which this bill will go. I had intended to move some amendments at second reading to refer this bill to committee for discussion, which I thought should take place before we voted on second reading, based on some points raise by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and by other hon. members of this House. This being a free vote, I felt that some hon. members should have a chance to discuss some of these issues before we vote on the bill in principle. But it seems that the majority of hon. members want to vote on second reading next Tuesday, and I think that is probably a good idea. Therefore, I am not going to move my motions at second reading, but I am certainly prepared to move them at committee stage and at third reading, as are other hon. members.

I just cannot see how the government can hope to get this bill through committee stage and third reading by the end of this month, and I suggest to the government House leader that the committee sessions should not be as they were on Bill C-58, and that his party should allow some government members who are retentionists to sit on that

committee. Certainly, there are some government members who are retentionists and they should be allowed to sit on the committee in relation to the number of votes. It is a free vote, and hon. members opposite who are retentionists should have the right to sit on that committee. I say that because I remember, when we were discussing Bill C-58, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) made a great speech at second reading and said she would only vote with the government on second reading to get the bill into committee where all the work would be done. Some of us who had been here a bit longer knew that that was a naive statement and that she would have a hard time achieving changes in the committee. That certainly proved true, because the government did not even allow her to sit as a voting member on that committee. She had to sit on the outside.

I suggest that the same thing will happen when the matter of capital punishment gets into the committee. The government will use its power to make sure that hon. members opposite who sit on that committee will all be abolitionists, and the bill will be hammered through committee. No witnesses will be called, a certain schedule will be set, and members will not be able to call the witnesses they want to call. On a bill as important as this one, we should have the RCMP talk to us so that we can find out their reasons for wanting capital punishment. We should hear people from the prison system. Perhaps we should hear people who have been condemned in the past, so that they can give us their views as to whether it would be a deterrent. I really do not believe the government will allow it to go that way.

Everyone wants to get out of here at the end of June. I have five children at home who would like to see me home from July 1 on, as well. When we debated this matter last time, we went right into July. I think we should have the vote on second reading on Tuesday, and I am willing to forgo putting my amendments and not to try to stall or delay this bill so that we can have the vote to find out what hon. members think about it. The government should be prepared to leave the committee hearings and third reading until the fall. I do not know what the rush is. The government has commuted present sentences—or stayed them—so it will not matter for a few extra months.

Mr. Allmand: Wrong again.

Mr. Reynolds: I wish the minister would stand up and say that. He has stayed sentences for a long time.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister has intervened once during the speech of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) on a question of privilege which was to correct something the hon. member said. This is a debate. There are opportunities for discussion and disagreement. I would be most reluctant to allow the minister to intervene a second time simply to register a disagreement with the remarks which are being made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta.

Mr. Reynolds: The minister will have ample time to speak. I am sure he called me a liar across the floor of the House, and I hope he will say that in his speech. He has stayed sentences—

Mr. Allmand: That is different from commuting.

Mr. Reynolds: I said "stayed". I admitted I made a mistake.

Mr. Allmand: I apologize.

Mr. Reynolds: I do not think there is any reason for the minister to call a person a liar. He is a little bit touchy about this, and I think he should apologize.

Some hon. Members: He apologized.

Mr. Reynolds: I thank the minister for his apology. I see no reason why this matter cannot go over to the fall so that we can have full committee hearings and a full debate on third reading. But the government is rushing to push this bill through by the end of June. I can guarantee hon. members that it will not get through by the end of June. There are enough speakers on this side of the House, and enough amendments which we want to discuss, so that any hon. member opposite thinking of going home on July 1 should change his vacation plans. There is no reason to believe that the government is any more honest now than it has been during the past eight years, or that the Prime Minister will allow people to be hanged. If this bill is defeated, I think the Prime Minister will continue to commute sentences, as he has for the past eight years.

I suggest to hon. members opposite that if they want to go home on July 1, their best bet is to vote against this government bill, which would leave us with the law which is in force right now: that is abolition anyway, because this government does not believe in hanging anyone. I would like to close by quoting an English philosopher, Sir James Fitzjames Stephen. He observed:

> —that if murder could be prevented by the fine of one shilling it would still break the moral bonds of society to impose only one-shilling fine on murderers.

Mr. Speaker, of course, a life sentence is not a shilling—nor is it a life sentence—but to many Canadians it still seems a cut-rate price-tag on their own lives. When people feel undervalued, the moral bonds of society begin to show the strain.

● (1520)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the motion in the name of Mr. Allmand. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: It is more than difficult for the Chair to determine the preponderance of those people with strong voices. In any case, to be more serious, there has already been an indication by the House that a recorded division is desired. I do not think it is too necessary to go on with the formality of attempting to give either the yeas or nays at this point. It is well understood that a recorded division will take place. I understand it is the will of the House that the division will be deferred, and therefore we have arrived, by the taking of the yeas and nays, at the conclusion of the debate.

It is hereby ordered that the recorded division will be deferred to a time to be announced by the government House leader when the House leaders have had an opportunity to confer.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed, and so ordered.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, you have indicated the desire of the House as included in the House order. May I issue an invitation for the House leaders to meet in my office at five o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we accept.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): D'accord.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. This bill has been under consideration for a number of days on second reading and in the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs as well. The latter has considered every clause of the bill during several meetings. Further, the content of the bill has been discussed at length not only inside the House but outside as well. Essentially, the bill does not intend to reduce the total federal contribution to the cost of insured services that it pays now but rather to limit for the coming years the rate or level of growth of the medical insurance costs.

Everyone is aware that the various governments are greatly concerned about the costs increases in expenditures earmarked for health services.

Provincial governments are really aware of that and so is the federal government. On second reading and before the committee, I already had the opportunity to explain all debates preceding the introduction of this bill under study by the House, and the reasons which prompted this government to set a specific growth rate in the bill.

As a result of representations made by members of Parliament and many citizens outside the House, the government made some changes in the bill which, although they may not meet all the objectives of the opposition, will at least have shortened the gap separating us from those against the adoption of this bill. Particularly, we agreed on a formula under which the growth rate ceiling would not be established from the third year after enactment of the legislation, but determined only after consultation with the provinces through an order in council.

We also agreed that the rate would be subject to debate in the House if enough members were to ask that the order in council adopted by the government be discussed in the House. So, once again, this bill is intended to meet the general concern of the public about the rate of growth of health expenditures and, in addition, still provides for the continuation of a substantial contribution to medical insurance expenditures.

I remind hon. members that we anticipate a rate of growth of expenditures for the current year that will be 14.5 or 14.6 per cent higher than the expenditures for the previous year. Next year, that rate of growth will be 12 per cent. So I suggest that hon. members remember that since October 1975 we have asked Canadian workers to limit their demands to 8 per cent, with a possibility of adjustment up to 10 and possibly 12 per cent in certain cases in their collective agreements.

The total amount that will be available for medical insurance this year in terms of federal government contributions will increase by 14.5 per cent on a national average basis. So I think it would be wrong to suggest that the rate of increase was set too low. In fact, the discussions I had with my provincial colleagues in recent months seemed to indicate that they will be able to meet without difficulty that maximum rate of increase set in this bill, and therefore I think we will have shown the effectiveness of the legislation now before the House. I am convinced that the mere fact that it was announced in the budget of June 1975 and introduced in the House a little later in this session already had a beneficial effect as far as the reduction in the rate of growth of medical insurance expenditures is concerned.

I would also like to remind hon. members that just two days ago the government submitted to provincial governments a new financing formula that would consist in a transfer of a certain number of tax points as well as an equal per capita payment across the country. That formula met with the approval of most provinces in principle. The premiers agreed that the ministers of finance would discuss this in greater detail at their meeting early in July, and they indicated that the provincial ministers of health as well as ministers responsible for education and the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) would participate in various stages of those discussions to reach a specific and detailed proposal that would attract the general consent of the provinces and the federal government.

I am confident we shall succeed through these discussions to reach an agreement rather quickly, and I indicated that my officials and myself are willing to pursue them with the utmost speed possible. We might conclude an agreement coming into force as early as next year, if the provinces are really interested in the implementation of

such a program. But the agreement might also have to be postponed for a period of a few years in the health area, for the simple reason that as far as hospital insurance is concerned, the federal government is still committed for another four years at least. Because we must serve five years' notice, as we did last July, to terminate the agreement on hospital care.

If the provinces wish to maintain these agreements in force until 1980 in the hospital insurance area, there is nothing the federal government can do to prevent them. But in the name of the federal government, I indicated quite clearly to all provinces that if they were willing to reach an agreement on a new financing formula well before 1980, so terminating ahead of time the agreement reached under the Hospital Insurance Act, the federal government would be quite willing in turn to implement without delay a financing formula that would certainly be more flexible than the current one. It would not require the provinces to contribute an amount equal to the federal contribution. The only condition would be that the funds involved, which will be transferred in the form of fiscal points and per capita payments, be allocated entirely to the health and education areas, and meet certain general criteria such as we have in the medical insurance area. However, it is very clear we would have much more flexibility than we now have under the Hospital Insurance Act.

Therefore Bill C-68, now at the third reading stage in this House, may not be implemented for a good number of years to come. In my view it is realistic to expect that it will certainly apply this year, and probably next year also. But if we are successful, with the provinces, to show as much speed and cooperation as was experienced last Monday, I am hopeful we might have a new financing formula for health services for 1978, if not April 1977. I feel the current state of federal-provincial relations is encouraging in this area. I also feel this special bill on the limitation of medical insurance expenses will be of a transitory nature, because I am convinced that before 1980 at least we will have reached with the provinces a new agreement covering medical insurance, hospital insurance and post-secondary education expenses, to which the federal government has already been contributing for a number of years.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I wanted to say at this stage of the debate on third reading of the bill. I hope hon. members will want to consider the bill in the light of what I indicated, so that it can go through all stages without delay.

● (1530)

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the minister a question in order to clarify one point?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the hon. minister accept a question from the hon. member?

Mr. Lalonde: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Do I understand from the minister's remarks that the proposals which were put before the first ministers with respect to the new tax-sharing formula will not apply in any province which wishes to continue for the remaining four years in the present Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act program, if that province wishes to remain under the 50-50 sharing program?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to imply that in my statement. If I did, I would like to thank the hon. member for providing me with the opportunity to clarify this matter.

I do not think it is realistic or possible to have a system whereby some provinces continue cost-sharing on a 50-50 basis while others start having tax points and per capita grants between now and 1980. If a province were to favour the early implementation of the tax-sharing formula, this would require the unanimous approval of the provinces, for the simple reason that we need to have a firm formula for per capita grants on a national basis. It would be difficult to do this if you had some provinces operating on a 50-50 basis and others operating on tax points and per capita grants. I am advised that what would be required, in those circumstances, would be unanimous agreement to cut off the five-year agreement under hospital insurance and switch to the new financing formula that has been proposed by the government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Do I understand the minister is saying that unless there is unanimous consent by the provinces to terminate the agreement under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, that formula, on a 50-50 basis, will continue until 1980?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, that would be my understanding as far as hospital insurance is concerned. Obviously, the situation with medicare is different. It would be a matter of decision as to whether it would be worth while having a tax point and per capita system operating only for medicare while we still have hospital insurance operating on a 50-50 basis.

My own inclination would be to insist that we decide the whole issue at the same time, rather than having an ad hoc type of operation where we would be covering only part of the health field in terms of tax points. If I were to make any case, I think it would have to be on the basis of both programs being changed under a new health financing formula.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I begin by saying that we recognize and accept the fact that there is a need for restraint in spending. I think all the provinces recognize the fact that spending in the area of health care has been going on more rapidly than perhaps they had hoped. With that in mind, we have to question very seriously the approach this government has been taking in its desire to cut costs in the health field, as indeed in any other field.

One of the important factors that has to exist in this country if confederation is to survive, and if there is to be a decent kind of relationship between the federal and provincial governments, is a feeling of mutual respect and trust between those governments. We have a situation in Canada at the present time where that feeling of mutual

respect and trust has been severely eroded by the action taken by the federal government under this bill.

Generally speaking, Canadians, and indeed people anywhere in the world, believe that if a contract is made between two parties, that agreement must be abided by both parties until one of two things happens: either the agreement expires and becomes no longer relevant for that reason, or it is renegotiated by meaningful, careful negotiation, by both parties.

A number of years ago, when the medicare law was introduced into the federal parliament, only one province—I believe it was the province of Saskatchewan—thought it could participate and, indeed, was anxious to participate in that legislation almost immediately. The remaining provinces had some very grave reservations. It meant a very substantial realignment of their own priorities. I recall reading some of the debates at that time. One question which stands out very vividly in my mind was put by one of the provincial ministers, who asked, "But how do we know that when the federal government realizes how costly this operation is going to be, it will not back out of its commitment to the provinces". We have exactly that situation now.

This reflects the fact that the Liberal government at that time was perhaps working under a good deal of ignorance. It did not think through the consequences of the legislation it was putting forward. I refer, of course, to the economic consequences. We now have a situation where the prophecy of that provincial minister is indeed coming true.

It is naive for the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) to say that the provinces now are not sufficiently motivated to try to cut costs, at least to the same extent that he is, because under the existing agreement they have maintained 50 per cent of the cost. We have a situation where one party to the contract, namely, the federal government, is trying to weasel out of its obligation to the provinces. My concern is that this kind of behaviour can do nothing but damage the relationship between the provincial governments and the federal government.

● (1540)

We know that costs have been rising rapidly, but we also know that taking unilateral action to change the agreement has put the federal government under a great deal of suspicion in the eyes of the provinces. If the federal government is concerned at all about its future relations with the provinces, it should reconsider this bill. Once suspicion develops in the minds of the provincial administrations with regard to proposals put forward by the federal government, it becomes virtually impossible to conduct meaningful negotiations between the two levels of government. This is the type of situation which is building up now.

I do not think I can say that we in this party are against the principle of ceilings on expenditures. What we are against is the idea that the minister can somehow make unilateral decisions and announce them to the provinces, and that the provinces can go to hell if they do not like what is offered. We are opposed to such an approach.

We recall that when the medicare legislation was first put forward by the federal government, a great deal of concern was expressed about its cost. But the federal government insisted that the plan should go ahead no matter what the cost might be, and to a great extent forestalled objections on financial grounds by undertaking to contribute toward the cost on a 50-50 basis. In these circumstances, the provinces went ahead with the plan, and now they are stuck with it. The Liberal government of the day devised the whole scheme. It should have known what it was getting into. Now that the picture is somewhat clearer, members across the way seem to be taking the position that a change can be made in the agreement without the concurrence of the other party.

When we first heard of this legislation, we thought it was merely a club of some sort which the federal government wanted to use to force the provinces to move more speedily insofar as the rearrangement of the cost-sharing formula was concerned. Today, however, we realize that the bill is more in the nature of a preview of what the minister would like to do in connection with all the cost-sharing arrangements with the provinces. I see the hon. gentleman is smiling. If he thinks I am not stating the situation accurately as far as the provincial governments are concerned, all he has to do is to think back to the beginning of this week when certain proposals were made to the provincial premiers in connection with cost-sharing.

The results of that conference were reflected in newspaper headlines of which I have one or two examples before me. Here is one from the *Gazette* of June 16: "Premiers talks end in uproar!" Another from the same paper, of the same date, reads: "Federal-provincial jungle is a jungle like no other." Headlines of this sort express clearly the results of the attitude the minister has taken toward the cost-sharing agreements which have been made. There is a general feeling in the provinces that the word of the government, the word of the minister, is simply no good. I hope the hon. gentleman will take the appropriate action to correct that situation. If I were in his boots, I would feel extremely uncomfortable. I suggest there will be hard times ahead for the government if it does not change its attitude. Its present course has resulted in severe damage to the contractual credibility of the Federal administration when dealing with the provinces, as well as severe damage to a variety of useful arrangements of mutual benefit. In the long run, of course, it is bound to be detrimental to confederation itself and to the people of Canada.

I urge the minister to change his mind with regard to this measure. As I say, we support the idea of restraint, but there is a factor which is more important to Canada than simply forcing this legislation through the House. If the hon. gentleman is interested in making meaningful future arrangements with the provinces, he needs to rebuild the feeling of trust and confidence which is required. The best way to begin to do this would be by withdrawing Bill C-68 and going back to the provinces with an open mind and a sincere desire to negotiate.

Mr. Darling: And a contrite heart.

Mr. Yewchuk: Yes, that too. Unless he does so, then for the next two years, at least, I believe there will be little possibility of making the arrangements which the hon. gentleman described in his opening comments. He indicated that the progress of the talks with the provinces was encouraging. But I do not believe him. I do not see any

evidence of encouragement from either the premiers' conference or the conference of health ministers held earlier this month. When he says that talks are progressing well, he is simply whistling in the wind. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have said enough today. The minister seems appropriately ashamed of himself, so I hope that the matter is given serious consideration by him.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-68, designed to place a ceiling on the federal government's contribution to the medical care program, has been before the House for many months. Now we come to third reading. It may seem to be a waste of time to debate it further, but I think it essential that we take some time to make one last, desperate effort to persuade the government and members on the other side of the House to recognize what a dangerous course the government is pursuing with respect to the health services of this country.

● (1550)

This legislation is being introduced on the ground that the cost of medical care has been growing too rapidly and that therefore the government must put a cap on its expenditures in the years ahead. It is true that some minimal amendments to the bill were made when it went through the committee of the House, but the basic restrictions are still there. The mere fact that the provinces have to be consulted means very little. Consultations with the provinces in the past have merely consisted of ministers of health or the premiers being called to Ottawa to be told what the federal government is going to do, and they can either accept it or lump it.

If enough members of the House ask for a debate on whatever formula the government sets for the third year, it will simply be an exercise in futility. Members are able to express their opposition, as members on this side of the House have been doing for some months, but this will not alter the government's decision. Therefore, the fact that the government has welshed on its commitments to the provinces when they came into medicare has now become the established principle that the government proposes to follow.

The minister has been complaining recently, according to the press, about the fact that the provinces have not wholeheartedly embraced his income security program. I have attended a lot of federal provincial conferences, and I imagine that some of the premiers feel the same way that I feel about them; that is, when the federal government invites you to join in a shared program, you had better go in very carefully. Otherwise you may find that, having made commitments and set up a program, the federal government is liable to pull the rug from under you and leave you holding the baby. That is why the provinces have been hesitant about entering the income security program. They have, right here, a concrete illustration of what happens when they do go into a shared program and the government pulls the rug from under them.

This is not unusual with Liberal administrations. I remember the late 1940s, when the Hon. Paul Martin was minister of health and he induced the provinces to go into a physical fitness program. I was one of the premiers who was most enthusiastic about a physical fitness program and we set up a very excellent administration. Then three years later the federal government walked out and left our administration with the choice either of dropping the program or financing it ourselves. The province of Saskatchewan proceeded to finance it on their own, but it taught them the lesson that when you go into a shared-cost program with the federal government, you had better have long-term commitments or you are liable to be left to pay the bill yourself.

The fact is that Bill C-68 is really the first major step in dismantling health insurance in Canada as it was originally envisaged in 1957 when the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act was passed, and in 1968 when the medicare program became nationwide. The reason is given that costs have been rising too rapidly. There is no doubt that costs have risen rapidly. However, I think the House ought to take cognizance of the fact that the cost of everything else has risen. In particular, health costs have risen in other countries which do not have health insurance, to a far greater extent than they have risen in Canada.

Those who oppose health insurance—usually those who are comfortably well off and who do not worry about meeting their health care costs—point to the United States where health care costs are met on an individual basis. In that country, as the minister has already pointed out, our American neighbours spend a higher percentage of their gross national product on health care—they have no health insurance program—than we do in Canada, where we do have a health insurance program. We have the best health insurance program in the western hemisphere: not the best in the world, but certainly the best in the western hemisphere. This does not mean, of course, that we should be satisfied to let the cost of health care continue to escalate without our doing anything to limit that escalation. All of us want to eradicate any abuse of or wastage in health insurance programs. But we ought not to fall into the trap, as some members have in the course of this debate, of laying the blame at the feet of the public for over-utilization.

First of all, only a doctor can decide whether a patient requires surgery or diagnostic procedures such as X-rays and lab tests. Any patient who walks into a doctor's office and says, "I would like an appendectomy" is not going to get an appendectomy. It is not like ordering a pair of shoes in a store. Only if a doctor decides that some care or treatment is required will a patient get it. The same is true of hospital care. A hospital is not an hotel where you check in and decide that you want a few days rest. No person can enter a hospital unless a doctor signs an admission form, and no patient can remain in a hospital once a doctor has authorized his dismissal. I have been surprised to hear some of the members of the House who belong to the medical profession—I see several of them here—advocating, in the course of this debate, the imposition of deterrent fees both for persons entering hospital and for persons who go to see a doctor.

Mr. Philbrook: Not from this doctor you haven't.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A doctor, more than anybody else, has control over what treatment a patient will receive, whether or not he will be admitted to hospital and how long he will be allowed to stay there. If there are doctors who are abusing the plan—

and there may be—then surely this is a matter for the medical association to take up and exercise what discipline it can upon its members.

When both hospital insurance and then medicare were established in the province of Saskatchewan, one of the things that the medical profession said to us was, "We don't want you policing us; we will police our own members". I, personally, agreed with them. I think they are in a better position to police their own members than is a government board. But let not anyone, particularly members of the medical profession, talk about overutilization unless they themselves are prepared to exercise some discipline with reference to their own members.

The imposition of deterrent fees, whether for hospital care or medical care, is not an answer to the problem. As a matter of fact, those who take the trouble to read the report of the royal commission on health care headed by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall will find in the report that Mr. Justice Hall and his colleagues examined the situation of those provinces that had hospital insurance. They examined the case of Saskatchewan, which had rejected the idea of deterrent fees, and compared it with the provinces that had adopted deterrent fees. They found that in the province of Saskatchewan the morbidity rate and the average length of stay in hospital was less than in the provinces which had adopted deterrent fees. Therefore, in my opinion deterrent fees are not necessary.

● (1600)

I heard in the course of the debate some comment about hypochondriacs, people who have imaginary illnesses, taking up the doctor's time and occupying scarce beds in our hospitals. Naturally there are hypochondriacs. We have always had hypochondriacs. But there are rich hypochondriacs as well as poor hypochondriacs, and the difference is that the rich hypochondriacs are able to pay for having somebody rub their backs and keep them in hospital. The fact is that people who think they are sick, are sick. They may not be ill with the things about which they complain, but they certainly are in need of treatment, either psychiatric or counselling.

An hon. Member: They are incurable.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They need treatment.

Mr. Railton: They are incurable.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The doctor says they are incurable. It may be they are.

Mr. Railton: Everyone recognizes that.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The doctor is not quite right when he says everybody recognizes that, because his own profession is becoming increasingly aware of the psychosomatic aspects of medicare. A great many people can be helped by the provision of psychiatric care.

Mr. Railton: Not those.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Certainly, the fact that we have people who imagine they are ill and who require medical attention ought not to be an excuse for imposing deterrent fees.

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

Mr. Railton: We never got much of that in my time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I do not know whether they took up much of the doctor's time, and I am not sure it did them any good to take up his time, but I do not want the hon. member taking up my time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is putting the doctor in his place.

An hon. Member: Carry on.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Of course we are concerned about high costs, but the answer to the high cost of health care in this country is not going to be resolved by imposing ceilings on federal government or provincial governments' contributions. In fact, I think I can show the House that the imposition of such ceilings will be counterproductive rather than beneficial.

Many years ago, when some of us were first arguing for health insurance in this country and when we managed to get legislation passed for health insurance, first in the provinces and then in the federal House, we kept pointing out that there were two phases to health insurance. The first phase was to remove the financial burden between the individuals providing health care and those receiving health care. That is an important burden, and one of the things that this country can be proud of is that we have finally removed the financial barrier, thus enabling the person who is ill to go to the doctor and get whatever treatment is necessary, and to be put in hospital to have all the benefits which modern medical science can provide.

At that time we kept pointing out that there was a second phase to health insurance. It is that if we are not going to undertake almost impossible financial burdens, we have to begin immediately to change the health delivery system. That is the problem which really faces us. What strikes me about this minister and his department is that they have known for a long time, and they have said it in some of their publications, that they way to reduce the cost of health insurance in this country is to change the delivery system and replace some of the high-cost services with low-cost services.

The minister and his department have been told this by the provinces and they have been offered the co-operation of the provinces to bring this about. In May, 1973, when the federal government proposed to the provinces that Ottawa's contribution to medicare should be equated with the gross national product, the provinces rejected that, I think in September, 1974. The provinces put forth, as an alternative, the suggestion that the federal and provincial governments should begin immediately to work on programs to replace the high-cost services with low-cost services.

As the minister admitted when he introduced this bill, the federal government agreed with the provinces to set up committees to study how this could be brought about, but in the budget of one year ago the federal government sabotaged the work of those committees. Without consultation, the government announced it was going to give the required five-year notice to terminate the hospital insur-

ance and diagnostic services program, and only a few months later introduced Bill C-68, which we are now discussing, to put a ceiling on its contribution to medicare. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) has done virtually nothing to work out with the provinces the kind of programs which would enable us to reduce our expenditures for high-cost programs by substituting low-cost programs. It is apparent to anyone that unless we introduce low-cost programs first we cannot eliminate high-cost programs.

For instance, in some parts of Canada today hospitals are being closed, but there is little value in closing active treatment hospitals if there is no place to put the patients who should be moved to low-cost nursing homes. There is no doubt that there are people in hospitals today who have suffered a stroke, who are incapacitated, and some are terminal cases—and it costs anywhere from $100 to $150 a day to keep them there—who could be cared for quite adequately in nursing homes, if we were building nursing homes. Once we build the nursing homes and can move these people into them, then it makes sense to close hospitals. But it does not make sense to close them if we have no place to put these people who are today in active treatment hospital beds.

I am sure every member of this House has come across cases of men who have had a stroke or who are bedridden and cannot be sent home because the wife is not well and there is no one to care for them. Until we get alternative programs we will not be able to cut costs. What we will do, as a matter of fact, is increase the cost in the long run, because if people cannot get into hospital and there are delays, when they get in and they are in an acute state they will stay for a long time. Everyone knows that a patient who comes in for an appendectomy may be out in a few days. If he comes in with a ruptured appendix he will be in the hospital for a considerably longer time. We are not saving money by putting the cap on. The intelligent way to deal with the problem of health care costs is to work with the province in instituting low-cost services and then be in a position to reduce the high-cost services.

● (1610)

The provinces have been trying to persuade the federal government to join with them in instituting cost-shared programs for such services. A lot could be done in this country by the establishment of more nursing homes, the provision of home-care treatment, meals on wheels, more extended care units in hospitals, more physiotherapy units in hospitals, more denticare programs in this country, particularly for children, in order that a preventive dental program could be carried on, and pharma-care for the aged. These are the types of programs that would reduce the incidence of illness and in the long run would cut down the cost of health insurance.

Those of us who through the years have talked about a new delivery system have been stressing the need for altering the focus on health care in this country. In the past we thought of the practice of medicine in terms of curative medicine and public health care, but many countries in the world now have switched their emphasis to preventative health programs. Some starts have been made in this country. But really there has been very little leadership from the Department of National Health and Welfare. We have a few community health clinics which have succeeded in involving the public in programs for physical fitness, proper dieting, weight watching and periodic medical examinations with a view to curing incipient illnesses before they have reached a dangerous stage. However, these are minuscule compared to the total need in this country. We really do not have a preventative health program.

No one need tell the members of this House that in the long run it costs less to keep people well than to cut them up and patch them up after they are dangerously ill. If the government really wants to tackle the problem of the high cost of health care in Canada, we ought to be tackling the problem of preventive health programs. For instance, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) could help a great deal by offering financial incentives for doctors to go into group practice, and for the establishment of group practice in the smaller hospitals where there would be diagnostic facilities, X-ray facilities and physiotherapy units.

This would save money and it would bring about better liaison between the general practitioners and the specialists, and better liaison between the medical personnel and the para-medical personnel who operate in the health field. I believe the day must come in Canada when we will have the facilities in the various communities so that the people will go regularly to clinics, so that the health of people will be checked periodically, and so that we will have a preventative program in which we get help to the people before they have suffered serious illnesses.

What has the federal government done in this field? I am disappointed. It is now eight years since we took the first step of establishing medicare in this country. It was a forward step. The late Lester B. Pearson and his government, along with the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), who was minister of national health and welfare at that time, are to be commended for that forward step. However, we have taken few steps since to begin to change the health delivery system to any serious extent, and we are paying the price because the whole delivery system of merely curative medicine is expensive and will become increasingly expensive.

What have we done about nursing homes? Some steps have been taken, but they have been really meagre. A few communities have established home nursing care and meals on wheels programs, but only in isolated instances. Some of the hospitals have established physiotherapy units, psychotherapy units and extended care units. Many of the hospitals have not been able to do this. Such programs make a great deal of difference in the treatment of people, because outpatient units mean it is not necessary to feed and look after people in hospitals. They can come from their homes for treatment, and return again.

We have done very little to expand health clinics across this country. Many of the younger doctors would be prepared, with financial incentives, to go into health clinics across this country if they were set up. The other night I attended a meeting of health care executives. Some of the young health care personnel told me how delighted they were when they read the booklet put out by the Department of National Health and Welfare called "A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians". I do not know who wrote that booklet, but I pay tribute to whoever it is.

However, since I read it I have been wondering whether or not the minister has read it.

Mr. Lalonde: I wrote it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If the minister wrote it, then I congratulate him for doing so, but condemn him for having done nothing about the policy he enunciated in the booklet. It is not enough to write about very fine fullsome programs, and not put them into practice.

We have done nothing at all in this country about physical fitness programs. Countries in which the people are much less wealthy than we are have effective physical fitness programs. In the minister's pamphlet, which I am now glad to be able to identify, "A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians", we find this statement: "We must improve our lifestyle and environment". I think that is something with which all of us would agree wholeheartedly. But I ask the minister what his department has done, or what the government with which he is associated has done, about improving our lifestyle and environment. We need merely to look across this country and see the evidence of mercury poisoning from which the Indian people are suffering, the arsenic emissions in the Northwest Territories, the cancer from asbestos fibres, the cancer found in miners at Elliot Lake, and the situation in the oil sands where Syncrude is beginning to get its plant under way. The report of the Department of the Environment suggests a maximum emission of 40 tons a day, while we have an emission of 280 tons per day. We might look at the Eldorado situation and Port Hope where people are being moved out of their homes because of the radiation-contaminated fill there. That was put there 25 years ago. What has been done about it? How can this go on?

● (1620)

Last Thursday I raised the matter in the House. I spoke about the fact that the great Canadian Oil Sands are pouring 400,000 gallons a day from its tailings into the Athabasca river. When I asked the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) what he was doing about it, he said he would look at it. But his own department's report based on tests made in August, 1974, shows that there is an undue degree of toxicity in the tailings being put into the river. Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, it is only a short time ago that we were treated by the Liberal government opposite to a public relations program in which they were going to restore for Canadians clean air and pure water. What clean air and pure water? The Canadian Waters Act—and I remember when it was being introduced by the former minister, Jack Davis—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Now a Social Crediter.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): — some of us said that this was simply a public relations gesture, and the government was very annoyed about this. Under that legislation, no national standards have been set up for what pollutants you can pump into a river, lake or coastal waters, as far as I know, and not one water quality management area has been established. When I asked the minister about it the other day, he said he would deal with the matter under the Fisheries Act. He has the power to act.

A moment ago when I spoke about conditions in which the people of this country have to live, somebody from across the way said that this is under provincial jurisdiction. Under the legislation for clean air and pure water the federal government has jurisdiction. Under section 16 of the Canadian Waters Act the Minister of the Environment has the power, if he chooses, to act without the provinces. He can do it under section 9 with the provinces, but under section 16 he can set up a water quality management area without the consent of the provinces, and thus deal with the pollutants that are being poured into the water.

Is this how we are improving our lifestyle and our environment? I ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare: Where are our programs for industrial health and safety in this country? In 1974, 1,415 people were killed on the job. Where is our industrial safety program? The government is very good at writing pamphlets and portraying the vision of what Canada could or should be, but I must say that it gets very low marks for putting its dreams into practice. This is a government of big smoke and very little fire.

If the government really wants to deal with the question of growing costs—and all of us agree in the House that costs must be held down to a reasonable percentage—then it is taking the most counterproductive method of dealing with increased health costs. As I have already pointed out, we are not spending an undue percentage of our gross national product in health care, but that does not alter the fact that we do not want it to get out of hand. We are going to put a ceiling on the federal government's contributions, but we are doing nothing about revamping the health delivery system so as to make it possible to give the people of Canada adequate health care at a reasonable price.

The provinces have indicated their willingness to cooperate in such a program. My plea to the government is that what we ought to do is set this bill aside until we meet again in the fall. If you set it aside altogether, I would not object, but the government would not want to do that. However, if we set it aside until the fall and gave the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the provincial governments an opportunity to see if they can work out changes in our health delivery system which would be less costly and just as effective, then this bill would be totally unnecessary.

On top of this legislation, the federal government has now announced a new cost-sharing program which it wants the provinces to accept. I must say that if I was disturbed about the government giving notice last June of its intention to terminate the agreement with respect to hospital insurance and diagnostic services, and very annoyed at Bill C-68 which puts a ceiling on the federal government's contribution to medicare, I am even more concerned about the proposals which have been placed before the first ministers this week by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

We have only fragmentary information about it. Many of the proposals are in principle and no figures are given, no base year is stated. But I take it from the reports and what the minister said today that the government is proposing that it withdraw from its commitment to pay 50 per cent of

the cost of hospital care and diagnostic services and physicians' fees, as well as its commitment to pay 50 per cent of the cost of post-secondary education. In proposing this, the government intends to replace the 50-50 share with the provinces by granting to them certain undefined tax points accompanied by equalization grants.

On the radio I heard the Prime Minister say that this will gear health costs to the annual growth in the economy, which he considers a more realistic approach to health care financing. I want briefly to give three reasons why I think this is a serious, retrograde step. First, we cannot equate health care with the growth of the gross national product. Capital costs for providing health care facilities may have to be adjusted according to the state of the economy, but health services cannot be geared to economic growth. The incidence of illness bears no relationship to our national productivity. Sick people have to be cared for and health services must be provided even in times of economic recession.

Indeed, this is one of the basic imperatives in establishing health insurance in Canada. We have no control over when epidemics may occur, and these must be dealt with regardless of the vagaries of the national economy. We can expand or contract highway construction or public building, but we cannot adjust health care to economic growth. Our first responsibility in a humane society is to get people well, and this must remain one of our major priorities. We had an illustration of this last year when the gross national product in this country showed virtually no growth, but the cost of living, the cost of health services and the cost of everything else went up. In a situation like that, how would it be possible for the provinces to provide health services which people need at a time when the gross national product stayed down? We might just as well tie the health contribution of the federal government to the temperature average for the year, or to how many gallons of water go over Niagara Falls, as tie it to the gross national product.

● (1630)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member wants to proceed, he will have unanimous consent because his allotted time has now expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I thank hon. members for their kindness, and I will not impose on their good nature. I would just like to finish this point and I will be through.

The second weakness in this proposal is that tax points will provide proportionately less revenue for the less affluent provinces. The wealthier provinces may be able to weather the storm during a period of economic recession, but the poorer provinces will find it impossible to do so. The Rowell-Sirois report of the early 1940s, and the green book proposals of the late 1940s, were predicated on the goal of ensuring that all Canadian citizens, no matter where they might live, would be guaranteed uniform services with regard to health, education and social welfare. We are in danger of losing sight of this objective. Are we to return to the situation we once had, when the standard of services enjoyed by Canadians was determined by the financial affluence of the province in which they resided? If we take this retrograde step, we will remove the cornerstone of confederation and weaken the bonds which hold this nation together.

The third factor which disturbs me is that the less affluent areas of Canada will find that in order to meet their health care costs in a period of declining tax revenue, they must resort to deterrent fees and user service charges. In that event, the concept of uniform health insurance benefits will be destroyed and we shall have a patchwork of health programs across the country. The result will be that those areas of Canada which are already disadvantaged in many other respects will also have a lower standard of health care. To me, that would be the negation of the kind of Canadianism which we have been striving to create over the last quarter of a century.

In my opinion, a nation which is not prepared to make adequate health services available to all its citizens, regardless of income or residence, is a nation which is in danger of losing its vision, and when a nation loses its vision the people perish.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on Bill C-68. We have heard today considerable discussion on the philosophy of health care, especially from the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) who as premier of Saskatchewan had much to do with the development of our present form of health care. This bill, essentially, involves limiting payments to doctors from the medical care portion of the federal purse. It points up a truism pointed out by the Hon. Enoch Powell when he was minister of health in the Macmillan government in Britain when he said that no matter what happens, health care must be limited in some manner. If it is not limited by taking from patients' pocketbooks, it has to be done by rationing the health care system, mainly at the doctors' offices or at the hospital door. Of course, the British national health system was limited because physicians had to see 100 or more patients within an hour or two, and people waited four or five years for elective operations which we would consider should be done within a week or two.

Probably most health care legislation is founded on the philosophy that if we spend only a certain amount of money, and if we do things right, health care will not be necessary, hospitals will not be needed and physicians would be out of a job. As a matter of fact, during the war years the British Labour party promoted the idea of national health care and told the British people that if a national health plan came into effect, hospitals would only be necessary because of lack of attention, and that with a proper health care plan hospitals would not be needed, doctors' services would be superfluous and that eventually the whole system would cost much less, and few beds would be needed. Of course, this flew in the face of reality.

Our population grows older as we keep alive those who might otherwise have died of acute illnesses such as diptheria and acute appendicitis. We save those who otherwise would have died of gall bladder disease, which is reasonably easily treated now, or heart conditions. These people now live longer and are hospital satistics for a longer time as they become older and more senile. Indeed, our problem

is only just beginning, because our population is aging. The generation of the 1990s will be faced with a very old population. Statistics in the United States show that at the moment about four people are working for every one who is retired. By 1980, three will be working for every one who is retired, and it is expected that the figure will drop to something like 2.5 working for every one retired, assuming our retirement patterns remain the same.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands expressed the idea that yearly examinations would do much to reduce the cost of health care. That is a noble idea, but somewhat impractical. For instance, if everyone in Canada had a yearly examination lasting half an hour, assuming doctors worked an eight-hour day, those doctors would have little time left to practice the curative portion of medicine. That is just how many people there are. Of course, in the case of special examinations such as heart, brain, eye, chest or gastrointestinal tract examinations, these could go on for hours and hours. So while preventive medicine is good in itself, it takes time, and the rewards have to be balanced against this.

The ideal of community health clinics have been promoted as having the possibility of providing good health care. I can only say that very often it amounts to: Let Joe look after the work today while I take a couple of hours for golf. No matter where they work, whether by themselves, in large hospitals or in large groups, the important thing with physicians is their own reaction to their patients, and community health clinics and other health bodies have many disadvantages. In many ways they are inefficient, and many doctors are temperamentally unsuited for them. From my experience, I would say that perhaps half of our physicians should not be involved with community health centres. However, that is a personal thing.

In this discussion on reducing health care costs it seems rather incongruous that the government has reduced the portion it is spending on research by something like $5 million when we consider that we have an $8 billion—I saw that figure the other day—health budget. To my way of thinking, this is a poor method of saving money. Unless governments fund medicine, there are not many other ways to fund it. If we did not have the sort of national health scheme we have, no doubt this circumstance would still be with us. Having got what we have, however, the government of the day must provide the vast bulk of the money necessary for health research. Of course, the Cancer Society and the Heart Foundation have collected the millions of dollars across the country, but these are special cases. These two funds have a certain appeal as many people lose relatives from these afflictions.

● (1640)

It seems unfortunate that the minister chose this method of reducing health care costs, as it is a very difficult exercise. In hospitals, the first thing that the management wants to reduce is the drugs even though they amount only to about 2 per cent of the total budget. When you consider that other than surgery and care, drugs are the most important part of getting a patient well in any hospital, to be penny wise is to be pound foolish when it comes to drugs. But this is a feature of the modern line of thought on health care.

[Mr. Ritchie.]

This bill is really superfluous now that there has been the federal-provincial conference which took place a couple of days ago when the super-parliament of Canada met; that is, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the ten provincial premiers. I doubt whether Canada can survive as a democracy in a federal system if so much of the decision-making process is to go on behind closed doors when matters of great public importance are debated.

The provisions of this bill are only one small item on the agenda of the federal scheme. While we have days to discuss the proposal in this House, the federal-provincial conference had only a couple of hours. The public and the elected members of this House still do not know what they discussed. The item referred to as the established program financing proposals—EPFP—will go a long way significantly to alter the financial structure of confederation. I am not entirely against the proposal of the Prime Minister that the provinces should now take over and administer hospital insurance and medicare, even if some inequality should exist in the provinces. There are inequalities within the present system, and I do not believe there would be many more. There would be absolutely no point in doing this if there were a *de facto* redistribution of constitutional power which would permit the federal government to leave the health field and move squarely into the provincial field of education, as they seem to indicate they might.

We ask what the federal government and the Prime Minister are up to. Are they trying to get out of paying for federal-provincial programs such as hospital insurance and medicare and attempting to transfer these dollars to education? The proposals to give the provinces certain tax points by which the federal government would reduce its level of income tax while enabling the provinces to raise their tax, is without meaning until it is spelled out in actual dollars and until the effect it will have on the provisions of this bill is shown.

There has been a great deal of talk about per capita grants. I have always held that it would be better, in relation to shared-cost programs, to have a system of unconditional grants which would take provincial needs into account. I realize the very great difficulty in arriving at a formula which reflects the financial structure of each province, but presumably this new system of per capita grants to the provinces would be permitted to grow with the gross national product or some other escalator.

Will this formula provide a reasonable basis on which the provinces can plan and pay for medicare and hospital insurance that will give the citizens a reasonable standard of care and with, I think one might add, some uniformity across the country? There are differences in the medical care provided in different parts of this country, which cannot be ruled out. There is no doubt that people who live in large cities have a higher level of medical care available than those who live in the country. On the other hand, people who live in the country are not so likely to be run over by motor vehicles.

I can understand why the federal government wants to get out of paying half the cost of provincially administered programs when it can neither control nor accurately predict the cost. There are, obviously, several problems. In a general way, the richer provinces like the idea of extra tax points. At least, that is my view of what came out of the

federal-provincial conference and what was voiced by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. He had a great deal of experience with this subject in his time as premier of Saskatchewan, because those were relatively hard days, although that province has now come up to the standard of the others.

There will still be problems with the poorer provinces, with their smaller tax base, being unsure that they will be able to cope with their obligations to their citizens. There will be the problem of maintaining national standards in the health care field, because under the federal proposal the tax points and per capita grants would be integrated with the actual cost of health services. As the provinces can spend the money they receive in any way they choose, almost certainly this will create some deviation in the standard of health care across the country. I do not necessarily believe this is an insurmountable problem.

In the way we measure health care, I believe there would be certain changes, but I have never been too sure that the standards we apply to health care are the best. For instance, we have hospital accreditation which, in essence, means that a group of super-civil servants go around the country looking at hospitals. The things they measure seem, to me, to reflect very little of the standard of care in any particular hospital. Teaching hospitals are rated by the American Medical Association or a branch of it which is involved in rating all hospitals on the North American continent.

Wrapped up in the proposals of the Prime Minister and their relationship to medicare financing and hospital insurance financing in relationship to this bill is the question of whether the federal government wants to get out of the funding of health costs in order that it can make a significant attack on the pattern of education in post-secondary schools across Canada. Will money that is allocated to health services such as contained in the provisions of this bill now be used for post-secondary education or in some other way such as language training or the promotion of Canadian studies?

Obviously, the government intends to introduce considerable educational content. This is typified by what came out of the federal-provincial conference a couple of days ago. There are major problems of how to relate the Prime Minister's proposals to the clauses in this bill. As I said, to me the bill seems to be quite superfluous to what we are now discussing. Here we are talking about a ceiling on hospital insurance, but in his proposals to the first ministers the Prime Minister gave no indication of how much money the federal government is talking about.

● (1650)

How many tax points are to be transferred? How large will the per capita grants be? With the Prime Minister failing to commit himself and making it virtually impossible for the provinces to assess the plan, it seems the height of ridiculousness when a federal official maintains that things will go much better if we can agree to the proposals first and then put the arithmetic on the proposals. Presumably, it is the federal government's idea of equality with the provinces, like the horse and the rabbit, even for the large provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

The Prime Minister in his opening statement said: "We care about democracy which entails the formation of an active and informed citizenry". When the provinces are not even informed of the arithmetic of the proposals, how can the citizenry be informed, when conferences are held behind closed doors and the government will not even reveal its figures?

The impact of this bill has been superseded by this first ministers' conference which was supposed to come up with new arrangements for the financing of health care in Canada. Indeed, the necessity of the conference began with this bill and the unilateral action to put limits on federal contributions and change the terms as legally as possible. This bill smacks uncomfortably of rule-changing in the middle of the game, a game which, incidentally, Ottawa levered most of the provinces into in the first place.

I recall in 1969 when the province of Manitoba desperately tried to introduce and modify the federal plan in order to introduce some things that would have put a brake on spending and given more flexibility to the plan. The federal government was adamant; it was "all or nothing." The minister of health for Ontario, Mr. Miller, said what the Prime Minister had done was the most infamous action since the bombing of Pearl Harbour.

This bill has set the stage for the opting out of all provinces from the shared-cost program. It certainly is interesting to see the reaction of the provinces when faced with this. The proposition that the Prime Minister put forward to the conference, and which is embodied in this bill—"it is not the money, it is the principle"—did not turn out to be a very satisfactory one for the first ministers' conference on dominion-provincial fiscal arrangements.

Quebec, which had taken its tax points and which had perhaps foreseen that the federal government would opt out of the arrangements that the Pearson administration had set up, could have afforded to take the view that it could face the issue with equanimity. There was no answer to questions such as, "What proportion of the transfer will be in tax points?" or, "What will the equalization basis be and what proportion will be in cash?" The province of Quebec talked about the principle of keeping the federal finger out of the education pie. The maritimes obviously talked about the formula being deleterious for the poorer provinces, while Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia talked about the principle being good for richer provinces, and they all joined in the chorus of the federal government's reneging on earlier revenue guarantees.

There was even the odd one who had some thoughts about principle, that is, whether or not Ottawa, by backing out of fiscal and administrative responsibility, would be weakening the Canadian capacity to have national social standards in the national economic interest. As this bill indicates, the opting out formula which Quebec had from the very beginning is obviously the one that all provinces should have. The opting out formula that was to recognize Quebec's special status as the homeland of the French Canadian community seems now to be extended to other provinces as well.

We have to recognize that even in the opting out formula, which is essentially what the government has proposed, there will be more autonomy in different regions and provinces. This will create new standards and new

difficulties. It may well be a more divisive force in the country than we see at the present time.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack)—Industry—Textiles—Request for tabling of report of Clothing and Textile Board on polyester yarn; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Labour Conditions—Possibility of lockout of Air Canada finance branch employees—Government action; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Regional producers' request for investigation—Government action.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say a few words on the bill before us. It is perhaps largely because of my Saskatchewan background that I am concerned about the situation with regard to the medical profession in this country, hospitals, medicare and the like. When the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) was premier of my province, he and his government introduced the first hospitalization plan in the history of, not just Canada but North America. That was quite a feat for a very small, at that time, rural province which did not have much of a base outside the grain and agricultural economy, an economy subject to the whims of not just the international grain situation but the weather at home, an economy which was then in the stages of being developed. That was done without the aid of federal financing. It was done without the support of the federal government. I believe that was in 1946.

That was followed by the introduction in Saskatchewan of medicare in the early sixties. Again, it was a "first" in the history of, not only Canada but North America. I remember that time very well. I was still in high school when medicare was brought in. There was a vicious fight in my province because of the strike of the medical profession in Saskatchewan. They were calling it state medicine, socialist medicine, an infringement upon the freedom of doctors, an infringement upon the freedom of an individual to see his doctor, and so on. That was a battle that was hard fought. It was a battle that was won. From there we have seen the growth of medical services and facilities all across this country.

A few years ago the federal government took the position of supporting hospitalization and medicare by doing a lot of the funding of these programs all across this country. There was a federal Liberal government which I thought was moving in a very progressive direction, putting more and more funds into what in fact in the most important thing in life, the health of Canadians. They were moving in a very progressive direction, getting more and more involved and participating more. Then all of a sudden we have this bill brought before us today for third and final reading, a bill which I am convinced, if it passes third reading, will allow the government to withdraw more and more from the financing of hospitalization and medicare in this country. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this were allowed to happen it would be a highly retrograde step, something which should not take place if we think of the future of Canadians and generations to come. Should the bill pass through the House it will result in great hardship falling on many Canadians, particularly those in the have-not provinces.

● (1700)

Back in 1968 the government said a great deal about regional disparities. It talked about a "Just Society". It is readily seen that a large part of a just society is making sure that medical plans and medical facilities are available to any Canadian no matter where he or she may live; that there is equal access to those facilities, regardless of the income or background of that person. It this bill goes through and if the federal government withdraws from some of the commitments it has made in terms of financing medicine across the country, the time will shortly come when many of the provinces—the Atlantic provinces, for example, which are much worse off than most of the rest of Canada—will be obliged to lower their standards of care and treatment. I think of the Atlantic provinces not being able to expand their medical facilities, not being able to purchase as much of the new and modern equipment, and therefore being able to offer only a lower standard of medical services and facilities to their people. I do not think that is fair, Mr. Speaker. The federal government should be involved in medical care throughout this country if there is to be uniformity of service in all parts of Canada.

As the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) said, it may be very attractive for some of the wealthier provinces like Ontario, Alberta and perhaps, British Columbia, to have additional taxation points when it comes to funding things like medicare, hospitals, etc., but it is not so attractive to poor provinces like Newfoundland, because the taxation base they have is so much smaller than that in the province of Ontario or British Columbia or Alberta. If the federal government withdraws, we shall see a pattern of diminishing services occurring in those poorer provinces.

We shall likely see in the not too distant future, the imposition of deterrent fees, utilization fees or user fees—whatever name you wish to use—in the provinces as one of the ways to help pay for medical facilities. In Saskatchewan we have the experience of deterrent fees. I remember very well a Liberal government in my province, back in the late sixties, imposing what it called a deterrent fee. If you went to a doctor's office you had to pay something like $2.50 per visit, regardless of the reason for your visit. When entering hospital you had to pay a utilization fee, no matter how long your stay or for what reason you entered the hospital. I do not think that is fair because these fees are nothing short of an extra tax upon those who are sick. I believe medical services and the availability of medical facilities must be universal regardless of where Canadians live.

If you are in Alberta, where they have all the oil money, or in the province of Ontario, with its wealthy industrial base, there would not be any need for a government with any social conscience to impose a deterrent fee of any kind. They could probably expand in the area of hospital care. But really, what choice is open to Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island? Indeed the same thing applies if you are in Saskatchewan or Manitoba and the farm economy happens to go into a downhill slide, as it did back in 1969-70 and you lose the potential taxation base.

It is true things are good right now in Saskatchewan. They are good in Manitoba. But that is because we now get a higher price for the grain we are selling on the international market. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) knows that. He is just taking his seat. He recalls the policies of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) who is responsible for the Wheat Board. Back a few years ago we got just $1.97 for our grain. I am sure he remembers that. The minister was paying people not to grow wheat. The economy of the prairies was in bad, bad shape. And at that time had the federal government withdrawn financing from hospitals, medicare, and so on, we would have had no choice in our province but to increase drastically the taxation of the people of Saskatchewan or cut back on the services and facilities available.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the cycle in agriculture which has been evident throughout man's history is probably going to continue. The time could well come when we would not have the base in the province of Saskatchewan or in Manitoba to finance the facilities which we enjoy today and this in spite of the fact that we are expanding, that we do have excellent governments, and that our provinces are diversifying their economies.

Another point I would like to mention, is that the federal government should be getting more involved in all aspects of medicine, not just in terms of what we are doing today, but in the future. We should be putting a great deal more emphasis on preventive medicine—finding out why people go to hospitals and helping before they get ill.

About a year ago the Food Prices Review Board commissioned a study on nutrition in Canada. One of the results published in that report—something which really astounded me—was that occupancy of about 40 per cent of the hospital beds in this country may be linked to improper or inadequate nutrition amongst Canadians. I believe it was also said that if you were to eliminate this cause of ill-health you would probably save about $2 billion in one year in hospitalization costs alone. If we had a proper food policy in this country we would not only improve the health of Canadians but we could bring down the cost of medicare and hospitalization in a very real way. Why do we not institute innovative programs to teach our citizens about good nutrition?

The same report said that about 70 per cent of old age pensioners in this country were suffering from calcium deficiency. Despite that, farmers have been told to cut back on their production of milk—that we have too much milk and production must be cut back by 16 or 18 per cent. They are told to suffer a drop in income. There is calcium in milk and there are people suffering from calcium deficiency. It would be possible to organize a school milk program; we could place a subsidy of fluid milk, and on milk products in order that people might buy more, be healthier, and eat more nutritious foods. This would be a beneficial, long-term investment, strictly in dollars and cents terms, let alone what it would mean in terms of people, of human beings who live in our country.

I visit schools. I believe the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) does this once in a while. I went to a school last week in his riding. I see in the schools coke machines and pop machines, and kids drinking the Coke and the Pepsi, but I do not see many milk machines in the schools, Mr. Speaker. I ask why, when we in this country produce a surplus of milk, we do not have a school milk program through which students can have milk every day in the schools, free of charge?

An hon. Member: Why not ask your provincial government about that?

Mr. Nystrom: All the provinces should become involved in this program to provide the young people with milk, if not free, then at reasonable prices.

An hon. Member: Nova Scotia is doing it.

Mr. Nystrom: I commend them on their action. I believe all provincial governments should follow their example. But a lot could be done by the federal government. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) was asked about a school milk program a week or so ago. He said he would ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) to look into the matter. I would like to see the minister take the lead in this field by calling the provincial governments together and saying, "Look, we are willing to help you finance a school milk program in a serious way." I do not know exactly how it would be set up. Perhaps it would be on a 50-50 basis. Perhaps it would be on a 60-40 basis. Maybe the federal government could supply the milk and the provinces could set up a delivery system.

We have the capacity to produce milk in this country yet we are asking people to cut back the production of milk when there are people who are suffering as a result of an inadequate diet. People around the world are starving, yet the government tells farmers not to produce more milk. It is no wonder that they come to Ottawa and throw cheese and powdered milk at the Minister of Agriculture. When farmers can produce food it is immoral to tell them not to do so. This milk could be used in our own schools, rather

than have our children drink coke and other liquids that are not nearly so nutritious as milk.

● (1710)

Another matter that I think the government should treat much more seriously is additional money for medical research. As a result of research we may find cures for a lot of diseases that are presently plaguing Canadians. I talk not only of finding a cure for cancer and heart disease but of a number of other diseases afflicting Canadians. I think of people in my own family suffering from rheumatoid arthritis. These people have to go through life taking painkillers because no medicine has yet been discovered to cure diseases of that kind. Yet the government is cutting back on money that should be spent on medical research, and I think that that is a crime and a shame.

I realize that we need restraint in various parts of the economy, but surely to God there are certain areas of the economy that should not be controlled, and I suggest one of them is medical research. I hope that the majority of the members of this House feel the same way.

It seems to me that all too often things are not done unless it is profitable to do them. Let me give one example of research that is being done in the food industry. In the United States they found out that a lot of the protein in chicken food went into the feathers. So a few guys had the bright idea of breeding, through genetic engineering, a featherless chicken, and then the protein, instead of going into the feathers, would go into the chicken and you would make more money with fewer chickens. A featherless chicken has in fact been bred in the United States, but unfortunately it suffered from a number of side-effects such as pneumonia, nervous conditions, and probably sunburn. My point is that you do not do this kind of thing unless it is profitable.

They have also discovered that when people buy chicken, whether Kentucky fried chicken or other kinds, they prefer the drumsticks, and they are now in the process of trying to breed a chicken that has four legs—the four-legged chicken. You do not do that unless it is profitable.

An hon. Member: Are they right wing or left wing?

Mr. Nystrom: I prefer the left wing. Maybe you prefer the right. Anyway, restraint program or no restraint program, the government should be putting more money into medical research so that we can help people in a serious way.

Before I take my seat let me say we should be more concerned about uniformity of health plans and programs. You will not get uniformity if the government begins to pull out of some of its commitments. You cannot get equity or equality in this way. As a socialist I believe that it is not enough in this country to talk about equality of opportunity, about laws, peace and understanding, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) does. I think what we have to talk about is equality of conditions for all Canadians, regardless of where they live or what their backgrounds may be, be they in oil rich Alberta or in a province like Newfoundland.

Mr. Paproski: Or in the potash rich province of Saskatchewan.

[Mr. Nystrom.]

Mr. Nystrom: You can only redistribute wealth at the national level, by using national plans. I know some of my Tory friends are not socialists, not even the red Tory from Edmonton Centre. However, I know that a red Tory like him must have a heart when it comes to some of the poor people of the Atlantic provinces. I am sure he would not mind sharing just a small portion of that oil money, perhaps just one or two per cent, in order to help finance better medicine and hospital care for those poor Canadians living under a Conservative government in Newfoundland.

In the world today we are polluting the atmosphere, spewing out 100,000 tons of DDT each year. Every one of us has DDT in our body fat. Carbon dioxide is being spewed out at the rate of 20 billion tons a year, and nuclear reactors are emitting waste materials, with unforeseen results on generations to come. We have polluted our waters with mercury. We do not know what effect some of these pollutants will have on the human body. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we should put a lot more money into medical research to help generations to come, and so I plead with the government to reconsider the bill before the House. I ask the government to remember that it has a heavy responsibility to finance medicine and hospital care. It is only through leadership shown by the government that all Canadians in all provinces will have equality of conditions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest to all hon. members that, if they are going to speak, they get back to the subject of Bill C-68 instead of wandering all over the field. The hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga).

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am forewarned or what the situation is, but before I get to the meat of my remarks I should like to share with the House a few observations that I have made during the course of my brief stay here of two years. It has not been prevalent in this debate because I think hon. members have treated the subject matter very responsibly, but when I go back to the debate on the motion moved on our opposition day which condemned the government for its failure to act in regard to medical research, all members on all sides of the House were guilty of playing politics. We saw hon. members opposite condemning the Conservatives when our critic had to go to the graduation ceremonies of his daughter; and we saw members on this side condemning the government when, for legitimate reasons, the minister and his parliamentary secretary had to be absent from the House. However, in all fairness it should be pointed out that the minister's capable parliamentary secretary has been here for the majority of this debate.

If one also goes back to the budget debate one can see the cross-play that took place. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) spent pratically all his time criticizing what our critic, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), said in his participation in the budget debate. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) devoted half his speech to criticizing the proposals that we had put forward. I had always thought that this was the role of the opposition. It may be that the Prime Minister is indulging in the role of the opposition because he is preparing himself for that role in the future.

The bill before the House proposes to limit government spending on health care costs. The only way that we can realistically hope to accomplish a cutback in this area is to be realistic about our expenditures on medical research. The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) did an excellent job of conveying that to the House. I also have a few thoughts that I wish to share in that particular area.

On May 28 the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs was told a story, a horror story, and unfortunately it is a true story. It is called "The Slaughter in Tunney's Pasture, 1976" and it was told by Dr. Kaplan, chairman of the Canadian Federation of Biological Societies. The slaughter is brought about by the amputation of an anticipated $5 million from the federal budget for the Medical Research Council, leaving it slightly over $50 million. In terms of real dollars this means a cutback of 15 to 20 per cent. There is a slaughter of time and talent. As one medical researcher puts it, "I face the possibility of having to give up my major endeavour of the last eight years. I cannot help but feel personal bitterness at such a prospect". And I, Mr. Speaker, can well understand his bitterness.

● (1720)

It is not just the doctors who are going to be adversely affected by these restrictions, but their technical and support staff as well. It sometimes takes as long as ten years to build up a cohesive team of technicians and doctors and to assemble equipment. If a grant is cut off after a viable working situation exists and then has to be dissipated, how many years are actually wasted? What happens to the personnel and the equipment involved? How can we evaluate the slaughter of hope, the hope that is to be denied many, many people who are afflicted with debilitating diseases for which there are presently no cures? There are no statistics to enumerate the chronically ill or to indicate the degree of suffering which they must endure.

How many Canadians will have to die prematurely from heart disease and cancer, our two major health adversaries, while we withhold medical research funds that could and should be used to push on with research which has been under way in these areas, or to establish new programs to study their cause and cure?

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) tells us that there is no brain drain, that 101 doctors have come from the U.S. to Canada while only 60 have gone the reverse route. Does the minister not take into account those 353 young Canadians who are now working in research fields in the United States and who hold foreign medical visas? That figure was given to me today by the director of special programs in the United States.

The frustration in the ranks of the medical research fraternity is immeasurable. The agony of the "on-again off-again" programming instils such a sense of insecurity that many of our top notch research doctors are simply giving up their hopes of being able to continue their work in Canada and are leaving the country. Submission after submission from medical doctors engaged in conducting research in our universities has indicated that they will not be staying in Canada. We are heading for the second age of the brain drain in Canada. Surely it is a national disgrace that young men and women, graduates of our own schools, are forced to anchor their careers south of the border.

If the government continues to take the shortsighted view that medical research is a frill, a large number of young scientists will have no choice but to stay in the United States, or to leave Canada because of the lack of opportunity to use their highly qualified skills here. Given the current government attitude, Canadian universities cannot continue training and graduating research scientists if there is no future for them in this country. In Canada it is necessary to work out of the universities because there is no central medical research establishment such as exists in many other countries.

We are making involuntary exiles of some of our most promising and responsible citizens of the future. Can we afford this drain on our society? Can we afford to lose the $100,000 it has cost to educate each and every one of these doctors who will not be remaining in or returning to Canada?

What are the priorities of the government? A few days ago representatives of the federal government were sitting down with the provincial premiers. This government announced to them that it wished to cut back on health care. The government has already cut back on health research. I ask you what kind of reasoning this is, because without research to solve some of our medical mysteries how will we ever be able to reduce the cost of health care?

With the spiralling costs of hospital and health care institutions, who can say what a dollar spent today in finding cures will save in ten years? I think a new adage can be coined; we are no longer penny wise and pound foolish, but in this instance we are millions wise and billions foolish. Who can say that billions of future dollars could be saved by present research investment? Who knows what suffering and premature death could be saved by that same investment? When the government speaks about the cost benefit of research, how can it be measured in terms of health and the very lives of people?

In multiple sclerosis alone $200 million is spent each year in caring for victims of this crippling disease and less than $1 million is spent in searching for the cure. Science has proved that it is a virus causative illness, and the President of the MS Association told the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs that the basic research has been done. Now they are ready to move into the more expensive clinical phase but research money is drying up.

How can increases of 25 per cent or more to the Department of National Defence, the Public Service Commission, the Post Office, and the Canadian Radio Television Commission be justified while the Medical Research Council has not even received the 15 per cent increase the government indicated would be allowed for over-all government expenditures? When less than 1 per cent of the total National Health and Welfare budget is allocated to the Medical Research Council, and when its real dollar funding has actually declined by 8 per cent while other federal expenditures have increased by 105 per cent, that is pretty indicative of the status that is placed on explorative medicine.

The federal government should not have to be convinced of the value of medical research when many of us can remember the time, not so long ago, when tuberculosis, polio, and diabetes were rampant killers. I ask whether the government is truly concerned about the health and well-being of Canadian people. If that is the case, then how can we in all conscience say that the emotional and physical health of the present and future population of Canada is only worth $50 million?

The Minister of National Health and Welfare has proposed that we spend $70 million on influenza vaccine during the next year. That is $20 million more than the whole Medical Research Council funds from the federal government. That is $20 million more than the government will put into research for every type of medical problem now being studied, while at the same time one outstanding doctor has had his application for a modest grant to continue his research curtailed. It is conceded that this doctor has achieved a breakthrough in the study of one of the bacteria that can cause meningitis, a disease which has reached epidemic proportions in some countries.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Elzinga: Is the hon. member rising to make his maiden speech in the House?

Mr. Paproski: Just let him speak, doctor. You have had your say, now let him have his.

Mr. Elzinga: We do not mind the interventions.

Mr. Paproski: Get back in your own seat if you want to talk.

Mr. Elzinga: We do not mind the hon. member. It appears that he makes all his major speeches from his seat in the House of Commons.

Let us look at some of the areas the government seems to consider are worthy of vast expenditures of our tax dollars while cutting back on essential health services. The unoccupied housing in Halifax was deemed to be worth $214,000; there was the bill of $34,000 from Information Canada for miscellaneous little jobs; what about the $3.8 million which was wasted by the Department of Supply and Services for a computerized government payroll system that did not work and had to be abandoned? Then there was another little bill which cost $16 million for advance financing to the Lockheed Company, and this is a saga for which we may not have received the final price tag. We also have linguistic and artistic projects for one year at a cost to us of countless numbers of dollars, but a low estimate is several hundred millions. Just one example of waste, pure and simple, was the issuance of $197,000 in tobacco stamps in excess of what was actually needed, and over $39,000 in liquor bottle labels fell into the same category.

These are just a few examples of fiscal indiscretions, and it makes me wonder in reality where the government does have its priority. I am sure that the people of this country would give their health and happiness and the health and happiness of future generations their highest priority.

[Mr. Elzinga.]

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a few comments at third reading stage of this particular bill. Let me say at the outset I was extremely interested and really gratified to hear the minister state that the present situation in respect of federal-provincial negotiations is somewhat encouraging. I think he amplified that he is hopeful that those negotiations will come up with a new formula for cost sharing relationships with the provinces. I find this most encouraging, but on the other hand it seems to be somewhat inconsistent with the bill that was introduced.

● (1730)

I want to remind hon. members that, as I understood the purpose of the bill when it was introduced, it was in effect to limit the rate of increase in federal spending on medical care but that there was also the important addition that it was to allow for federal-provincial cost sharing on new alternatives with the development of less expensive health care delivery programs and services. As the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) indicated somewhat earlier, and certainly I concur with this, one must be somewhat suspect concerning the degree of progress which has been made in this particular area. Having said that, I think one also should look the possibility that the minister may well have had an alternative purpose in introducing this particular legislation in view of the encouraging comments he made somewhat earlier, that is, perhaps it was a method to manipulate the provinces in terms of these negotiations.

May I simply say that if the minister is correct in respect of the facts he presented this afternoon, then in fact this entire piece of legislation is redundant. Indeed the particular negotiations which are going on at the present time, if they are as fruitful as the minister indicated, may be far more important than this particular legislation we have before us today.

I wish to make one or two references to the comments made by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. If I may say so, certainly I am in agreement with the theme he developed about the importance of the universal concept of the medicare program. However, I think we must also recognize that there have been some inequities in the program. I think if one were to assess the program now—and the minister has the figures at his disposal—we would find that there is evidence to suggest that the very people we had hoped to reach through this type of program, principally those at the poverty level, have in fact not been reached by this program. So in fact in this universal program there are indeed inequities which exist. I think this is one area to which the minister must direct his attention. I refer to the fact that the great proportion of the medicare program, universal in concept, really has not reached that group of individuals, which was the intent of the program in the initial instance.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands talked about the importance of looking for alternative low-cost programs to replace our high cost programs. Certainly one can sympathize with this. I am sure there are ongoing discussions between the federal and provincial governments. However, I think it is important to bring one matter to the attention of this House, that is, that we must avoid what I call the add-on principle. Certainly if one is

replacing a high cost program with a low cost program then indeed one must show that these high cost facilities, this high cost technology, and these highcost projects are indeed replaced by the so-called low-cost type programs.

I think there is a trend from time to time—and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all of us have seen evidence of this—in which we end up with an add-on principle. In principle it seems nice to have a low-cost program, but if in fact it does not replace the high cost program to which I referred then it has been a failure in terms of economics.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands referred to the minister's new health perspective for Canadians. I want to emphasize that I think this is an important part of the equation of the health care program in Canada. I think this is an area in which the federal government must and should give greater leadership. The hon. member has discussed several aspects in this regard. There are one or two things on which I want to enlarge in a moment in respect of which I think the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) can and should give leadership.

I also agree with the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands when he referred to the problem of attempting to equate health care with economic factors. I would go one step further. I think there is a myth which exists which should be exploded, that is, that good health care can be equated with good health. I think this would be one of the advantages if the minister were prepared to take action along the general tenor of the philosophy that is outlined in the new health perspective.

I wish to make one comment regarding the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) who talked about the introduction of a medicare program in the province of Saskatchewan. I would simply say in passing to him, and I apologize for not remembering the year, that the Canadian Medical Association long before that program was introduced actually proposed a universal program of medicare for Canada which in fact was rejected by the federal government of that day. I am sure if the hon. member is interested I could give him all the details of the facts regarding that particular situation.

As I indicated somewhat earlier, I feel there is an important part of the equation which has been referred to previously in which I believe there should be very strong leadership at the federal level. I would like to refer to some of these areas. Perhaps in the first instance I might come back to what one might refer to as environmental health hazards and environmental health problems which are very numerous. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands referred to some of them.

I believe this House will recall, I think it was on May 7 this year, that there was a debate on mercury poisoning. This really in effect is a prototype of several types of environmental hazards which exist in Canada. Obviously, however, it has had a very devastating effect principally upon the native people in Canada, particularly the Crees in northwestern Quebec and the natives in northwestern Ontario. Let me simply emphasize that over and above the destruction we have seen within these native communities there is no question that the myth that Minamata disease does not exist has been eliminated. I am sure we are all aware that Dr. Barbeau of the Montreal Institute of Neurology, who is well known both nationally and internationally, has demonstrated the presence of Minamata disease among the Cree people, and among two white people in that particular area. As I understand it, there is recent evidence to suggest that there are symptoms among the native people in the northwestern part of Ontario.

The member also mentioned the problem of radiation. Irrespective of my personal concerns about the growth of atomic energy, and particularly in terms of weaponry, I think we also must recognize that there is substantial evidence to point out that radiation itself is a hazard. We have had the recent situation, for example, at Port Hope and Uranium City. I think it must be made very clear that the federal Atomic Energy Board has not clearly established safeguards. We now have well documented evidence that radiation hazards are possible, and certainly do cause illnesses such as cancer, leukemia, and other disease entities. I do not know of one expert who will not say that there is a potential health hazard from the possible radiation effects of uranium. This is another area of course which requires additional research.

The problem of polychlorinated biphenyls, or pcb's, has received a great deal of attention lately, particularly in relation to the smelt in the Great Lakes system. We know that this particular substance is stored in the fatty tissues of individuals, indeed probably stays there for a long period of time, and perhaps indefinitely. We are well aware of the potential health hazards in this particular area.

One other rather interesting aspect is that of birth defects. I think that if one were to look very carefully at the Canadian context the two most common birth defects we see are related to spina bifida anencephalus. Spina bifida is the condition in which the neuro sheath is incompletely formed, and anencephalus implies the incomplete development of the brain. Let me say, without going into details, that it is important to know that there is now a substantial body of evidence to suggest that environmental health factors play a substantial role and are perhaps one of the most important causative factors in this regard.

● (1740)

Somewhat earlier mention was made of asbestos in connection with the pulmonary problems it causes. I should point out that it has not only been a problem in Ontario, but a recent judicial inquiry in the province of Quebec indicated very clearly that approximately 15,000 workers in that province are risking their health each day that they work in the mines. The problems of lead poisoning have been well documented in an excellent report prepared by the province of Ontario in recent months. Carbon monoxide, chlorine, smoke inhalation, various solvents, occupational hazards—all of these are problems which play a most important part in terms of environmental health hazards. There have been new findings with regard to health hazards encountered by polyvinyl workers. A rare form of cancer was recognized at the Goodrich plant in Kentucky. I would remind hon. members that there are now well documented cases of this disease entity in the Canadian context.

I could go on and talk about many other environmental health problems which, in my view, require a great deal of attention, but there are three points that should be made

about environmental health hazards. First, when we talk about environmental health factors this implies that individual Canadians have no control over certain disease entities, and that there must be intervention on the part of the government. I suggest that in the national context leadership should come from the federal government, and a strong role in terms of our health care system implies a far greater involvement by the government in the entire area of environmental health hazards. As I indicated previously, in my view the federal government has the responsibility of demonstrating this leadership.

As indicated earlier, basic research is most important in the area of environmental health because, as has been alluded to, although we have many of the answers in this area, certainly there are many aspects of pollution and environmental implications with which we are not yet familiar.

Having mentioned the area of research perhaps I should make some comment on the direct relationship between the economics of health and the use of basic medical research, despite the fact that a debate was held two days ago on the importance of medical research, and the point was made by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

Let me take a moment to compliment the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville on some of the remarks he made earlier, and the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga) on the excellent speech he gave. I am sorry the Minister of National Health and Welfare was not here last Tuesday, but I know he had an excellent excuse for his absence. Perhaps I might make reference to one or two aspects of this subject which I think he would find interesting. I do this, Sir, because I believe that in terms of the total health care system one cannot divorce Bill C-68 from the most important component that was involved, that is, negotiations with a view to finding alternative forms of health care referred to by the minister in the past.

I would like to review briefly the types of technology in medical research because one must understand the importance of research and the part it plays in improving health care. There is an excellent article by Dr. Thomas Lewis from the University of Cornell in which he writes about technology being divided into three broad groups. The first group is the so-called non-technology. This is the type of technology which is most important, what we often refer to as supportive therapy, the sort of care that is used for cases of rheumatoid arthritis, osteo arthritis, cancer, etc. We must recognize that it requires a great deal of money, time, and effort by specialized personnel, whether they be physicians, nurses or paramedical people, and it requires a great deal of money for hospital care. Yet we must recognize that there is no definitive answer in terms of the actual disease mechanism. We do not have an understanding of the disease process.

The second group is referred to as the half-way technology. It is very significant in today's health care. We see it in connection with organ transplants, and the treatment of coronary heart disease in intensive care units. It involves sophisticated types of equipment and highly trained technical personnel. It is obvious that this type of technology is very expensive, and yet I must remind hon. members that it is only half-way technology, something that compensates for the breakdown of a particular organ, something that is used to prolong the life of a patient. But again in these cases we do not have a complete understanding of the disease mechanism. I believe that the public and many members of this House do not fully understand this type of technology.

Every day when we pick up a newspaper we read about some new organ transplant which is interpreted as being a major breakthrough in research. Yet in many respects it is primitive in its approach, and although sophisticated technology is used there is an incomplete understanding of the disease entity.

Third, we have a type of technology which really goes unnoticed, the technology that introduced the antibiotics which in effect eradicated the very severe problem of infectious diseases which occurred in our hospitals many years ago. The other day I gave the example, which is probably worth repeating, of a case of typhoid fever. In terms of the treatment methodology that was used many years ago, a patient with a case of typhoid fever would probably be admitted to hospital for 50 to 60 days, would require intensive, highly skilled nursing care, and a careful monitoring of laboratory tests. The cost of that was astronomical. A conservative estimate would now be about $10,000 to $15,000 in today's terms. What are we talking about today? A case of typhoid fever is treated with a bottle of cloramphemical, with two or three days of fever, after which there is improvement. I would simply emphasize what my colleagues have said previously, that basic medical research has a very direct cost effect relationship over a period of time.

I want to congratulate the minister on the position he has taken with respect to motor vehicle accidents. It is a matter that has concerned me for many years. As the minister well knows, in recent years it has been the leading cause in terms of potential years of life lost in relation to other deaths. The latest figures I have show that back in 1971 there were 5,690 deaths from motor vehicle accidents, a great number of them in the younger age group. As I recall, 50 per cent were in the age group between 15 and 25. I do want to compliment the minister at least for taking some aggressive action regarding motor vehicle accidents, seat belts, speed, etc.

● (1750)

Another matter which might be looked into is that of alcohol and drug abuse. I am sorry that I cannot compliment the minister in this regard. I recognize that he has allowed some funds for—

Mr. Lalonde: It won't be long.

Mr. Holmes: I am sure I can compliment him for at least a small degree of action with respect to native people, but when one recognizes that there are direct medical costs which exceed the total intake of provincial and federal taxes, which, as I understand, run very close to $1 billion per year, we must recognize that we have a very serious problem on our hands. I want to emphasize that this does not include the indirect costs for loss of work, loss of productivity, family break up, etc. I must remind the minister that, in my opinion, he has not scratched the surface,

and a great deal must be done. This is another area which requires federal responsibility and federal leadership.

There is another matter I want to mention in passing. It is related to this whole subject, and I hope it has been discussed at federal-provincial meetings. It is the problem of drug misuse. I am somewhat appalled when I see the amount of drugs used by the average Canadian. From the recent figures I have, Canadians on the average use approximately one million tranquilizers per day. We have to consider the large number of accidental poisonings and overdoses of drugs which take place. The incidence of drug reactions is very high indeed.

There is a good deal of evidence to suggest that somewhere between 5 per cent and 10 per cent of admissions to hospital is really related to the problem of overdoses of drugs and reactions to drugs, and I should remind the minister that in this particular instance there is really a geometrical progression in terms of drugs. In other words, if a person takes two drugs, that does not produce twice the chance for a reaction. It really produces three or four times the probability of a reaction. Of course the more drugs one takes, the greater the propensity for this problem. The minister should be looking at drug misuse very carefully with the provinces, and if there is an area in which leadership at the federal level would fit into the philosophy the minister has described in his new health perspective, obviously this is it.

Another matter concerns me immensely because, in my opinion, the federal government has directed no appreciable attention to it. That is the whole area of mental health. From the limited information which has been obtained from the federal-provincial meetings, I understand that there have been some discussions about this, but I think it is worth while to take a moment to consider the magnitude of this problem. I would like to remind hon. members that approximately four out of every 1,000 Canadians occupy hospital beds because of mental illness at any particular time. I should also point out that there are one million children, or approximatley 5 per cent to 10 per cent of schoolchildren, who suffer from emotional or learning disorders.

I am sure hon. members who have been on school boards or who have been associated with schoolchildren will recognize the effects of dyslexia and learning disorders of all kinds. These youngsters really have the basic innate ability to do just as well as any youngster, and yet we have directed very little or almost no attention to this problem.

We should also recognize that approximately 50 per cent of the time of physicians is devoted to dealing with emotional problems. Here again we have no response from the federal government, and no help in this area. There are innumerable other statistics one could cite in this regard, but let me stress that the federal government has demonstrated no leadership with regard to mental health. That is left entirely to the provincial governments, and I urge the minister to recognize that this is an area which is national in scope. It is a problem which occurs in every province and every territory in Canada, and requires initiative on the part of the federal government and leadership from the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Our aging people were alluded to earlier, and their problems require leadership at the federal level. We must recognize that we have a growing population ratio. I recall the present figure, something like 7 per cent of our population is over the age of 65, which represents about 1.7 million people. However, it is also projected that by the mid 1980's somewhere between 9 per cent and 10 per cent of the population will be above this age. If we look very carefully, we will see that a very high percentage of these people utilize hospital beds. The attitude toward these senior citizens is certainly not conducive to an over-all program of rehabilitation or to an over-all program of handling their particular problems. They have more than just medical problems per se, whether they be, for example, arthritic problems or genital urinary problems in females, or muscular problems which are more common in males. However, what we tend to ignore, and have not concentrated sufficient energy on are the psychological problems of senior citizens.

Far too many senior citizens are lonely, far too many are out of the mainstream of society, and far too many live at the poverty level because their incomes have not been adequately supplemented. Far too many live in isolation. A great deal could be done, not only at the community level—and there should be far more community involvement—but also at the provincial level. However, this is the type of problem which is national in scope and demands leadership from the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Another important area in the delivery of health care is consumer involvement. I have been concerned for some time that in the evolution of our health care system there has been a great deal of misunderstanding with respect to the health care system. Some of this misunderstanding has led to irresponsible comments by many individuals, and the minister should give some consideration to the creation of an advisory council which would involve not only various professionals, but also consumers, who are the most important part of the program. Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the House leaders met this afternoon and have agreed, in accordance with the House order of May 20, to fix the time for recording the vote on second reading of Bill C-84 at 12.30 midday on Tuesday, June 22.

May I also indicate that tomorrow the first order of government business will be the report stage of Bill S-32, followed, if there is unanimous agreement, by third reading of that bill, and if by that time third reading of Bill C-68 has not been completed we will return to the debate which is now under way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. this day.

At 6.02 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Medical Care Act

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, when I called it six o'clock I had already developed two or three themes. I have indicated and attempted to describe in some detail the irrelevance of Bill C-68 in terms of the federal-provincial negotiations that are being conducted and have been conducted within the past two or three days. I was attempting to make some reference to the health perspective as introduced by the minister some time ago, particularly in the areas of environmental health, problems relating to the aged, mental health, and several other areas where I think the minister should be showing greater leadership and responsibility than he has demonstrated in the past.

Before terminating my remarks I want to deal again with the health perspective as presented by the minister. As I recall, he developed four categories, one of which was the so-called health organization or management system, environmental health matters, lifestyle health, and the area of biology, recognizing of course that the organizational health area is that traditional area of health that in the past historically, politically, and on a community basis has been a provincial responsibility. There were, of course, the other three areas which I alluded to earlier.

I want to turn now to the so-called organization health aspect which as I indicated is, in my view, and has been a provincial responsibility and to touch on two or three matters with which the minister should have some direct concern and input and should show greater leadership. One area is physician manpower requirements. If one were to assess the situation in Canada there are indications that the physician-patient ratio is adequate, but there is no question that there are inequities in various parts of Canada. For example, if one would look at the rural areas, particularly in the northern parts of Canada, he would find that frequently there are not enough physicians.

● (2010)

It is also important to look at the various types of specialties present in the Canadian context. One frequently finds that there may be an over-abundance of certain specialists. Surgery may fit into this category and yet there may be other areas where there is an urgent need; for example psychiatry, opthalmology, and dermatology are frequently bypassed.

Having said that, I believe there is an immediate need for high level negotiations between the federal and provincial counterparts to achieve certain objectives. It is very important that they should help to define these various health needs, some of which I alluded to a moment ago. It is important that they identify these manpower requirements in terms of geographic location. It would also be useful if they established specialist requirements in all of the areas of post graduate studies. This would be extremely important in giving more diversification across Canada.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

It would also be useful to determine the appropriate numbers of specialists needed in the various segments of Canada, certainly in relation to population. They must find means to attempt to encourage physicians to practice in various parts of Canada. Again I refer to those areas such as northern Ontario where in the past there has been an absence of their presence. In this regard it is essential that they look very carefully and re-evaluate the medical schools in Canada to ensure we have the production capability to turn out students which are highly qualified in the Canadian context.

There is another area where the minister could play an extremely important role. I now speak in terms of computer technology. We know there have been rather unfortunate experiences in terms of records. In many instances hospital data is outdated. It is certainly not current in terms of what is happening in Canadian society.

Despite the fact that we had a nutrition survey in the past, we see very little data regarding the health status of Canadians. It is therefore difficult to know the extent of the health problems as they exist on a day to day basis.

It would be useful in this regard if the Minister of National Health and Welfare were to demonstrate some leadership and launch an effective program in this area with adequate help in order to assess the health of Canadians. We would then be far more informed in terms of developing future programs. I have no doubt that, with co-operation from the provinces, we could update and modernize this kind of technology which would give us this kind of information.

Finally I want to refer to what I call the regionalization of health care. We hear a good deal about regional variations regarding health care in Canada. There has certainly been some effort in the past to rationalize the delivery of health care in the various regions of Canada. I think of those so-called depressed or under-privileged areas of Canada. I should emphasize that in the past we on this side of the House have agreed in principle with the concept of community health centres.

In his negotiations with the provinces and in re-defining the new formula in terms of federal-provincial negotiations, the minister must ensure equitable standards across Canada. He must pay very close attention to such provinces as the maritimes, and other so-called have- not provinces. In any formula it is absolutely essential that we ensure those provinces have the same standards and universality as the rest of Canada.

I wish to summarize by indicating that Bill C-68 is redundant in terms of the negotiations going on at the present time. Unfortunately it does not address itself to the comprehensive problems we see in the delivery of health care across Canada. I have attempted to allude to many of these problems for which I feel the minister has a direct responsibility and should be providing leadership. I certainly hope that he will take heed of the observations made by many members in this debate today.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and with the co-operation of the hon. member, I wonder if I could address a brief question to him because he has expertise in this area.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Will the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) permit a question from the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom)?

Mr. Holmes: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nystrom: I ask this question of the hon. member because of his background in the medical profession. He touched a bit on nutrition. Will he comment a bit further on that? The hon. member said we need some new programs. As a medical doctor, what kinds of programs does he feel should be looked at? What would be the cost of an adequate nutrition program? I ask this in light of the reference I made to the report last year of the Food Prices Review Board which stated that 40 per cent of hospital cases are possibly linked to the fact that we do not have adequate nutrition in this country. I would be interested in the hon. member's comments on that.

Mr. Holmes: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville has raised a very valid question. I will answer as briefly as I can by referring to the nutrition survey carried out in Canada. If one looks carefully at that survey one will see that it not only involves all provinces and territories, but special groups across Canada. For example, the nutritional standards of the native people of Canada are very bad. In urban areas where there is a great deal of poverty, the problem exists.

In response to the hon. member's question, the most important point at this time is that we should in a very scientific way identify these areas of individuals who need our attention immediately. Some have been identified. I refer, of course, to native people. I also refer to the urban areas in which there is poverty and where nutrition is poor.

This afternoon the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville referred to the nutritional problem as it relates to the youth of Canada. He made reference to the sorts of things that we see in some of the schools.

In answer to the hon. member's question, the most important thing at this time would be an educational program on the part of the government. Of course, there are certain areas which were alluded to earlier today in which direct government involvement in terms of subsidies and other programs would obviously be of value in resolving this particular problem.

● (2020)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I very much enjoy participating in this very important debate on health. There is often talk at federal-provincial conferences of readjustment of federal subsidies to the provinces, and in various areas, as was recently the case with respect to health.

In the Montreal *La Presse* dated June 16, 1976, Mr. Marcel Adam pointed out in very interesting comments summed up in an editorial the results of the attitude of the federal government which continued to drag the provinces into joint programs in the areas of health, social welfare and assistance to post-secondary education whose costs have increased in recent years because of inflationary tensions. The circumstances are appropriate to quote an excerpt from that editorial as follows:

> Committed to paying 50 per cent of the cost of those programs the federal government now finds the bill exorbitant, and decided to cut back its financial participation. It feels all the more justified in doing so that it is paying for programs it cannot control from an administrative point of view because they affect areas—health and education—of provincial jurisdiction. There is in that new federalism proposed by Mr. Trudeau something a little annoying because he is amending unilaterally under the law of the strongest the rules of a game that his partners accepted to play on the condition that both parties would respect them. Now that the federal government has exhausted the electoral viability of those joint programs he would like to shift on weaker shoulders a burden in which he does not see anything more than financial embarrassment and political inconvenience.

We all realize that the monetary problem comes into play here and becomes at certain moments a determining factor. It is readily seen that provincial health ministers are interested at the smell of federal dollars. On the other hand, the federal government faced with the problems of inflation and monetary instability is attempting to impose restraints. The results can be disadvantageous from several points of view.

Recently, in a document undoubtedly sent to every member of parliament, the chairman of the medical research group mentioned two specific points that I shall quote:

> 1. Research is the sole practical solution to reduce the cost of the various medical services as it enables to develop treatments for diseases affecting thousands of people and costing the government more than $7 billion every year.
>
> 2. The majority of our leading physicians and surgeons are attracted by teaching hospitals with active research programs mostly sponsored by the Medical Research Council. While it allows a general spending increase of about 16 per cent, the government did freeze the budget of the council at the previous year level. This action results in a significant reduction of activities at the medical research level. The greatest scientists have to go elsewhere to continue their research work. This action will have important effects on the quality of medical education throughout the country.

Following the announcement of Bill C-68 concerning the review of federal-provincial agreements in the hospital insurance field and the limitation of credits for the federal contribution to health insurance, the Quebec medical association submitted a brief where it mentioned on the last page, and I quote:

> However, if Ottawa persists in its plan to reduce its contribution to health services without giving to the provinces an equivalent transfer of the taxation base we think that the provinces would be encouraged to impose a deterrent fee to medicare consumers or to use private insurance companies to insure the difference in the medicare costs that the federal does not seem in a position to support any more.

Health is a basic right for every citizen. In principle, this right has been recognized for many years; in practice, however, it was violated since medical treatments were available only to some people within society. Since then, the state has intervened. I am not in favour of public-controlled medical services. However, considering that a large percentage of the people were and still are assisted in one way or another by welfare agencies and that many workers have suffered from endless unemployment periods, considering further the inadequate wages of a number of heads of families, the state felt it necessary to direct this legislation in such a way as to enable everybody to enjoy a good health which present medical knowledge allow us to have.

These are in short the reasons which contributed to the implementation of medicare plans. However, it has to be noted that no concensus was reached to determine what would be the best service: federal or provincial, comprehensive or partial, universal or restricted, compulsory or voluntary. And how many other things should be specified, how many other questions would have to get an answer, among which the following which is of vital importance: Who will pay? To whom? And how?

On several occasions, during the debates which led to the implementation of the present socializing medicare plans, we had submitted proposals which were probably not complicated enough to deserve the attention of the politicians of the time, or too realistic according to their usual idea of administrative difficulties which arise from the different plans in effect. We had suggested that the state might contribute through an assistance at the level of insurance premiums which would have enabled every citizen or group of citizens to select the medicare policy which would suit them best. Based on the Social Credit Party's proposals, the medicare plan would have been more easily implemented, more comprehensive and less costly, while securing everybody's safety with no obligations to all parties concerned. Unhappily, the government opted for a medicare plan prepared by bureaucrats who have complicated things.

● (2030)

Following a lengthy period of hesitation when it was sometimes difficult to determine whether we had a sickness medical care insurance or the sickness of insurance, we finally contracted the sickness of socializing insurance. We all agree on the common objective: access for everyone to every form of medical care. However we realized that a number of difficulties had risen when time came to determine the conditions to be applied.

I want to point out in passing that the health care plans have contributed precious little towards training more physicians, even though people are complaining of a lack of physicians. To remedy this situation, two solutions presented themselves; either train more physicians or allow other persons to take part in dispensing some medical treatments and relieve the physicians from a number of chores. The medical profession has not taken up any of these solutions with regard to the possible cooperation of other professions. We all know the attitude physicians are taking faced with chiropractors, optometrists and even pharmacists.

Health is priceless. So is the service that restores it. Yet most doctors manage to use that imponderable to their advantage. In the newspaper *La Presse* dated April 18, 1966, a journalist quotes the testimony given by Dr. Benoît Deshaies at a seminar on proverty, and I quote:

> Protected by some politicians and constituted into a real bourgeois and priviledged cast, oblivious to social ills, a minority of some 15 per cent of all doctors, whose income fluctuates between $75,000 and $100,000, rule as masters, at the expense of the population, on an empire: that of their profession and the medical organization.

Too often, qualified and willing students cannot have access to the courses that would allow them to complete their training as medical doctors. The number of candidates seems to be controlled by an organization that wishes to keep its monopoly in the field. If we add to that the disastrous effects of extended strikes which finally penalize defenceless patients, we get a rather dark picture of the result of the various health insurance plans. Those urging undiscriminate change must recognize that too quick a conversion of methods has serious disadvantages.

I have here today's issue of *La Presse*, from which I quote a paragraph concerning hospital admission problems:

> The President of the Council of Physicians, Dr. Paul Henri Royer, noted there were two very serious cases of heart trouble but only one can be cared for. So the younger was treated. We were thus faced with irrational choices.

This is what is happening. I also read in *La Presse* of July 30, 1975 an article titled:

> Yesterday's and today's medicine.

That article was signed by Dr. Léo Ladouceur, who has this to write concerning today's medicine, and I quote:

> Today's medicine is capable of extraordinary things that used to be unthinkable. It is in its every day practice that it has become inefficient, and even harmful.

Who is responsible for that state of affairs? The article gives the following answer:

> The government, the patient and the physician. The government, by establishing free care for everybody. What was needed was free care for have-nots, leaving the majority of the people with the obligation to pay a small part of the cost of medical care. This would have prevented abuses, avoiding that physicians' offices be literally invaded by patients with either imaginary or benign sores. Under current conditions physicians do not have the time or enough of it to get interested in those who are really ill. There is no way to prevent clients from going from one physician to another to ensure that the first diagnosis was the right one, and the first prescription the right one, to prevent that imaginary patients besiege waiting rooms and examination rooms because the program is free. The physician, obsessed by the idea of making money and who hands out medicine like a dry good merchant. One patient every ten minutes, assembly line medicine, where symptoms are treated instead of illness. Diagnosis means an investigation, therefore questions and answers, an examination, X-rays, laboratory analyses and monitoring to correct your mistakes or confirm your forecasts. And the poor physician, not as consciencious or tired out, with clouded cerebral processes, makes out a prescription for drugs which are effective, but sometimes contradictory. This is what can come from good intentions and an, extraordinary level of science, which is nevertheless necessary.

In another paragraph entitled "Castonguette or Chargex", he adds the following:

> As much respect as I have for today's surgery and medicine, with its examination, diagnosis, excision and transplant methods, which bring back yesterday's surgeons to the exhalted barbers that they once were, today's medicine is too often practised in doctors' offices where patients pass through at rates that the Medicare Control Board would like to see increased and come out with hastily written but duly signed prescriptions for a series of drugs which are highly effective, sometimes contradictory and capable of bringing a dead man back to life or killing someone.

In view of the present results, of the application terms, of medicare plans, of the many formalities resulting from this bureaucratic system, of the total or partial paralysis of services due to multiple strikes in this area like elsewhere, it is rather difficult to foresee where this expensive and unstable system will lead us.

In closing, to illustrate certain events that can happen, I would like to quote a passage from an editorial of the CJRC station dated March 15, 1971, and entitled:

A TELLING STORY ABOUT HUMAN NATURE

A good family man, when seeing that his sick daughter was not getting any better, desperately tried to have a doctor come to his home. Exasperated by the many refusals of the doctor who told him dryly to take his daughter, to wrap her in a blanket and to bring her to him, the father did as he was told even though the temperature was freezing cold.

A few days later, in the middle of the night and during a cold spell, the doctor's furnace broke down. He looked in the yellow pages to find a heating specialist. He finally reached one who, it happened, was the father of the sick girl of a while ago. Recognizing the voice of the doctor, the plumber-father paid his nighttime customer in his own coin, saying: Take your furnace, wrap it up in a blanket and bring it in to me.

Doubtless, the doctor concerned learned a good lesson. Several ailing persons have had to wait interminably before being hospitalized, and the application of health insurance plans complicated the situation. It would be a good idea to come back to good old common sense. That may be one of the virtues we lack most in our era of insecurity in various fields.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Broadview.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I hope I can meet expectations. When I spoke on second reading on February 24 the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) was not in the Chamber but his parliamentary secretary was here. The minister is not here at this moment but I am sure he will be, and I notice that his parliamentary secretary is coming into the House. I am also happy that the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery) is present tonight because he may recall that when I spoke on February 24, 1976, I tried to dramatize the actions of the Ontario Conservative government in regard to the closing of hospitals. The hon. member will recall that they closed the Doctors Hospital, which I think is in his riding.

I am sure that he will get up this evening and attempt to do what I am hoping to do, namely, that if we could persuade the Ontario government to reopen Doctors Hospital, we will also be able to persuade the minister to take a second look at Bill C-68.

Mr. Blais: It was the courts which did that, not the government.

Mr. Gilbert: The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) says it was the courts that did it. I would disagree completely with him. The courts may have made some input, but I am sure it was the persuasion of members like the hon. member for Spadina and the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) who have spoken out about the closing of hospitals across Ontario that had a direct effect on the Ontario minister of health. You will notice that the minister of health for Ontario swept across the province closing hospitals. This was followed by an onslaught of criticism because of the closing of the hospitals, the loss of employment, and the resulting decrease in medical health care. Then what happened? That minister of health had a heart attack.

● (2040)

An hon. Member: Don't blame him for that.

Mr. Gilbert: None of us wants any person to have a heart attack, but I am sure that the minister of health for Ontario as a result of that heart attack had second thoughts with regard to closing of hospitals. I would not wish that the present Minister of National Health and Welfare should have a heart attack, but I hope he will have a change of heart with regard to Bill C-68. It is very important that he have that change.

This has been quite a week, Mr. Speaker. On Monday we had the premiers of the provinces meeting with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) trying to work out problems with respect to equalization payments for health and education. I am sure you will remember that on Tuesday we had a Progressive Conservative motion condemning the government for its funding of medical research. I asked at that time whether there was a doctor in the House. There were many doctors in the House, some of whom spoke on that subject. Many laymen also spoke, and most were very critical about the cutbacks in medical research grants across the country. They realize how important medical research grants are if we are to maintain a high standard of health across Canada. We now have, and it seems to be very timely, the third reading stage of Bill C-68 which deals with health and contributions by the federal government toward health costs incurred by the provinces.

We heard many speeches during second reading of this bill and we had many amendments at the report stage. Before this bill passes I am sure we will hear many speeches on third reading. As a result I hope the minister will have a change of heart and a change of attitude. In my February speech I said I always considered him a man of compassion, and a man of high intelligence who could carry some of his ideas in respect of social needs into legislation. However, I have been bitterly disappointed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and bitterly disappointed by his parliamentary secretary who has been unable to persuade the minister.

It is my hope that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), who gave me such healthy applause at the beginning, is able to persuade his colleague in cabinet regarding the contents of Bill C-68. That minister was at the Habitat conference, and I shared some of my time there with him. He is a person who is concerned about human settlements. When we talked about human settlements we were talking about housing, about water, about health and the environment. We spoke about all these subjects at the conference. It was my hope that the Minister of the Environment, after meeting many of the delegates there, would have had a change in attitude and heart, and come back and impose the moral tone in the cabinet that Sister Theresa imposed at the conference in Vancouver.

One thing I like about the Minister of the Environment is that he is a man of very high moral fibre. The minister has been a representative of labour throughout his life. He made the decision to join the Liberal party, which I think was wrong, but he made it. He has had a certain input in some legislation, although it has not been much. I hope he will be able to change the attitude of the Minister of National Health and Welfare regarding this particular bill so that he can put legislation on the books of Canada that will be acceptable. I hope the Minister of the Environment will put legislation on the books in respect of the environ-

ment and pure water. It is only men like the Minister of the Environment who can persuade other ministers. I have noticed some nodding applause from some of the ministers regarding my statement about the minister's strength, calibre, and intelligence. The Minister of National Health and Welfare is not here tonight, so I hope the Minister of the Environment will take the message to him that I hope to convey in the next 20 to 25 minutes regarding Bill C-68.

It is my belief that the Minister of the Environment is not fully aware of the contents of this bill. It is a complex piece of legislation and I wish to read some of its contents very slowly. Under the Medical Care Act the federal government contributes to provincial medical care insurance plans on the basis of 50 per cent of the per capita cost for the year of all new insured services provided under the provincial plan, multiplied by the average for the year of the number of insured persons in the province at the end of each month. That just indicates how complex the calculation is in respect of health care expenses experienced across the country.

This bill would also limit the increase in the federal contribution to the provinces. It imposes a maximum yearly percentage increase in contributions for 1976-77 of 14.5 per cent, for 1977-78 of 12 per cent, and for 1978-79 and thereafter of 10 per cent. These maximum increases include an amount of 1.5 per cent for the increase in the population of the provinces, and if a province grows in population by more than 1.5 per cent the minister has said the maximum increase would be adjusted upwards accordingly. He said that in a speech he made on September 15, 1975, in Montreal. That indicates how complex this medical care bill is, and it also indicates how slowly we must move in respect of making changes.

One of the best contributions I could make on third reading would be to impress upon the Minister of the Environment and the parliamentary secretary what has been set forth by the Canadian Association of University Teachers at the conference held on Monday and Tuesday. When the first ministers discussed health and education the Canadian Association of University Teachers issued a statement in which it was suggested that, before any changes are made regarding equalization payments for post-secondary education, there should be a royal commission established to study the problems of education across the country. This association said this was necessary to establish national standards of education and to maintain the high quality of education in this country.

I was rather proud that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) moved a motion under Standing Order 43 asking the House for unanimous consent regarding a recommendation of the Canadian Association of University Teachers that a royal commission be set up to study education before any changes are made to equalization payments. Perhaps we could apply that type of recommendation to health costs so that before any change is made in equalization payments there would be a royal commission set up to study health costs across this country. Surely that is a reasonable request by a reasonable person to reasonable people. I am sure the ministers would accept that proposition.

Why do I say that? You will remember that back in 1958 when the hospitalization bill was passed this gave all the provinces the right to contribute or to participate in contributions regarding national health care costs. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that there was a loophole in that bill. Who closed that loophole? It was closed by the Conservative party. Not only that, but the Conservative party under the leadership of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) set up a royal commission on health under Mr. Justice Emmett Hall.

● (2050)

It was the Royal Commission on Health under Mr. Justice Hall which laid the foundation for the legislation on medicare which was set forth in 1968 by Mr. Pearson. We owe a great debt to Mr. Justice Hall in respect of the report of the health committee of 1960-61. At the present time we are now acting on another report of Mr. Justice Hall in respect of the railway unions. It looks as if we will have peace with regard to the railway unions across Canada as a result of the recommendations of Mr. Justice Hall. We have in Mr. Justice Hall a man who has studied the question of health in depth. Surely it behooves us to request Mr. Justice Hall to set up another commission to study health.

Why is there the need for a royal commission on health to be chaired by Mr. Justice Hall? The reason is plain. Only hospital and medical expenses are covered under the present Medical Care Act. This does not include paramedical expenses, pharmacare expenses, dentacare expenses, and the expense of medical appliances. At this stage it is the provinces which bear the cost in respect of paramedical services, pharmacare, dental care, and medical appliances. Surely the cost of $1.5 billion to all the provinces across the nation is an indication of the necessity that these things be included in a national hospital and medicare program. We need national standards. National standards have been established in respect of medical and hospital care. We need an expansion of this type of standard to include paramedical care, pharmacare, dental care, and medical appliances.

Let me turn for a moment to the question of paramedical care. Perhaps I might mention the Habitat Conference. At that conference many films were shown. There was a film shown by the Republic of China. It was called "The Barefoot Doctors in China". For 15 minutes the film set forth the excellent work the barefoot doctors in China are doing in meeting some of the needs that can be met by paramedics across the country. The average doctor will tell you that a great deal of his time is spent doing things that nurses and paramedic people could do just as well and just as efficiently.

That film, "The Barefoot Doctors in China", indicated the type of work that is being done. These people conduct preliminary examinations; they prepare certain drugs from herbs and give out medicines to the people. They also keep records. Some of them give acupuncture treatments. This allows the regular doctors to perform some of the more necessary functions. In China these paramedics are trained in one and one-half to two years. Surely in Canada we should have paramedics playing an important role in the field of national health care.

We talk about national standards. National standards are required in relation to pharmacare. It is only some of the

NDP governments across the country which have provided pharmacare as part of their medicare program.

Perhaps I might relate a personal experience in respect of dental care. I have three children. They all required immediate orthodontal care. I had to pay $900 for each child. I am able to afford the $900 for each of my children. I was happy that their teeth were straightened out. This gave them confidence and a better appearance. However, there are many people across this country who cannot obtain orthodontal care. Therefore it is necessary to establish dental care and pharmacare as part of our national standard in respect of our health and medicare programs.

I notice that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is now in his seat. I hope he will listen to this, because when we talk about national standards and compare provinces like Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia with some of the have-not provinces such as the maritimes and Newfoundland it becomes apparent how necessary it is that national standards be provided and that these services be available to people who do not have the money to buy them.

First it is necessary to determine what should be included in health care. Second, the question arises concerning who should bear the burden because at the moment in respect of health and medical care there is a sharing between the federal and provincial governments. I ask the minister to give some thought to this. I also ask the hon. member for Spadina to give some thought to this because I am sure he will be speaking on this subject. It may be that we need a national program with regard to medical and health care across the country in the same way we have a national pension plan and a national unemployment insurance plan.

An hon. Member: And a national lottery.

Mr. Nystrom: And the NDP.

Mr. Gilbert: I will not comment. What do we have at the present? We have different premiums in Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, and Alberta—you name the province. It seems to me we should study the advisability of determining whether we should have a national medicare policy which would include national standards, which would include all the things I have spoken of, such as medical care, paramedical care, pharmacare, dental care, and medical appliances. Who should bear the burden? Should it be participatory between the people, the provinces, and the federal government? It seems to me it should. I do not believe our medical care and hospital care should be determined by the province in which we live. I think we should have national standards and national premiums. There should be a national program and there should be full availability of all health services to everybody.

My third reason for a royal commission is the persuasion aspect. At the beginning of my remarks I pointed out how able we were to persuade the Ontario government to change its attitude and methods concerning the closing of hospitals across the province of Ontario.

● (2100)

One of the problems I have noticed about the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and I have observed him in pension debates, in family allowance debates, and in medical care debates, is that he does not listen. If you look at the bill as passed in committee and at the report stage you will find that he has not made one change of any substance to the bill. That tells the story. We know that he has moved from a position of compassion to a position of contempt, callousness, coldness—you name it. He has become a hardened, indifferent bureaucrat.

Perhaps I can persuade the minister. I will try to tell him that he has his priorities out of whack, out of kilter. Can you imagine the cabinet deciding—and I am glad the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) is here because I will speak about a very important subject—that it should spend about $1.2 billion on 18 Orion aircraft when all we give for medical research is $50 million. It seems to me that if you are determining priorities you should put high on the list such issues as health, housing, unemployment. The best that they could do was to put the Orion on the top priority list. It was only because they could not get the necessary financing that the Orion deal did not go through.

Let me tell the minister about the second priority. Can you imagine a country like Canada spending $1.5 billion on the Olympics, which are only going to last for two weeks? Surely if we had our priorities in order we would have said that this $1.5 billion should go to health, housing, pensions, and medical research—things that affect people. What does the government do? It sponsors a national lottery to pay for the Olympics.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Gilbert: What is a national lottery? A national lottery is nothing more than a tax on the poor. It is the poor people who think they will win a substantial prize. The result is that they pay out $10 on a regular basis. This is taxation of the poor. I am not the least bit proud of actions in Manitoba with regard to lotteries, nor am I proud of the actions of the federal government with regard to the national lottery because I realize it is a tax on the poor. Men of reasonable and rational thinking, men who have any compassion, would realize that this is what it is. Surely there are other ways of getting money to pay for the necessities of the public.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): That is not what Nystrom said.

Mr. Gilbert: Have you seen the federal cabinet make any reduction with regard to corporate welfare grants that we make? Not one penny. In fact it has increased capital cost allowances. It has shortened the time with regard to depreciation. It did not touch depletion allowances.

Some hon. Members: Oh, Oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest all hon. members take a look at Standing Order 12(3) which reads:

When a member is speaking, no member shall pass between him and the Chair, nor interrupt him, except to raise a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest that we all adhere to that rule.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of your suggestion may I remind the hon. member, or suggest to him that we are now debating Bill C-68 which has to do with the Medical Care Act, but he is discussing lotteries, and I am certain he will end up discussing farm bills before long.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest that we all get back to Bill C-68. We have been wandering again.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in view of what the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) has been saying, that lotteries are not a tax on the people. People do not have to buy tickets if they do not want to do so. Lotteries are a voluntary expense that you can incur or not. It is not a tax.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest to the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) that this is not a point of order but rather a point of debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. I need it.

Mr. Nystrom: The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) will not help.

Mr. Gilbert: I tried to tell the Minister of National Health and Welfare how out of whack his priorities are, and I really had to dramatize it to persuade him because democracy depends on persuasion. I hope the minister realizes that, and I hope he has a change of heart and a change of mind.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the minister has done with regard to his response on medicare. He said that people will have to change their lifestyles.

Mr. Friesen: They will have to give up heart disease.

Mr. Gilbert: Yes, and they will have to give up cancer, and they will have to give up all the other attendant diseases. They will really have to change their lifestyles. He said it is up to the provinces to pass the seat belt legislation. This was his great contribution. Most of the provinces have passed the seat belt legislation. This is the minister's response to the health needs of the people. The minister said that we must have an educational program on alcohol, on cigarettes, on drugs. I could not agree more, but surely the very people who are affected by alcohol, drugs or cigarettes are those who need hospital and medical care, those who need pharmacare, and drug care. It is not an educational problem, it is a funding problem. There is a requirement for the establishment of national standards. It is a problem of expanding the programs and funding them. Therein lies the duty of the minister.

● (2110)

The minister also talked about air and water, and I saw the performance of the government with regard to water at the Habitat Conference. It was a pretty pitiful performance. In fact the government would not undertake to make any dollar commitment for clean water, not only for Canada but for the world. The government made no contribution whatsoever, and I am sure the Minister of the Environment was not the least bit happy about that, but that just indicates that perhaps the Minister of the Environment has his priorities out of order.

What has the government done with regard to clean air, mercury poisoning, lead poisoning, or asbestonosis?

Mr. Blais: Asbestosis.

Mr. Gilbert: The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) really must feel ashamed of what his government has done for the people of the north, and more especially for the native people, with regard to mercury poisoning in fish. What has the government done? Not a thing.

What has the government done with regard to lung cancer? Nothing. What has it done with regard to lead poisoning? There is a plant in my riding which the minister says does not fall within federal jurisdiction but comes under provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, it falls both within federal and provincial jurisdiction, and it imposes upon the minister the duty to expand health care, the duty to provide money, to help the native people of Canada and to help people who suffer from lung cancer and from different industrial diseases. I am rather ashamed of the minister for his pitiful performance.

Surely I have aroused the minister and persuaded him and his cabinet colleagues, the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of the Environment, to take a second look at our medicare legislation to determine what they are going to do. Surely it behooves the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of the Environment to accept my simple proposition that, before any change is made, a royal commission should be set up to study the expansion of services and to study the sharing of the burden of the costs. I have recommended Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, who has experience in the field, and surely that is a reasonable request.

I hope the minister and his fellow ministers will accept that reasonable and rational plea to stop the debate on this matter and to take that recommendation with regard to a royal commission on health, and the recommendation of the Canadian Association of University Teachers with regard to a royal commission on education, to the cabinet. I am hopeful, and I hope that hope is fulfilled.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker,—

An hon. Member: Tell us about pensions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Anything to please you.

On Wednesday of next week it will be a full year since Mr. John Turner in his budget speech of last year announced that this bill we are now debating would be introduced. I suppose there are some hon. members who might say that to draw attention to the fact that we have

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

had this matter for a full year is to suggest that the mills of parliament grind about as slowly as the mills of the gods.

I suggest that the time we have had this bill around indicates that it is a bad bill. Indeed there have been times when the government itself considered not proceeding with it, and whenever we have had a chance to debate it in the House, in committee, and now back in the House, we have done our best to persuade the government that the bill should not be proceeded with at all.

Lest my reference to Mr. Turner's announcement of June 23, 1975, suggests that we have been debating the bill all that time, I might put one or two other dates on the record. Bill C-68 was actually introduced and given first reading shortly after that. The date was July 8, 1975. However, the government in its shame about the bill did not seek to move second reading of it until January 28, 1976, so the actual debating of this bill in parliament spans just the last five months.

We have said on every occasion on which it has been possible to do so that in our view this is a bad piece of legislation. There were times when we thought that the government would decide that its anti-inflation program, for what it was worth, was good enough and that this bill did not need to be proceeded with, and there were other times when we thought we were persuading the government that the bill should be withdrawn, but here we are at third reading with the government still trying. However, as is obvious to the government, we are still trying to get across the message that this is legislation which ought not to be passed by the parliament of Canada.

I referred to Mr. Turner's announcement in his budget speech of June 23, 1975.

Mr. Stevens: June 25.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, June 23. I have it right here in front of me. The hon. member thinks it was on June 25. I can tell him that it was on June 25 that he made his speech.

Mr. Stevens: That's right.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): But Mr. Turner introduced that budget on June 23. He announced not only the proposal to bring in this bill to amend the Medical Care Act, but he also gave the provinces of Canada a five year notice of the termination of the agreements under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

It has taken us an exceedingly long time in this country to get legislation in the health and medical field, but I believe a good deal can be said about it in its favour. I think we have made tremendous progress, but what really disturbs me—and any hon. members who paid any attention to the speech I made on second reading will know what is in my mind—is that it was in 1919 that the great Liberals of that day first promised that something would be done about health insurance. It took us about half a century to get it out of the Liberals and, as I have already intimated, the kind of legislation we got from the Liberals, with a great deal of input from other parties, other persons and outside agencies, was not bad. The reason it was not bad was because of certain principles that were locked into the legislation, namely, universality and the attempt to structure it in such a way that Canadians would get the benefit of our health legislation on equal terms no matter where they might live in Canada.

● (2120)

One of the problems that we in this country must yet solve if we are going to have national unity, if we are going to have one Canada, is that of achieving economic levels and service levels that are the same right across the country. All Canadians should enjoy the same standard of living no matter what province they live in. That is one of the real problems of Canadian identity and Canadian unity.

The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act and the Medical Care Act both paid their respects to this goal by providing that the federal contribution to hospital costs and medical costs would be of the order of 50 per cent of those costs in the provinces, the goal being not just to help provincial governments with their problems but the goal being to establish the same level of hospital and medical services for Canadians wherever they might live. I think it is this kind of thing, the same level of hospital and health services anywhere in Canada, the same level of old age pension benefits—when I began this speech my friend across the way said he hoped I would get pensions into it, so there it is.

Mr. Francis: It is the same speech as in 1959.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My hon. friend says it is the same speech as in 1959. Where was he for the 17 years before that? I have been making this kind of speech in the House since 1942 and, if necessary, I shall keep on making it until 1999. I say the things that have done the most for Canadian unity and establishing in Canadians a pride in being part of this country are in this social legislation field—health insurance, family allowances, unemployment insurance, hospital and medical services.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): And CNR pensions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My hon. friend wants to get pensions into it too—CNR pensions and the CPR pensions are areas where we have not yet got things to be as proud of as we should like. My point is, however, that we have progressed. We have moved in a civilized direction by getting these services on the same level for our people in this country wherever they might live. One of the tools used to achieve that has been for the federal government to put what was admittedly a generous input into these services as represented by the so-called or roughly 50 per cent formula.

Tonight we are not dealing with the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, the Old Age Security Act or the Family Allowances Act; we are dealing with the Medical Care Act. The Medical Care Act, as passed by the parliament of Canada after half a century of our struggling for it, provided and still provides that the federal treasury will pay 50 per cent of certain defined costs for certain insured health services in the provinces. That was good—good not in the sense that it helped provincial governments with their financial problems, but good in the kind of health security it provided for Canadians in all parts of

this land. What does this bill do, Mr. Speaker? It changes that formula; it jeopardizes that important principle that provided for federal financial participation to the tune of 50 per cent. It does it by a new formula which is precise for a couple of years, and then is as uncertain as it can possibly be.

When we debated this bill in the House at second reading, or in committee where we had it for a long time, the spokesmen for the government side tried to counter our arguments by saying that there would be more federal dollars put into health services this year than were put in last year and there could well be still more dollars the year after that. They asked why we say there is any cutback. What one has to do, Mr. Speaker, is not compare this year with last year, or next year with this year, but to compare what will be the story next year under the new legislation with what it would have been under the old legislation.

The old legislation said the federal treasury would pay 50 per cent of the health care costs of the provinces. The new legislation, under this bill if it passes, will say that the federal government will pay the lesser of two quantities; either it will pay the 50 per cent of the provinces' cost or it will pay last year's cost escalated by a certain fixed percentage. If the costs go up more than that percentage the result is that the provinces will get less than 50 per cent of what their health costs are in the current fiscal year or the one that follows this.

There is no question about it, Mr. Speaker. Even though there may be extra dollars in one year compared with a former year, the fact of the matter is that the provinces are being told that they are almost certainly not going to get the 50 per cent which has been the rule—the 50 per cent which enticed them to come into it, the 50 per cent which provided some reasonable guarantee that Canadians would get the same level of health care in any part of Canada. We regard this as a most regressive step. That is why we have done everything we could to persuade the government not to proceed with the legislation. That is why we have played our part in keeping it around for a full year, and if we have our way it will not be passed into law at all.

I said that the bill provides for precise limits that the federal government will pay to the provinces in this fiscal year 1976-77 and for the next one, 1977-78. After that there is no formula in the bill. When it was first brought in there was a percentage there and the government said, "We will be very nice and take that interest percentage out." Instead there was put in a right for the government to fix the percentages of increases that will be allowed after these two years by order in council. Sir, that means that the government will make the decision itself. That means it is a cabinet decision. The provinces can make their representations, there can be consultations—we had that in the Conference Centre on Monday and Tuesday of this week and everyone knows what the provinces felt about those consultations—but they have no input. Parliament has no input.

The government will be free in the fiscal years after the end of March, 1978, to determine unilaterally how much it will cut down on health care revenues for the provinces. The result of this is going to be that the provinces will be getting less than the 50 per cent which brought them into the scheme—the 50 per cent which, while not a sacred figure in itself, has meant a useful contribution to the implementation of the principle that health care should be the same for Canadians all over Canada whatever province they may live in.

In the process of putting in this provision for future years to be governed by order in council, the government acted as though it wanted to be kind to the Tory party which felt that this should somehow come back to parliament. Therefore into the bill was written the provision which states that after the government has passed an order in council fixing a limit on federal contributions to the provinces in the years in the future, if 50 members of the House of Commons sign a motion calling for the matter to be debated, it shall be debated in the House of Commons right away.

● (2130)

If a motion is put down by those 50 members wanting an order in council to be revoked, if that motion is passed in this House and also in the Senate, then that order in council gets revoked. However, what chance does such a motion have of getting passed in the House of Commons or the Senate dominated by a government with a majority, a government which uses that majority in the way it is used by the government that is across the way?

The provisions in this bill about reference of these future percentage limits to parliament are really a farce. The whole business is thrown into a state of great uncertainty. In particular it is a matter of uncertainty for the provinces. They do not know what the score is going to be in the future. They do not know what the limits will be on federal contributions. They do not know how to plan their health services for the years ahead simply because of the uncertainty that is in this bill.

If this creates uncertainty for the provincial governments, that means in the end it creates uncertainty for the citizens of our various provinces. They may not feel it as quickly as the provincial governments, but they will feel it where it hurts. Somewhere down the line the poorer provinces, once they find the government not providing 50 per cent of the money, will have to resort either to extra charges such as special taxes, deterrent fees or what have you, or to cutting down on health care services. That is a real possibility. Flowing from this bill is a picture of Canada retreating from the high ideal of one nation from coast to coast in which the health care services for our people are to be the same right across the land.

My friend across the way says this is the same speech I have been making since 1959. I realize the hon. member is a young man. He does not realize what was going on before then, although he was in the department and he should have known. Some of us were preaching this kind of thing long before that. Apparently we will have to keep at it for a long while yet.

The point I am trying to make, and I may have said this in 1959 or 1942, or I may have to say it in 1999, is that it is not just a matter of dollars and cents. It is not just a case of one group of cabinet ministers in Ottawa not being concerned about the financial problems of groups of cabinet ministers in Toronto, Winnipeg, Victoria and so on. What is at stake here is the whole concept of Canadian unity, which I submit calls for far more than our hearing

the same radio and television programs, enjoying the same football or hockey games, solving our language problems, or what have you.

The surest way to provide some unity and establish pride in being a Canadian anywhere in this country is to ensure that the basic needs of our people are met on the level of equality. If we cannot do it right away in everything, we can do it in terms of health and medical care. I deplore as strongly as I can a measure that is certain to have the effect of creating differences in the levels of health and medical care in the various parts of this country.

Criticisms have sometimes been levelled about speakers not staying close to the bill. I have tried to talk about the bill before us, Bill C-68, which amends the Medical Care Act. However, I think I am entitled to refer to it in the context of things that are related to it.

As I pointed out earlier, when Mr. Turner brought down his last budget on June 23, 1975, he made, amongst other announcements, two in that same budget that related to health. One was that the Medical Care Act would be amended as the government is now trying to amend it. The other was that the provinces were then being told that in five years the agreements under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act would be terminated.

These two things have to be taken together. If it was only medical care that was being changed, maybe the provinces could adjust to it. However, when the provinces are told that not only will they have to handle their health and medical care costs with less help from the federal treasury but they will have to provide their hospital services at this point not knowing what they are going to get from the federal government when the five year period is over, you throw the whole business into a state of jeopardy. When you add to that the kind of thing that was put before the provinces and the country by the federal government at the Conference Centre on Monday and Tuesday of this week, you create a situation that is serious for the future of this land.

I have not had time to read everything that was said, even those things of which copies have been given to us, at the Conference Centre on Monday and Tuesday. However, I read enough of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said to note that he thinks the federal government, the Liberal party, have done enough because they have played a part in getting hospitalization, medical care, and improved post-secondary education established in this country.

The Prime Minister is almost proud of the fact that his government, and governments before his, gave the money to get these things going. He seems to think that is all the federal government needs to do. I say to the Prime Minister that this is not a static matter. It is not something that comes to an end. You do not just bring proper hospitalization and medical plans into effect and reasonable assistance in the field of education, drop all this, and expect that they will carry on. They will only carry on if there is a formula which provides money from the place where money is most available, and which provides money of the kind that will achieve as much equality as possible right across the country.

The Prime Minister also said at the conference that the desire for the same level of service should not simply become a case of our having a stereotype situation right across the country. In my opinion that was just a rationalization, an excuse for backing off.

● (2140)

Any Liberal in this House who is a Liberal, any Liberal who has respect for what his forbears forecast in 1919, any Liberal who has respect for the dreams and hopes which Mr. Mackenzie King had and which Mr. St. Laurent had, and which Mr. Pearson tried to carry forward, should be mortally ashamed of the steps proposed in this bill as well as in the accompanying termination of the hospital agreements and in the fiscal plan proposed on Monday and Tuesday at the premiers' conference, because these things they are doing amount to turning their backs on the sense of national unity which former Liberals possessed.

I remember—it was a personal conversation but that is no reason why I cannot recall it—being at the United Nations in London in 1945-46. The leader of the Canadian delegation to the preparatory commission was Mr. Dana Wilgress, and then when the first session got going in 1946 the leader was Louis St. Laurent, who was then either minister of justice or the secretary of state for external affairs, later prime minister.

An hon. Member: How long was he prime minister?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Long enough to do a lot more good than is happening now. The time came when some of us were hoping the deliberations would come to an end. Mr. St. Laurent said he hoped the UN session would end soon because he wanted to get back to Canada. The 1945 federal-provincial conference had been something less than a success. I remember him saying, "We can't go on when the advantages for our people are so uneven in different parts of the country." This was the kind of dream some of those Liberals had. Mr. St. Laurent had it; Mr. Pearson had it. They wanted to round out their promises concerning old age security, labour legislation, and adequate provisions in the areas of health and welfare. This meant involving the federal government and the federal treasury so that we might have unity from coast to coast.

The present Prime Minister and his cabinet colleagues are now saying, "We were just getting things going; we got the provinces into these things to do the job and now we propose to back away and let them carry the load." Mr. Speaker, the wealthier provinces can carry it and perhaps provide even better levels of service than their people have enjoyed up to this time. But Canadians in the less wealthy provinces will suffer set-backs and cuts. This will not be good for Canada. That is why we are so strongly opposed to this bill.

As I may have said earlier, if this bill were the only one of its kind maybe the provinces could absorb the shock. Even then we would say that the legislation was wrong. We have said so right from the night Mr. Turner announced it on June 23, 1975. It is still our hope that the bill will be dropped as far as this session of parliament is concerned, at least. But when you consider the fact that the hospital agreements are to be terminated five years

from last June, and when you add to that the new fiscal arrangements the government is trying to foist on the provinces, and when you add to that the fact that the government is cutting back funds for medical research, the point comes at which one is tempted to ask the question: what is a federal government for? Surely its purpose in a country such as ours is to bring the standards of our people up to the same level from coast to coast, particularly in services which really matter.

I submit that nothing matters more than health and education, and these are the things the federal government has been attempting to cut back this week by the proposals made to the conference on Monday and Tuesday, and health services in particular are damaged by the bill which is now before us. I therefore reiterate our party's determined opposition to Bill C-68. In our opinion it should not pass.

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, we have before us today another element of the government's so-called restraint program. I say "so-called" because this, like so many other aspects of that program, is not restraint at all but rather, intergovernmental buck-passing.

What the federal government is proposing to do is limit the growth in its per capita contributions to the provinces under the Medical Care Act to 13 per cent in this fiscal year, to 10.5 per cent in 1977-78, and to a percentage to be determined by the cabinet in subsequent years. The minister assures us that the cabinet—and for once I trust the government's assurances in the field of federal provincial relations will be worth the paper they are printed on—will set the percentage caps for the years after 1977-78 in accordance with an appropriate formula to be developed after consultation with the provincial governments. But that assurance itself is a hollow one because there is no commitment to negotiate this formula with the provinces, merely a pledge to talk with them about it before it is introduced.

The question before us, Mr. Speaker, is whether this unilateral arbitrary action by the federal government is going to hold down the cost of health services to the taxpayer. Most certainly it will hold down the share which appears in the federal estimates, but if we are merely transferring the burden to the provincial level there is no saving to the taxpayer.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) has argued that this bill will provide the provinces with an incentive to hold down the cost of the program because the federal government will no longer be around to pick up half the cost of any increases over the guidelines. That is a clever argument, but it ignores two important facts. First, the provinces already have a strong incentive to hold down costs. After all, they pay a varying but substantial share of the cost of these programs, just as the federal government does. Moreover, it removes the incentive to poorer provinces to close the gap between their per capita expenditures for medical care and those of the more affluent provinces.

Let me quote from the statement of the minister of health for Prince Edward Island, Catherine Collbeck, at the Victoria conference of provincial ministers of health in August, 1975:

> The implementation of Bill C-68 would have a very serious effect on the level of health care in Prince Edward Island . . . Our resources are severely strained to meet the rising costs with federal contributions under the present agreement.

● (2150)

Under the new proposal—

That is, Bill C-68.

> —it will be difficult to maintain the present standards of health care services with no hope of ever attaining the national standard.

That, Mr. Speaker, from a Liberal health minister in the province of Prince Edward Island! Any real financial restraint that we will obtain under this bill—that is, financial restraint imposed on the provinces as a result of these caps or ceilings—will be purchased at the cost of locking in existing regional disparity in health care. The federal government will bear responsibility for that, but it designed the bill so that the provinces will have to accept the lion's share of the blame. It is the federal government's responsibility, Mr. Speaker, but it shifts the blame to the provincial level, and that is the meaning that the government attaches to the phrase "co-operative federalism."

I note that the minister has made a modest amendment to Mr. Turner's original proposal in that provinces, with the consent of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the sanction of the federal cabinet may extend insured services without the increased costs which are attributable to those services being subject to the guidelines. A wise and generous use of that power by the minister and his colleagues might provide a measure of benefit to have-not provinces, but because medical services in Canada are already comprehensive the benefit will be slight at best.

On Tuesday in this House the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) argued that his proposed new financing arrangements for the established programs of hospital insurance, medical care, and post-secondary education would benefit the have-not provinces because the principle of equal per capita grants means a larger contribution from the federal treasury to their coffers. That was the Prime Minister's statement in this House.

I hope he is right and I wish he had allowed the premiers of the have-not provinces to test his hypothesis this week by revealing to them the financial details of his proposal. Instead it remains locked in secrecy. He is once again playing his old shell game of what comes next. However, in the field of medical care that program, whatever its merits, is still at least two years in the future. In the meantime this bill could do serious damage to the principle of national standards in health care services and will certainly leave a legacy of bitterness and frustration with the provincial governments. I would say to the minister that that kind of legacy does not augur well for the future of Confederation.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have just been handed a blank piece of paper by my colleagues so that I can begin.

Mr. Yewchuk: Is that the content of your speech?

Mr. Leggatt: This iniquitous piece of legislation attempts to cap the federal contribution to medicare to 13

per cent in 1976-77, to 10.5 per cent in 1977-78, and to 8.5 per cent the following year. Thereafter authority to set ceilings is left with the federal government. The reason I describe this legislation as iniquitous is—

Mr. Rodriguez: —because it is.

Mr. Leggatt: Yes, it is, but also because if there is ever going to be any inducement to the federal government to expand provision of medical care in this country, it must come from federal leadership. What the government has said is that it no longer seeks to provide leadership in the provision of medical services in this country. The government has said that it thinks everything is great, and that it is backing out of medicare.

What do you do, Mr. Speaker, in a place like P.E.I. or Newfoundland if you want to go to a dentacare program?

An hon. Member: What about St. Pierre and Miquelon?

Mr. Leggatt: They have good teeth there so do not need it. Just look at the job that St. Pierre and Miquelon did on the Canadian delegation at the Law of the Sea conference. This little island in the Atlantic is claiming 200 miles all around it, and Canada is fluttering around worrying about this tiny little island. That is why I say they have very good teeth in St. Pierre and Miquelon.

There has been a clear change in the philosophy of the government, Mr. Speaker, a move to the right, a clear abandonment of the kind of idealism that a few naive individuals in 1968, 1972 and 1974 thought the government had. As we see these capping moves and abandonment of responsibility in providing some kind of consistent medical care and social services in this country, we know where their heart of hearts lies. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is making passionate love all right; it is passionate love to the chambers of commerce in Canada, but he has abandoned most of the people of Canada. All that we have accomplished in Canada in terms of medicare has been just the first phase.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Ten o'clock.

Mr. Leggatt: I would like to call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker, but there may be just a minute to go before I can do so—unless the House would like to call it ten o'clock. This may be something members are not really interested in.

Mr. Blais: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that we are finding the hon. member's comments so enlightening, might I suggest we not see it is ten o'clock for the next few minutes, so we might all be stimulated on our way home.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Leggatt: May I just comment on that.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is now ten o'clock.

Mr. Leggatt: That was hardly a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Unless there is unanimous consent to continue, we have to proceed with the adjournment debate.

Adjournment Debate

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under the provisions of Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

INDUSTRY—TEXTILES—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT OF CLOTHING AND TEXTILE BOARD ON POLYESTER YARN

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight at the adjournment session to bring again to the attention of the government and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) the precarious position of the Canadian textile industry and of the depressed markets for Canadian textiles at the present time. This depressed and adverse condition particularly applies to the makers of polyester yarn and filament. My words tonight are, of course, pursuant to my question asked of the minister on June 11. I asked it because of my deep concern for the welfare of the industry in my riding.

Celanese Canada, with its plant at Millhaven, is a major employer in my constituency and the area around it, as well as in Kingston, but because of the exposure of its product to the competition from cheap labour from Asiatic competitors overseas, the company has been forced to make major lay-offs in its personnel. This has naturally resulted not only in protests to the government by this great Canadian producer but also has brought sharp protests to the government from the county council of Lennox and Addington. I also have letters from employees and from the reeve and council of the Township of Ernestown.

● (2200)

Let me quote this resolution moved by councillor Grant McIlquham seconded by councillor Ian Wilson:

> Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Ernestown express concern to the federal Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce regarding the depressed state of the Canadian textile industry resulting from excessive volumes of imported textile products. The impact of this recently resulted in the lay-off of 235 employees from our local Celanese of Canada plant situated in the Township of Ernestown. In addition delay in expansion programs involving upwards of 40 million dollars has resulted. To date 360 employees of synthetic fibre producing plants have been laid off in the Kingston area. Potential summer employment opportunities in the area for upwards of 385 students have also failed to materialize.

Needless to say, this motion was carried by the township council unanimously, and it is strengthened by a personal letter I received from Mr. McIlquham in the same vein.

There is no doubt about the seriousness of the situation. There are some strange anomalies abroad in the Trudeau government. Why is the minister hesitating? The answer I got to my question on last Friday was that a report would be tabled on the matter of the dumping of cheap textiles into our market from other countries, and that this report would be tabled at the end of June. The end of June means that this House will be adjourned and the government, the cabinet, and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce can then go back to sleep. The House will not be sitting, the government will be rid of the opposition, and generally eased of any further pressure from this belea-

guered Canadian industry. That is not a good enough answer for me, Mr. Speaker. This matter should have been dealt with long ago by the minister and the anti-dumping tribunal, but there are some strange happenings and some stange anomalies in the Trudeau administration. The government, figuratively, is not "looking after the store."

The chairman of the anti-dumping tribunal is apparently too busy with his varied commercial activities, trying to sell and introduce the products and munitions of other countries to Canadian consumers. There must be terribly illegal conflict of interest there.

The situation of the textile industry is a case which should be dealt with immediately by the anti-dumping tribunal. What about the cabinet? It does not seem to be interested in the welfare of Canadian industry. Far from it, the ministers are busy now drumming up support for the abolition of capital punishment in the coming vote on Tuesday night, and there is one minister over in France deeply interested in the dangerous proposition of pressing bilingualism into air traffic control in Canada.

You cannot blame me for pointing this out, for most of us here know that if Canadian industry, and especially secondary industry as in this case, does not prosper, then neither does our country nor its workers in industry. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Roy), when speaking during yesterday's textile debate, said that an increased willingness to buy Canadian would be one element in the solution to the problems of the industry. That is all very well, and I think most of us do try to buy Canadian. But we see in our stores a flood of foreign goods from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Korea where the workers in the plants receive 14 cents an hour, Canadian equivalent. This flood of cheap goods is so great that lately one picks up quite a few garments from display cases in stores before finding one made in Canada.

Having regard to the problems of polyester yarn products in the textile industry, I brought to the attention of the House last week the fact that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce had then had a major recommendation of the Clothing and Textile Board for over five weeks. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) replied on behalf of the minister that no action would be taken until the end of June. The minister is thus taking seven weeks or more to act in a crisis where action in two weeks was indicated.

I was distressed initially by this reply, having in mind the hardship it implies for the hundreds of people who have been laid off their jobs in Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, and in the Kingston district and other constituencies where this product is efficiently made and processed. Further investigation of the problem has revealed something more distressing still.

Previous outbreaks of the polyester yarn problem were studied on two occasions by the Clothing and Textile Board. The board made recommendations in December, 1972, and in February, 1975. In both cases the government failed to table or implement the recommendation of its board. The present inaction of the government, which the hon. member for Laval says will continue until June 30, when this House rises, suggests that the government may not be taking any action at all to restore the loss of jobs.

[Mr. Alkenbrack.]

In this grave matter affecting hundreds of my constituents, I request that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce tabled without further delay the recommendations made by the Clothing and Textile Board five weeks ago, and to announce immediately the actions the government will take to implement them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised to hear tonight about that matter on the late show on a subject that was debated yesterday during an opposition day. I would have preferred to see the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack) participating in the debate we had yesterday. He would have understood what the textile policy was. I think the only answer I would have to give would be the following. Either the hon. member just wants to table a report without it having been considered to determine its full application and implications for all parties involved, or he wants the report to be brought forward without any follow-up, or again perhaps he wants some time to be taken to consider the implications of that report and then see what it could mean for the parties involved.

I would refer the hon. member to the speech made yesterday by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson), as reported at page 14578 of *Hansard*, and he will see then the exact answer given to his question, and I quote:

> I do not, however, deny the legitimacy of the claim that the process is on the slow side. I have looked into this and asked that once a report comes in from the Clothing and Textile Board there should be no delay in taking appropriate action. In this connection I am faced with something of a dilemma. We could table the report quite quickly after it is received from the board, but the policy has been to hold off publication of the report until a decision has been made on the action to be taken.

I suggest that if we table the report without simultaneously announcing our decision on the action to be taken a whole series of representations could be made which would further delay the process. For the moment we think it is preferable to receive the report, decide on the action to be taken, and made the announcement accordingly. If hon. members think that another amendment to that method could further step up things and they have information or know another procedure that could be used we would be quite happy to listen in an objective manner.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again I am somewhat surprised to see that matter discussed on the late show because if the hon. member had participated in the debate yesterday he would have had the answer.

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—REGIONAL PRODUCERS' REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, on June 4 a group of producers representing all the producers within the CBC who are not of the Toronto-based organization put out a news release asking for the establishment of a royal commission to examine the organizational structure of the CBC and to find ways of decentralize that organization. I rose on June 8 to ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) the following question:

Can the Secretary of State inform the House of any of the substance of the president's discussion and why the producers across Canada had to resort to this public call for a royal commission?

Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's answer was as follows:

I myself met with some members of the committee two weeks after his meeting. There is a problem which arises out of the success of our regionalization.

That is a staggering statement. I wish to give a couple of examples of the ludicrous nature of that kind of statement. I have before me a question from the order paper which was put by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), dated March 25, in which he asked why the ten o'clock p.m. CBC radio news program coming from Vancouver is to be cancelled on April 1, 1977. Here, among some other reasons, is what the CBC representative wrote:

● (2210)

The English services division of the CBC decided that the resources available in the British Columbia region would be better devoted to improving B.C. newscasts and B.C. contributions to national newscasts than to the largely editing job involved in the present 10 p.m. news.

First of all, the answer does not tell you who the English services division is. Obviously it is part of the division in Toronto which cut off the news program coming from Vancouver. It means that all those people in the Kootenays, in the Chilcotin region, in the north country, in the Okanagan, who want local farm news from Vancouver are not going to get that program any more because Toronto knows best. Toronto will decided what will be on the ten o'clock news. But the English services division in Toronto has decided how those resources should be distributed. That is exactly the argument.

What is bothering the producers and directors across Canada within the CBC? Is is not that they do not have quality equipment; it is that they have no decision making power. Toronto knows best. Because I knew that the president of the CBC was going to Vancouver to meet with this informal group known as the Committee of 100, I posed the question to him when he appeared before the Broadcasting Committee on May 6. I asked him about the pilot project of the Peter Gzowski show. Somebody told me that a group of 16 technicians had been shipped from Toronto to Vancouver to do that pilot project. Mr. MacPherson, the vice-president and general manager of the CBC English services division, happened to give me the answer at that time. Here is what he said:

The unit would be a producer, researchers, bascially the travelling group that also produced the pilot program, there would be a director involved—

Here we have a program produced and directed in Vancouver, but the CBC has to bring their crew from Toronto to do it in Vancouver and, above all, they bring a research man. What kind of lunacy is it to have researchers coming from Toronto to produce a show in Vancouver?

The Secretary of State has the gall to say that the problem of directors and producers in B.C. stems from the fact that the CBC has been overly successful. We have a $30 million monument in Vancouver which looks like a grain elevator. The government has poured $30 million into that building, but the CBC is keeping the producers and directors there out of work because Toronto wants to make the decisions. Any time there is a program emanating from Vancouver it looks across the country for producers and directors to put on that show. And what do you know, you cannot find any good ones in Vancouver so you have to bring them from Toronto! The same is true for the Maritimes.

I know the parliamentary secretary cannot speak on this subject, but I know Nova Scotia is suffering in this way, and so is New Brunswick and Newfoundland just because Toronto thinks it is God and has all the answers and nobody else in the country knows anything.

A few weeks ago the House passed a resolution unanimously asking the committee to examine why the CBC abandoned or cut back its farm broadcasts. This is another example of CBC in Toronto deciding that there is a segment of the community in Canada that does not need the show that is going on. This is the point of my question to the Secretary of State. Why has he this penchant, this fixation, on buildings and equipment but not on people who produce the show in the first place?

While I think a royal commission is no answer to this because the report would be gathering dust as soon as it was finished, we do need a Secretary of State who will be serious about the real issues in public broadcasting. Forget about all the fancy, sexy projects that he has going in the country, and get to work to provide the kind of projects that will find work for the producers and directors in Canada and bring about unity.

The president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has said that one of the greatest issues within the CBC is that there are a lot of fractious factions within the CBC. The reason is that nothing is being done which will honour the intelligence and the decision-making processes in the regions.

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member emphasizes that it is the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) who is in charge of the CBC, but the CBC comes to the committee quite often, and the hon. member can question there.

During questioning on May 7, 1976, by the hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) when the CBC was before the broadcasting committee, the CBC president, Mr. A. W. Johnson, outlined how he intended to deal with the three major propositions of the Committee of 100. One proposition had to do with the autonomy of decision-making within the British Columbia region; one proposition had to do with the extent of production in the British Columbia region; and the third proposition had to do with the kind of programming that CBC should be emphasizing.

In connection with those propositions, Mr. Johnson told the broadcasting committee meeting that as for the autonomy of decision-making in respect of productions for the network, the CBC must use the best talents, the best executive producers and producers that it can find and that the CBC regards the producers in British Columbia as it regards the producers in Toronto, as being a pool on which to draw. Excellence, not quotas, must be used as the basis for the CBC's determination of what is the best team for producing programming which relates to a particular part of the country.

At the subsequent meeting with the Committee of 100, Mr. Johnson stressed his concern for proper balance be-

tween national, regional and local programming and for over-all consultation in the program decision-making process at all levels. He assured the Committee of 100 that this area would be a priority for regular review during his term of office.

At the meeting in Vancouver the CBC president further agreed, as he had said he would when before the broadcasting committee, to give the Committee of 100 the facts, both in statistical and program terms, on what is being produced regionally for regional consumption, what is being produced and used in other centres across Canada in the regional exchanges, and, thirdly, the amount of production emanating from British Columbia on the national network.

On the third question concerning programming emphasis, Mr. Johnson told the broadcasting committee, and subsequently the Committee of 100 in Vancouver, that he thought the short generalization of the point of view of the Vancouver group was that the CBC should leave situation comedies, family dramas, and variety to the Americans because they are good at them. If the CBC were to do that, he said, it would be leaving to the Americans a very large proportion of programming and viewing time of Canadians, and he did not believe that would be a good thing.

The desire of CBC television producers for even more regional involvement is understandable and CBC program managers in Toronto and the regions have discussed and will continue to discuss this question with producers.

I am informed further that the CBC has been reviewing over the past several months both its regional organization and regional program production, production both for regional and network use. It was with this review in mind that the CBC president visited all regions of the corporation during his first nine months in office and met with representatives of the Committee of 100 in Vancouver last month. Mr. Johnson has advised that he expects to be in a position to make a statement sometime this fall on the proposals which result from this review.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the three minutes time allotted to her has expired.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 18, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR INQUIRY INTO LOCKING OUT OF FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES BY AIR CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. Yesterday the following telegram captioned "Urgent" was sent to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro):

● (1110)

In the matter of the dispute between Air Canada and Canadian Airline Employees' Association. CALEA recognizes Air Canada's legal rights under the Canada Labour Code. Nonetheless, CALEA finds Air Canada's action of June 16, 1976, inexcusable in light of the discrepancies of what the public is told and what the employees have been told. I hereby urge you to instigate an inquiry into the current dispute and also into Air Canada's labour relations policies and attitudes. We would be pleased to meet with you at your earliest convenience regarding this matter.

It is signed, J. T. Saunders, President, Canadian Airlines Employees' Association. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That the Minister of Labour, in view of the long-standing nature of the dispute and the unprecedented action of our national air carrier in locking out its employees, follow the very reasonable request by J. T. Saunders, President of the Canadian Airlines Employees' Association for an inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House before presentation of such a motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION OF SOVIET VETERANS COMMITTEE

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to recognize the presence in our gallery of a very noble group from Russia, the delegation of the Soviet Veterans Committee. It was my privilege to meet with them in Winnipeg on a return visit with the Royal Canadian Legion this week. I was also privileged to meet with them last night, and with your permission I should like to recognize the presence of Admiral Zakharov and Major-General Golyakov.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Finance is temporarily absent so I will ask the Prime Minister whether he is now in a position to provide the House with some information as to the role of the Chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal, and whether his activities in various business enterprises may have placed him in conflict with the provisions of Section 21, subsection (7) of the Anti-Dumping Act which, prima facie seems to be the case?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. I did have conversation with the Minister of Finance before he left for a meeting with the Investment Dealers' Association. He had not finished the inquiry he was personally conducting, of which he talked yesterday in the House.

POSSIBILITY OF PREVIOUS INQUIRY INTO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Prime Minister for his answer. If I may I should like to direct a question about the same matter to the Solicitor General. Could that hon. gentleman inform the House whether previous or former activities of the Chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal in seeking investments for his own benefits or the benefits of others caused an investigation into his activities sometime ago in this respect, and whether the RCMP or military intelligence ever informed any of the Solicitor General's colleagues about this? If so, when was this done?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have never been advised that there was such an investigation.

Oral Questions

POSSIBLE AGREEMENT TO PERMIT CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL CONTINUE COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Will he indicate, if he can recall, whether during negotiations with Mr. Gauthier, at which time it was agreed he would carry on as Chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal for an additional six months, that Mr. Gauthier's private business activities were discussed and, as Mr. Gauthier has said, that an agreed condition of his continuation as Chairman was the understanding that he would be permitted to carry on these private activities? In any event, could we have the contract referred to by the Minister of Finance last Tuesday in respect of Mr. Gauthier's current employment tabled in the House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be gald to convey to the Minister of Finance the suggestions of the hon. member. I would just remind him that Mr. Gauthier was staying on at our request. He had for sometime wanted to resign at the end of December, and it was to accommodate the government and to help us in this transitional period for six months that he agreed to stay on. What exactly transpired of a contractual form or in conversation between Mr. Gauthier and the minister, I think would be wise for me to let the minister answer.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Gauthier's tenure of office as Chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal was mainly under Mr. Turner as Minister of Finance, will the Prime Minister indicate if at any time Mr. Turner indicated that Mr. Gauthier was carrying on private business activities at the same time as being Chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal and, if so, what was the rationale for permitting Mr. Gauthier to carry on with these activities?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making an assumption of which personally I have no knowledge; that is, that he is carrying on these activities. On this side, we find it wiser to find out the facts before making allegations. I have nothing further to add as to the period under Mr. Turner when Mr. Gauthier was brought in there except a recollection of not knowing Mr. Gauthier personally. I inquired about him and found out that he was a very valuable civil servant and that it would be a very good appointment if we made it. It was as a result of this that we proceeded to make the appointment.

* * *

FEDERAL PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

ESTIMATE OF IMPACT ON REVENUES OF PROVINCES OF FEDERAL COST-SHARING PROPOSALS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister arising out of the cost-sharing proposals which the right hon. gentleman placed before the first ministers' conference. I should like to ask the Prime Minister if the government has done a costing analysis of the proposals giving the estimates of the financial impact on each of the provinces and more particularly, as to whether or not the government has made any estimate as to what financial returns this would have given the provinces over the past years had these proposals been in effect and a projection as to what tax returns and revenues this would give the provinces over the next five years should these proposals go into effect.

[Mr. Allmand.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as I answered the other day I cannot give these estimates in detail. Perhaps some figures do exist in the Department of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and that of the Secretary of State, but as I emphasized to the House, and I think the premiers understand this well, the projection through the past of course would not be a fair indication of what we are doing. In the past we knew that these programs escalated at a very fast rate, something I believe in the area of 15 per cent or 17 per cent escalation per annum. We did not want this to continue and that is why we have resorted to capping some of these programs. But in the plan for the future we sought agreement from the House, the country and the provinces to limit the rate of escalation and instead of doing this through capping—

An hon. Member: Capping?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, through capping, a difficult term to understand. I am sure the hon. member will be able to ask a supplementary. It would be a good day for him to do so. What we are proposing instead is a plan which would be composed of cash grants. These would be escalated more or less at the rate of growth of the national product. They would grow as the country grew. This is not possible to calculate in detail but every one would be able to plan on that basis. We know more or less the rate at which we hope to grow.

The other part would be in the form of tax points which we said would grow at least as fast or faster than the GNP. This is the problem with the fiscal dividend which would accrue from the fact that some of these tax points tend to grow faster than the rate of growth of the economy. So, it was a clear indication to the provinces of the principles on which this would be based which would permit them to make the calculations. I repeat that we may have made some estimates in departments but they are always conjectural. It depends upon the rate of growth of the economy.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be very difficult for this House or the premiers of the provinces to make any decision in respect of these problems unless they get the kind of information I am asking for, and particularly some idea of what the base year would be in each case and that so far has not been divulged. In view of the Prime Minister's answer to my question to the effect that the grants for health services and post-secondary education are now to be brought into line with the rate of economic growth, I want to ask the Prime Minister what possible relationship there is between the incidence of illness and the gross national product, in view of the fact that last year the cost of providing health services went up by 15 per cent at the same time that the gross national product was virtually at a standstill.

● (1120)

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, there is obviously no absolutely direct correlation of which I know between the incidence of illness and the growth of the economy, but I take it the hon. member must recognize that the amount of money we can spend for health and education is not unlimited and that it is useful, if governments are to search out priorities and spend the public moneys in ways which meet those priorities, that they be able to do some planning. They cannot just say that they might have an epidemic next year and therefore they will have to let the growth escalate at an epidemic rate for the next ten years. There are obviously contingencies for which one has to plan. But the hon. member has been leader of a government which I think was notoriously successful in the management of its economic affairs, which never came near bankruptcy, so he must have been able to plan ahead what he would spend in various sectors of the economy including health, and I am sure he would understand this.

BASIS ON WHICH COST-SHARING FOR HEALTH AND EDUCATION WILL BE TERMINATED

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that last year in the budget the former minister of finance announced that he was giving notice to the provinces of the termination of the five year agreement covering hospital insurance and diagnostic services, since this agreement still has four years to run, are we to understand that all the cost sharing proposals with respect to health services and post-secondary education are entirely contingent on the provinces accepting the immediate termination of the hospital insurance and diagnostic services, or is it intended that they will carry on for the four years which remain on the 50-50 basis and some other arrangement will be made about the other health insurance programs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): In the case of the post-secondary education the expiry date is April of next year, if my memory is correct. We talked about three areas at this conference. In the area of medicare, of course, the system of federal grants is already well established. The only case I think to which the hon. member's question refers would be hospital grants and we indicated that we were not going to accelerate the termination date of 1980. We were putting in place a program which hopefully would be able to bridge over the difference. If we can institute the program earlier, as indeed some provincial premiers suggested, we are prepared to do it sooner, and the Minister of National Health and Welfare indicated that in his statement to the conference. But it is not our desire to foreshorten this date if the provinces do not want to do so and we did not urge for it in any sense; we were merely responding to a suggestion by one of the premiers.

REACTION OF PROVINCES TO FINANCING PROPOSALS FOR MEDICARE AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE—PROVISION FOR REVIEW OF PROGRAMS

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): I asked this supplementary question of the Acting Prime Minister two days ago and he said he would bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister. I should like to ask the Prime Minister now whether he could indicate to the House what the reaction of the premiers was to his established program financing proposal insofar as it relates to medicare and hospital insurance. Could the Prime Minister also explain the circumstances of the review which he has been proposing between himself and the premiers in so far as hospital insurance and diagnostic services are concerned?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that in my perception of it a great majority of the provinces favoured this scheme because it responded to a request the provinces have been making for a long time that there be a transfer of tax room and greater flexibility for the provinces in applying or in spending the money they receive from the federal government. To my recollection, only one or two provinces, or perhaps three, indicated that they were not sure, and that perhaps they would rather continue receiving it all in the form of cash rather than some of it in the form of tax room, but the general response to the scheme, as I perceived it, in principle, was favourable.

Of course, the calculations of rate of growth and the base year, to which the hon. member from the New Democratic Party referred, are important in the calculations, and we indicated that at the meeting of ministers of finance in July these would be the areas which would be discussed in greater detail. However, in so far as the principle of getting more tax room from the federal government is concerned, hon. members opposite will remember that this has been a constant request of the provinces, and this is designed to meet that, at least in part.

REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED REVIEW OF HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has referred repeatedly to the federal-provincial review of health legislation and programs, and I wanted the Prime Minister to tell us how such a review would be carried out and what the circumstances of this federal-provincial review, to which he has been referring, would be.

Perhaps I will repeat the question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Can the minister explain the circumstances of the federal-provincial review in so far as health legislation and programs are concerned? There had been mention made in his established program about the financing proposal of the joint federal-provincial review of the health programs. I wonder if the minister could clarify the circumstances of that review.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there has been an agreement in principle with the provinces to consider the possibility of extended cost sharing under the existing legislation, but in addition, there was general agreement in principle with the provinces, when the ministers of health met last time, that it would be appropriate to have a more global review which would consider all aspects of health in this country, not only the provision of the services which we are cost sharing now or those we could cost share under the existing legislation, but the whole area of prevention, for instance, and the whole area of the provision of health

services both by the federal and provincial governments. The suggestion was made and agreed to in principle that we should take time, before agreeing on a wholly new financing formula, to look at the whole health field along the lines of the New Perspective on the Health of Canadians, which was published by the government three years ago.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER TO INQUIRE INTO SAFETY OF BILINGUAL TRAFFIC CONTROL—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO AVERT STRIKE

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister with respect to the anticipated strike by CATCA which, as a result of the statement yesterday, is now nearly upon us. Yesterday in the House the President of the Treasury Board in answer to a question by the hon. member for Vegreville said, with respect to the replacement of an appointee, that he did not believe it is possible to appoint a replacement for Mr. Keenan before the return of the Minister of Transport, who is now travelling abroad. Does the Prime Minister accept the proposition that the government is paralysed with respect to this matter until the return of the Minister of Transport? In addition, I wonder if the Prime Minister could inform the House what other action the government is taking or is contemplating with respect to this important matter.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to that question, the government is by no means paralysed in the way the hon. member has described. The search for a replacement for Mr. Keenan, as I indicated earlier this week in the House, is going forward. The minister certainly directed his attention to this before he left and his officials are pursuing it very vigorously in his absence. He is in regular and frequent contact with his officials and certainly the House and the hon. gentleman can be assured that we are proceeding with all possible speed to find an appropriate person to replace Mr. Keenan as the commissioner.

● (1130)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we can say at least that it is most unfortunate that the minister chose this time to be away. This leads to the second question to the Prime Minister. When is the Minister of Transport planning to return and are there any plans afoot for the government to make application to the courts with respect to this matter having regard to the announcement made yesterday by the air traffic controllers? What are the plans of the government in respect of the matter and are any sessions being conducted between the government or representatives of the government, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, with the officials of CATCA to find a suitable replacement for Mr. John Keenan? This seems to be the central issue in this whole matter and I wonder if the Prime Minister could tell us what is happening?

[Mr. Lalonde.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is a series of questions there. In answer to the first one, the Minister of Transport was planning to return by the regular DND flight schedule for Monday. It is possible that he will return earlier depending on several contingencies, one of them being that the government is asking for an injunction which I believe will be heard at four o'clock this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: In the meantime, to repeat what the parliamentary secretary just indicated to the House, we are very concerned indeed with finding a commissioner or commissioners to replace Mr. Keenan and, as he indicated, we hope that will be done as soon as possible.

POSSIBILITY OF CONSULTATIONS WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS TO AVERT STRIKE—CONSIDERATION OF COMMISSIONER SUGGESTED BY CONTROLLERS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister for that answer. Since the application to the courts that he refers to, which I presume is to the federal court of Canada, is likely to be an ex parte injunction and in effect would only postpone this strike for eight or ten days if it were successful, would the Prime Minister answer another part of the question I put to him? Does the government intend to have consultations with the officers of CATCA during that period if the injunction is successful or in the alternative, are those consultations going on now, bearing in mind that what they are talking about is perhaps the curtailment to the Canadian public of an essential service?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Of course, Mr. Speaker, in so far as talking to CATCA is concerned, this is necessary and has been done to the extent that we are trying to look for a commissioner who would be acceptable to both sides, the public and CATCA itself. I do not say that at some point if we cannot reach agreement we will not have to proceed on our own. Of course, we would like, as we did with Mr. Keenan, to find someone who is broadly acceptable to CATCA and hopefully to the other interests involved.

Apart from not wanting to speculate on the results of a legal proceeding, an injunction, which I indicated we are going to proceed with this afternoon, I must remind the House that the government's position is that this strike is an illegal strike, that it is not part of the collective agreement. We are quite disturbed that any group or union in Canada would want to strike against the principle of bilingualism. This in our mind is what is now happening. It is conceivable how a strike can solve, some times, economic issues or issues of a contractual nature, but it is inconceivable to me how this strike can solve safety in the air. This certainly cannot be done by strike action.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, by way of preamble I want to make it quite clear to the Prime Minister that I think all parties in this House of Commons, and indeed the country, regard the matter of air safety as the important aspect—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Why not bilingualism?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Can the Prime Minister confirm whether a suggestion was made by CATCA as to an acceptable commissioner and whether the government considered that? Did they in fact reject that suggestion? I understand one was made or is that a point that is still pending with respect to that particular matter?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, concerning the hon. member's preamble, I am glad to hear the statement that the opposition is concerned for public safety. I hope they would share the government's view that the question of bilingualism, the use of bilingualism and its relation to safety cannot be settled by a strike and they join us in denouncing this strike as ill-timed and—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You, as a government, are not taking it seriously.

Mr. Trudeau: I see the hon. member shaking his head in assent. I hope that can be interpreted as a statement of the Tory party to all those—with of course the exception of the hon. member for Edmonton—

Mr. Paproski: Centre.

Mr. Trudeau: Edmonton Centre who seems to disagree with his seatmate.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What equivocation.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You should not inflame a bad situation.

Mr. Trudeau: Why do you not make a clear statement?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I just did; you make an answer.

Mr. Fraser: You are not helping, Pierre.

Mr. Trudeau: I should like to know how the hon. opposition is helping. They do not seem to be very helpful in this matter.

REASON MINISTER OUT OF COUNTRY IN VIEW OF THREATENED STRIKE OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the right hon. Prime Minister. I should like to make it quite clear that the primacy of safety is in the mind of everyone around here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, with the resignation of Mr. Keenan as the commissioner and with the uneasiness amongst air traffic controllers at the collapse of the commission which was evident a week or so ago, can the Prime Minister explain why the Minister of Transport should have decided at this moment and in these circumstances to leave the country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the sequence of events is not as the hon. member seems to suggest. The Minister of Transport indicated to me several months ago his desire to be in Europe at this time in order precisely to look into the kind of issue, amongst others, which is of concern to this country—safety in the air. There are improvements that can be brought to air transport and so on. So he did not decide at this time to go, he had decided long ago to go to Europe. When he left, the issue of the commissioner and had been settled and unsettled in the way the House knows and, as the parliamentary secretary indicated, the search was on for a replacement for Mr. Keenan and it was, beyond the first attempts that had been made, difficult to find people who would be agreeable to both CATCA and les gens de l'air. It obviously was a matter which would take some time and some cooling off, which is what has been taking place, and the uncertainty is going on. We have not yet found someone who would be reasonably acceptable to all concerned in this and the search is proceeding.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has confirmed the reports that the minister has gone to Europe to inquire into this problem of the use of languages and its effect on safety. I wonder what construction one is to put on this particular visit, particularly in the light of its having been decided several months ago. Is one to conclude that the minister has some doubts as to the reliability of the facts set out in the Bilcom report and has had to go there to check matters out for himself?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York-Scarborough. Order, please. The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

* * *

ENERGY

MINISTER'S VIEW OF CRITICS OF NUCLEAR POLICY—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister is based on the Statement by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that:

> . . . public reaction to the nuclear issue is based on some highly inflammatory and misleading information.

● (1140)

Given that officials of the Atomic Energy Control Board, the president of Petro-Canada and a number of leading Canadians have warned about the dangers inherent in radioactive wastes from nuclear power plants, does the Prime Minister share the minister's cavalier assumption that any criticism, even that of such informed and responsible sources as I have mentioned, falls into the "highly inflammatory and misleading" category?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is totally and completely incorrect in saying that that is the minister's assumption. Therefore, I do not share it.

Oral Questions

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister undertake to look into the statement made by the minister to the Canadian Nuclear Association, with a view to having him clarify it or, at least, retract his broad-brush approach to criticism of nuclear power, in the interests of open and informed debate on this vital issue?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the minister has participated repeatedly in open and informed debate, and I think the hon. member herself in aware of the existence of broad-brush statements; that, I think, was her expression. Politicians are sometimes inclined to use them. It is important to look at them in good faith, and to see the context in which the minister takes action and is pursuing this debate.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

POSSIBILITY OF CONSULTATION WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS TO AVERT STRIKE

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister? In view of the immediate prospect of the air traffic controllers strike and the unfortunate absence of the Minister of Transport, may I ask if officials of the Department of Transport are meeting with representatives of CATCA, the Canadian Air Traffic Controllers Association, and setting forth proposals to avert the possibility of the strike?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, we have decided to take court action, but if Mr. Livingston wants to meet us, we are ready to see him at any time. I must say that Mr. Livingston has made a number of statements up to now, but he did not attempt to approach me or any of my officials. The government's view is very clear: it is an illegal strike and we shall take the necessary steps to avoid it.

[*English*]

ALLEGATION RADAR AND LANDING EQUIPMENT OBSOLETE—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister? Since it is necessary to harmonize safety with bilingual air traffic control across the country, since there are serious difficulties with regard to the use of outdated radar and landing equipment at airports across Canada, and since the issue of bilingual air traffic control may exacerbate the issue of safety and safe procedures followed by air traffic controllers across Canada, may I ask if the government has taken steps to replace obsolete radar and landing equipment, so that we may at all times be assured of the safety factor?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, Canada has an enviable record in air safety. It is second to none.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, we are determined to maintain that standard. If the hon. gentleman is aware of some particular difficulties concerning our navigational aids, I wish he would draw them to the attention of the ministry so that we can examine them one by one.

* * *

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

GUIDELINES FOR SENIOR STAFF OF MINISTERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. On July 18, 1973, on the subject of conflict of interest legislation, the Prime Minister was reminded by the then leader of the opposition that "there is also nothing in the guidelines announced today respecting ministers' senior staff people". Has the Prime Minister been addressing himself to this continuing problem? If so, what does he intend to do about it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this matter was settled several months ago—I am not sure of the exact date. My recollection of that question is none too precise. However, when I announced the guidelines I indicated that they would, indeed, cover everyone in the position to exercise influence on the government and who might be in a conflict of interest situation. Ministers, in so far as their exempt staff is concerned, have assured compliance with the guidelines on the part of such staff. Of course, the departmental people have been informed, and they have conformed to the guidelines. This is also true of the Crown corporations. As far as we know, every sector of the Canadian public service and ministerial service has been covered by these guidelines.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

PROPOSED STEEL COMPLEX FOR CAPE BRETON—REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Is the minister in the position to report briefly on the progress, if any, being made with regard to the proposed steel complex for Cape Breton? I ask this, Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of the matter, namely, the apparent cancellation of new developments at the existing steel mill at Sydney, a mill which is the backbone of the economy of Cape Breton Island where the work force has been drastically reduced, as the minister knows. What message of encouragement does the hon. gentleman have today for the people of Cape Breton Island?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the hon. member, with regard to the last part of his question concerning SYSCO, that today's newspapers are announcing the last investments, to which the Department of Regional Econcmic Expansion contributed; they will give results in

the near future. They will increase by a considerable amount the plant's capacity to produce rails and will thus make SYSCO's operations more profitable. Unfortunately they will not solve all the problems of the company.

In answer to the first part of his question, I must say that it is true that a few weeks ago the premier of Nova Scotia was in Europe and that the president of DEVCO, Mr. Kent, accompanied him. On that occasion they met several industrialists, heads of steel industries in particular, who are interested in the development of a primary steel industry in Canada. I have had a few brief reports on the result of that meeting. I have been told that the meeting was very interesting and very positive and that one could hope that more progress would be achieved at any moment with regard to that project.

With regard to the project for the development of a steel industry in Canada, and in eastern Canada in particular, as the hon. member knows the department continued its analyses as a result of the tabling of the CANSTEL project report. I can assure the hon. member that the department has now completed those analyses, and that we will therefore be in a position to discuss and contribute efficiently, in terms of technical information, to any proposal we may be submitted in the course of the coming months.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE MINISTER KNEW FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS VERBAL

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Would the minister inform the House if he knew that the commitment by Lockheed to provide interim financing for the LRPA project was purely verbal, if he first knew it about mid-November and if he was ever given occasion to think otherwise?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I did not know that in mid-November. I said earlier to the House that I first learned that Lockheed could not perform what they said they could do when I returned from Brussels. That was about the middle of December. That was also the first time I learned there was only a verbal arrangement. In fact, I may not even have known of the verbal arrangement until later in December. I knew on my return from Brussels that they could not carry out their part of the financing.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I could produce half a dozen references to indicate that the minister did know, but will limit myself to one.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, how can the minister account for his answer of June 2, as reported on page 14077 of *Hansard*? When asked whether he had asked Lockheed for any written commitment that they would supply the interim financing he replied, no.

● (1150)

Mr. Richardson: I would have to look at the record to see what was being referred to at that time. None of our officials, it is very clear, asked either Boeing or Lockheed, at that stage, for written confirmation. They asked for assurances that the financing could be arranged. This has been stated so many times that I do not know why we have to keep on repeating it.

* * *

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

ALLEGATION DEPARTMENT ADVISING BANKRUPT PERSONS TO IGNORE COURT WRITS OR SUMMONSES

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or his parliamentary secretary or, in their absence, the acting minister in charge of that department. It arises from written complaints I have received from the small claims court in Napanee regarding the new "instant bankruptcy" procedures followed by the department or by employees and officials of the department in connection with cases of bankruptcy. Individuals who apply to this department and commence bankruptcy proceedings are being instructed to ignore all court summonses or writs from county and small claims courts, not to accept them and to avoid service. This is contrary to the law. No one can lawfully ignore a writ or a summons from a court. Why does the minister or his department authorize such illegal acts? Will he investigate the situation and stop this illegal procedure?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Obviously, I shall take note of the hon. member's question and draw it to the attention of the minister concerned. I am not aware of the circumstances surrounding the hon. member's representation but the situation will be examined and I hope to have an answer for him soon.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SENIOR CITIZENS' WEEK

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to draw the attention of the House to the fact that next week, in Ontario at least, will be senior citizens' week and that the Ottawa Senior Citizens Council is represented in your gallery today by Mr. Walter Turnbull, who is a former deputy minister and a very prominent former public servant as well as secretary to Prime Minister King, who is present to emphasize this important event. I am sure all members will wish the senior citizens well.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

LABOUR CONDITIONS

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO MEDIATE DISPUTE BETWEEN AIR CANADA AND FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES

Mr. John Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour arising from my proposed motion earlier today under Standing Order 43. The minister now has a copy. Can the hon. gentleman report to the House whether his officials have been able, over the last few months, to find any way of breaking the longstanding impasse in relations between Air Canada and its employees in Winnipeg? Having heard both sides of the story, I can assure the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that there is the greatest need for somebody to mediate between the parties in connection with this matter.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): I agree with the hon. member that there is a need to resolve this situation; it goes very deep in terms of emotional considerations. I was informed a short while ago that the union has gone to the courts to contest the legality of the company's lock-out. In the meantime, they have sent me a telegram suggesting that a commissioner be appointed and we are giving active consideration to the appointment of a commissioner to look into one particular area which I consider to be the root cause of the dispute. I hope to be able to tell the hon. member at the beginning of next week what action is to be taken.

* * *

NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO ALLEVIATE EFFECT OF RATE INCREASES AND TO DECREASE RATE OF INTEREST ON LOANS TO COMMISSION

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister? I had intended to direct this question to the minister for Indian affairs yesterday but he was not in the House. Today, he was here for a while, but he is not here now and I note that his parliamentary secretary is not here either. The question concerns the rate increases proposed by the Northern Canada Power Commission. For the past several weeks, people in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon have been expecting the minister's reply to reports on the NCPC by the public utilities boards and by citizens groups in the two territories. Is the minister concerned now prepared to make public the action he is prepared to take to protect northern consumers from the drastic increases in the cost of electricity which are contemplated? In particular, would he change the rate of interest on the loans to the Power Commission to help bring about a favourable result?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I thank the hon. member for giving me notice that he will put these questions and make these representations to the minister on Monday. I will ensure that he is prepared to answer.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTION AIRBORNE REGIMENT REMAIN IN EDMONTON—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister comply with my request to allow the Canadian Airborne Regiment to remain in Edmonton?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): The Airborne Regiment is being considered, as are all units, in the course of the infrastructure study. I cannot make a commitment about any individual unit.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF OLYMPIC LOTTERY TICKETS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Yesterday, as well as a week or so ago, the hon. gentleman denied any knowledge of fraudulent improprieties within the Olympic lottery program, as well as any RCMP activities in this regard, other than in the Province of Ontario. Upon further investigation I have reason to believe that these fraudulent practices are, indeed, taking place in Quebec and elsewhere and that an on-going investigation is being carried out into this matter in Quebec by the RCMP fraud squad based in Toronto and under the supervision of Inspector Rodney T. Stemler. I would therefore like to ask the Solicitor General who, I say, with respect, does not know a great deal about what is going on in his department—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Jelinek: Well, he does not know whether the RCMP are investigating this matter in Quebec. I would ask him to look into this question again and perhaps report to the House before it rises for the summer break.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I put that question directly to the senior officers of the RCMP a few days ago and they gave me the answer I gave to the House. I have to rely on information given to me; I do not deal with the inspector referred to by the hon. member, I deal with the senior officers here in Ottawa. I told the hon. member yesterday that I will check again. I will do so and if there is any further information, I will give it to the House.

* * *

LOTO-CANADA

SUGGESTED DELAY OF PROGRAM PENDING CLARIFICATION OF ALLEGED FRAUD IN DISTRIBUTION OF OLYMPIC LOTTERY TICKETS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): The minister is obviously not getting the proper information

from the top. However, my supplementary question is addressed to the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the many uncertainties and, surely, fraudulent irregularities within the existing lottery program, much of which, as the hon. gentleman knows, will be passed on to Loto-Canada, would the minister consider postponing the inception of Loto-Canada until all questionable aspects of the sale and distribution program have been cleared up in order to avoid the continuation, perhaps unintentionally, of fraudulent practices within the new program?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to appear three days before the committee. I answered all questions. The hon. member did not ask me any question on the distribution of the tickets, even if he had the opportunity to do so for many hours. I answered other questions on this subject. I said we wanted to have strict control over this, to be sure that there is no abuse and that we wanted to have a distribution system controlled by Loto Canada rather than by intermediaries appointed by the provincial government as is the case for Wintario. We intend to appear before the committees of the House each year to answer questions. The chairman of Loto Canada had long sessions with me at the committee, and we tried to give every possible answer to hon. members. We told them that if they had concrete suggestions, they should put them directly to Mr. Cousineau who would be prepared to examine and use them.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

PROPOSAL TO RENAME JUSTICE BUILDING IN HONOUR OF RIGHT HON. LOUIS ST. LAURENT

Mr. Sean O'Sullivan (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the question period the Prime Minister invited me to pose a question to him and, being one of those who can resist anything but temptation, I should like to do that right now.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

● (1200)

Mr. O'Sullivan: As the rather extensive and expensive renovations come to an end on the Justice building next to the Confederation building on Wellington Street, I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman would give consideration to the suggestion that that building be named after a man who served with distinction as Minister of Justice, who went on to become Prime Minister of Canada and served in that office with distinction. We will not hold it against him that he was a member of the Liberal party. I am referring, of course, to the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. member for this very generous and worth-while suggestion. It is not the first time that he has referred in gallant terms to a former Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: You may have another, too, shortly.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre says there may be another chance a few years down the road.

Mr. Paproski: Right after 1978.

Mr. Trudeau: I am sure that if that happens the hon. member for Edmonton Centre and I will retire together. The question is indeed worthy of consideration. I have already had discussions with the Secretary of State and the cabinet on suitable ways of honouring the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent. We have decided on one course but this may be one that we would want to consider before making a final decision.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF OFFICIALS FROM GOVERNMENT OF GHANA

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know all members of the House would want to join with me in welcoming to your gallery today a number of trade officials representing the government of Ghana and certain private business concerns in Ghana who are in Canada for discussions with government officials and representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, I have to stand on a point of order for purposes of clarification of the answer given me by the President of the Treasury Board. It is true that during the committee stage the situation of Loto-Canada was before the committee, but I did not ask the President of the Treasury Board about the distribution of lottery tickets. However, I asked the president of Loto-Canada about this and he had no idea what the distribution of tickets was going to be. Therefore, my point of order is this: in response to my question, the minister was referring to the committee stage, not to my question at all. I wonder whether the minister would answer and tell me whether he would reconsider postponing the initiation of Loto-Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Seventeenth Report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey).

Order Paper Questions

[*Translation*]

BROADCASTING, FILMS AND ASSISTANCE TO THE ARTS

Sixth Report of Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, in both official languages.—Mr. Guilbault.

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

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are marked by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,773, 5,171, 5,237, 5,402, 5,523, 5,550 and 5,650.

[*Text*]

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT AND ACTIVITIES PROGRAMME

Question No. 4,773—**Mr. Herbert:**

Of the total amount of $60,886,000 appearing in the 1975-76 estimates for student summer employment, how much has been (a) paid to students (b) paid as salaries to public servants (c) spent otherwise?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): During the Summer of 1975, some 12 federal departments operated programmes under the Student Summer Employment and Activities Programme. Attached is a departmental breakdown of expenditures of the 1975-76 proportion of funds allocated. The difference of $6,000 between the noted amount of $60,886,000 and the amounts shown on the attached table is due to a rounding off of these figures.

Department	Amount Paid to Students	Paid Salaries to Public Servants	Spent Otherwise	TOTAL
Manpower and Immigration	$35,475,000	$2,293,000	$3,618,000	$41,386,000
National Film Board	80,000			80,000
Health and Welfare	1,009,000	39,000	21,000	1,069,000
National Defence	6,363,000	11,000	1,391,000	7,765,000
Consumer and Corporate Affairs	31,000		29,000	60,000
Secretary of State	6,307,000	340,000	2,389,000	9,036,000
Indian Affairs	1,036,000	158,000	8,000	1,202,000
Solicitor General	37,000			37,000
Agriculture	99,000	3,000	6,000	108,000
National Revenue	18,000			18,000
Transport	73,000			73,000
Energy, Mines and Resources	58,000			58,000
Total	$50,586,000	$2,844,000	$7,462,000	$60,892,000

PUBLIC SERVICE—SECOND LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

Question No. 5,171—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1970 to date, have any departments or government bodies negotiated contracts with Paquette Hudson Associates for the teaching of a second language to public servants and, if so, in each case (a) what was the contract (b) how many (c) for what amount?

2. For each year, what percentage of the money granted to the school was directed to salaries of (a) teachers (b) administrators?

3. Are the requirements for (a) formation (b) experience of the teachers only under the school and, if not, is there a link between such requirements and those that prevail when hiring teachers of a second language for the Public Service?

4. For each year, how many (a) French speaking (b) English speaking public servants have followed courses offered by the school?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by all departments and agencies as follows: none.

[Mr. Speaker.]

CONTAINER RAIL RATES

Question No. 5,237—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Did CNR increase its container rail rate to the Port of Halifax-Dartmouth to and from Montreal and/or Toronto by 10 percent on January 1, 1976 and, if so, what is the government's position on the request for a further 5 percent in June 1976?

2. What is the government's best estimate of the total rail rate increase since 1969, in percentage terms, should the 1976 increase be approved?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. Export/Import container rail rates applicable between Halifax and Montreal and/or Toronto were increased by 10 per cent on January 1, 1976. Carriers have advised the shipping public that a further adjustment will take place no later than July 1, 1976, amounting to an additional increase of no less than 5 per cent. Under the statutes, railway companies are not required to request permission for increases in freight

rates and may initiate such increases by filing tariff amendments with the Canadian Transport Commission on 30 days notice. Such increases do not in the normal course require approval of the Commission or the government. However, the Canadian Transport Commission is monitoring the recent increase in container rail rates in the performance of its new duties under the Anti-Inflation legislation, and has called upon the railways to furnish it with all the information it requires in this regard. Any finding under the Anti-Inflation legislation will be communicated in due course.

2. An estimate of absolute total container rail rate increases since 1969, in percentage terms, cannot be readily ascertained as terms and conditions relating to specific movements have been broadened considerably since that time. The following statement contains a complete breakdown of charges applicable on container movements between points under review for the period in question.

Containers Export and Import—Loaded—Freight all Kinds or Empty via Rail

Effective Date	Between Montreal, Quebec and Halifax, Nova Scotia										Between Toronto, Ontario and Halifax, Nova Scotia									
	Column 1		Column 2		Column 3		Column 4		Column 5		Column 1		Column 2		Column 3		Column 4		Column 5	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
August 26, 1969	75	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	110	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
October 1, 1970	81	162	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	117	234	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
October 1, 1971	—	—	87	174	93	186	99	198	—	—	—	—	124	248	131	262	138	276	—	—
April 1, 1973	—	—	94	188	100	200	106	212	140	280	—	—	132	264	139	278	146	292	207	414
May 1, 1974	—	—	103	206	109	218	115	230	154	308	—	—	142	284	149	298	156	312	228	456
April 1, 1975	—	—	118	236	125	250	132	264	177	354	—	—	163	326	171	342	179	358	262	524
January 1, 1976	—	—	130	260	138	276	145	290	195	390	—	—	179	358	188	376	197	394	288	576

(a) Charge in dollars per 20 ft. container.
(b) Charge in dollars per 40 ft. container.

Explanations of columns:

Column 1: Applicable on a minimum of 200 containers per calendar week when the carrier receives a minimum of 40 trips per year in each direction.

Column 2: Applicable only on a minimum of 18,000 20-foot containers (or equivalent) per calendar year, loaded or empty, between Halifax, Nova Scotia Montreal, Province of Quebec, Saint John, New Brunswick and Toronto, Ontario. Containers moving on behalf of the same shipper between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick and Hamilton, Ontario may be added to the volume between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick, Montreal, Province of Quebec and Toronto, Ontario. A calendar year begins October 1 of each year and terminates September 30 of the following year.

Column 3: Applicable only on a minimum of 15,000 20-foot containers (or equivalent) per calendar year, loaded or empty, between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick, Montreal, Province of Quebec and Toronto, Ontario. Containers moving on behalf of the same shipper between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick and Hamilton, Ontario may be added to the volume between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick, Montreal, Province of Quebec and Toronto, Ontario. A calendar year begins October 1 of each year and terminates September 30 of the following year.

Column 4: Applicable only on a minimum of 12,000 20-foot containers (or equivalent) per calendar year, loaded or empty, between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick, Montreal, Province of Quebec and Toronto, Ontario. Containers moving on behalf of the same shipper between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick and Hamilton, Ontario may be added to the volume between Halifax, Nova Scotia, Saint John, New Brunswick, Montreal, Province of Quebec and Toronto, Ontario. A calendar year begins October 1 of each year and terminates September 30 of the following year.

Column 5: Applicable only on a minimum of 20 twenty foot containers (or equivalent) in any one calendar week, loaded in any one direction.

CNR—COST OF "VIA CN" LOGO

Question No. 5,402—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. What is the design cost for the CN's new "Via CN" logo?

2. What is the projected total cost of conversion to the new logo?

3. What is the projected total cost of the advertising campaign promoting this new logo?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. $7,000.

2. Adoption of the VIA logo and colours does not add the CN's costs. Equipment is painted as required and the VIA logo will be applied when passenger rolling stock and locomotives come up for painting in the normal cycle. The first unit to be painted, the Turbo trainset, was in the process of overhaul and required repainting. The VIA logo and colours are used in various graphic applications such as timetables, ticket envelopes, menus, etc., as material is restocked.

3. The objective of the current advertising campaign is to promote business and improved passenger services. The use of the VIA logo does not add to the cost of the campaign. Although the logo will be used in future CN passenger service advertising no funds are allocated to promote the logo itself.

PRINTING OF "BETWEEN FRIENDS" FOR COMMEMORATION OF UNITED STATES BICENTENNIAL

Question No. 5,523—**Mr. Horner:**

1. Were tenders placed for the printing of the book the government is having printed to commemorate the United States Bicentennial Celebrations and which is called *Between Friends*?

2. Were tenders placed for the design of the book and, if so, how many were received?

3. Was the lowest tender or the best design accepted and, if it was the latter, under what criteria was the design chosen or if the former, what price range did the tenderers have to work or file between?

4. Who was finally accepted on the tender in the (a) designing (b) printing?

Order Paper Questions

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Film Board as follows: 1. Yes.

2. No. The design was carried out under the supervision of the Executive Producers of the National Film Board's Still Photo Division.

3. Not applicable.

4. (a) Not applicable; (b) Ashton Potter Ltd, Toronto, was the lowest tenderer.

MEETING BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PSAC AND REPRESENTATIVES OF DPW

Question No. 5,550—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 5,164 which stated in part that a meeting would be held between representatives of the Public Service Alliance of Canada and representatives of the Department of Public Works in regard to the charges made by PSAC President C.A. Edwards in a letter dated January 19, 1976, has the meeting taken place and, if so (a) on what date and where (b) what are the names of all those who were present?

2. Did the PSAC set a date of October 30, 1976 for remedying various insufficient fire protection situations in government buildings and, if not (a) what exact date was set (b) what is the government doing about the situation?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): 1. (a) The meeting took place on April 29, 1976, in the office of the Assistant Dominion Fire Commissionner, Ottawa; (b) E.S. Hornby, Assistant Dominion Fire Commissioner, J. Wyllie and A. Woods of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, and V.M. Clarkson and L.C. Roy of the Treasury Board Secretariat.

2. (a) Fire protection in Federal Government Buildings is a matter of continuing concern and attention, and therfore no specific date was set or discussed in this regard; (b) Arrangements were agreed upon at the meeting whereby the Public Service Alliance's field representatives will be able to bring any suspected fire protection deficiencies to the attention of the Dominion Fire Commissioner's Regional Offices. There was also agreement to hold a follow-up meeting in Ottawa in October, 1976, of representatives of the three aforementioned organizations to review progress, and particularly the operation of this new field liaison arrangement.

RESOURCES REVENUE—YUKON TERRITORY

Question No. 5,650—**Mr. Neil:**

1. For each year 1970 to 1975 inclusive, what has been the resources revenue from the Yukon Territory?

2. For the same years, what portion of the revenue has been returned to the Yukon Territory?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Resources Revenue—Yukon Territory ($Millions) 1970-71, 1,112; 1971-72, 928; 1972-73, 1,300; 1973-74, 1,770; 1974-75, 4,960; 1975-76, 4,530.

2. Nil. There is no revenue sharing agreement with the Yukon Territory.

[Mr. Horner.]

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,408 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

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

[*Text*]

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION CENTRES

Question No. 5,408—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. How many Manpower and Immigration Centres are there in Canada and where is each located?

2. How many Manpower officers are assigned to each centre?

3. From 1970 to 1975, what has been the yearly cost of officer training in each centre?

4. What is the size of the labour force served by each centre?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FINANCE

MEASURE TO AVOID DOUBLE TAXATION BETWEEN CANADA AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-32, to implement conventions for the avoidance of double-taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium and Canada and Israel, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (for the Minister of Finance) moved:

That Bill S-32, an act to implement conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium and Canada and Israel, be amended in clause 11 by striking out line 24 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"(8) Where a motion taken up and considered in accordance with this section is not adopted by the House in which it was introduced or is adopted, with or without amendments, by that House but is not concurred in by the other House, the particular order to which the motion relates comes into force immediately upon the failure to adopt the motion or concur therein, as the case may be.

(9) For the purposes of subsection (2), a day"—

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, is the minister who moved this report stage amendment not going to explain what it means?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, first of all I must thank hon. members who worked on the finance, trade and economic affairs committee and were able to agree on an amendment formula, at least to protect the interest of both Houses. I think the idea was to have a neutral resolution, and we did not find any formula at the time. Among all the orders and bills which had been examined, no formula was found acceptable. The committee, with the unanimous consent of all its members, drafted the text included in the present bill. It seems to meet the requirements of this House and the other place, and it gives all members a means to agree and to ask that in the next few years what has to be reviewed be so reviewed, with the three countries mentioned in the motion—France, Belgium and Israel—and that the changes likely to occur between the signatures of the various orders be accepted. That is what is included in the formula, in the amendment to clause 11, which was thoroughly examined by all members of the committee, as I said earlier. I have the impression that this formula will be used in the future in several bills, because so far we did not find any final formula meeting those requirements. That is why we decided to find one and include it in the legislation, as it is here.

[*English*]

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to endorse what the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Trudel) has said. I am pleased that we were able to arrive at a suitable amendment to clause 11 of this bill. As the House will recall, we raised this point extensively at second reading stage, pointing out that we felt the wording was most unfortunate and would, in effect, really have no practical application had it been left as then proposed. We pointed out that, while this is a relatively bulky act, it was an act that deserved the attention of hon. members since we were dealing with a very important aspect of our taxation system. So I am pleased that the amendment now before the House has been agreed upon.

There are two additional comments that I should like to make at this stage. First of all, I think it is most unfortunate that the government has represented to certain members in the private business community that the opposition has delayed passage of this bill. In no way have we delayed its passage. The history of it is that it was first debated in the House at second reading on April 2. It was reported out of committee, and I think both sides are in agreement that the changes made in committee are quite desirable. It was reported to the House on May 11. It has sat on the order paper, as far as this House is concerned, since May 11.

● (1210)

I would suggest we have debated a lot of things in this House without considering this bill, many of which could have been held in abeyance, giving higher priority to this measure. Certainly, we have indicated at all times that we did not intend to delay its passage if it were brought back for consideration. I am pleased that has been done today.

The third thing I would mention is the hope that before we complete third reading, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) will comment on the many points raised at second reading concerning the possibility of tax avoidance, or even fraud taking place to the extent of $1.6 billion involving Canadian companies. I am referring, of course, to the *Globe and Mail* report which was referred to at the second reading stage in April. At that time, the Minister of National Revenue said the figure was too high and made some rather casual comments.

It is important that before finally passing this bill, the Minister of National Revenue gives an explanation of what is being done in order to ensure that there is no tax avoidance or fraud taking place involving Canadian companies. Perhaps he could also indicate to what extent he thinks a problem now exists. I hope that in the time remaining someone will indicate, for hon. members present, the current position in respect of tax avoidance and fraud. If the Minister of National Revenue cannot do that, perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance could make some comment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Trudel: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) raised—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. We must have unanimous consent for the parliamentary secretary to speak again, since he has already spoken. Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Trudel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my colleagues for allowing me to speak again. As he mentioned himself, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) raised a point during debate on second reading. He was extremely concerned to realize that some people could escape taxation. I think that during the debate on third reading, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) could certainly address himself to that question.

Still, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the point being raised by the hon. member is not covered by Bill S-32 which is now before us. The purpose of this bill is to avoid double taxation of monies already taxed either in Canada or in the countries I have mentioned. As I said earlier, I do believe the Minister of National Revenue will be happy to take part in the debate on third reading. But I repeat that the aspect that causes him much concern and that concerns us too on this side of the House, has been very well put and must strictly apply in another bill or an act different from the one we are now discussing.

[*English*]

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about the bill before us. It should not pass in the kind of quiet oblivion which seems to have descended on the debate. While we are in favour of international agreements, generally speaking, the special position of Canada means that international agreements almost inevitably work to our disadvantage, especially in respect of taxation agreements. I say that in

this sense: most countries have a mutual interest in things, in the sense that there is a *quid pro quo*. However, given the higher level of foreign ownership in Canada, what happens is that almost invariably our treasury suffers from these agreements.

I know we take pride in being a good international citizen. I certainly take a personal pride in that, as I am sure do other hon. members of the House, and perhaps all Canadians. But increasingly I think that the kind of international agreement we are talking about should be given much more consideration than has been given in the past. We must temper our desire to be a good international citizen with concern about our national self-interest because of the high degree of foreign ownership and penetration into Canada by large, multinational corporations. This is not a national country in that sense, but a country which is more prone to paying more, because of this penetration, than any other. This applies not only to the matter of taxation and the repatriation of dividends, at whichever end they are taken, but it also applies to things like copyright and trade name laws.

Let us consider the situation in respect of patents, for instance. An international agreement in respect of patents is virtually worthless because we do not have, to any great extent, foreign patents. Relatively few patents are taken out in Canada, because if the multinational corporations who operate here make a discovery, they patent it in some other country. The same thing applies to trade or brand names. Brand names originate in other countries and, through our branch plant economy, these foreign names are used in Canada. This creates all kinds of problems when it comes to Canadianizing an industry, or the amalgamation by a Canadian company in order to take over and repatriate an industry to this country.

I do not think this bill should pass without this kind of danger signal being raised. It seems to me that in our great desire to go along with the rest of the world, we are creating these problems for ourselves. What I am really doing is kind of serving notice that from here on these international agreements, particularly when they concern ownership rights, repatriation of dividends and the kind of tax rates that can be levied, should receive much greater consideration then they have in the past. On many occasions in the past we have had to let things go because of lack of information. Let me point out one occasion on which I was very critical of the governor of the Bank of Canada who, at a time when Canada desperately needed to go on a floating exchange rate, because he wanted to maintain his friendship with other bankers around the world opted for a fixed exchange rate.

The point I made at that time, as others did, was that it is fine to be loved by all bankers around the world, and it is fine for everybody to pat you on the head when you meet with the bankers who say that little Canada, or big Canada, is a fine international citizen. But we are cutting our own throats. Many of these international agreements fall into that category.

I pose this dilemma, Mr. Speaker, but, quite frankly, I do not know how you reconcile the great feeling we have in this country, of being co-operative with the rest of the world and not being out of step, with what is going on in the world and is evidently working to our disadvantage because of these international agreements. I think this is one of the great problems with which parliament will have to grapple.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I was not particularly moved to make a speech on such a complicated and technical subject as international taxation, but after listening to some of the remarks of the parliamentary secretary, and having read some of the things he said about S-32 when it was before this House for second reading, a few ideas came to mind which are of interest. It may be that as the afternoon goes forward, the parliamentary secretary or someone on the government side who may be knowledgeable in this field will enlighten myself and others in the House, particularly about my concern as to how the double-taxation system works.

Let us take, for example, the taxation system between Canada and South Africa. First of all, is there a double-taxation system in this regard?

Mr. Sharp: That is irrelevant to this bill.

Mr. Rodriguez: I am interested in the whole question of double-taxation as it affects third world countries.

Mr. Sharp: What is the connection with this bill?

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, the government House leader suggests this is irrelevant to the question before us. There were a lot of things said by the parliamentary secretary that were irrelevant to Bill S-32. He talked about teachers in the future being excluded from this double-taxation agreement. He talked a great deal about that, and about third world taxation.

Mr. Sharp: This has nothing to do with South Africa. It is Israel we are talking about.

● (1220)

Mr. Rodriguez: I raise this question because it is very relevant to the operations of Falconbridge in Namibia. I would like to know, if this kind of double-taxation agreement between Canada and Belgium follows this pattern, whether, in effect, this would be an improvement of any kind in respect of double-taxation with the third world countries where Canadian multinational corporations are exploiting their resources.

I hope the parliamentary secretary, or someone on the government side, will enlighten the House on this question, because if it means what we are doing is coming up with a nice dandy arrangement with the industrialized countries, I want to know how it might be improved to work for the benefit of the developing countries. I suppose it is very nice to have a double-taxation agreement which prevents individuals or companies from being taxed doubly in the home country as well as in the host country, but I wonder when the government will move on a policy to provide that Canadians are not double-taxed. That is an important question.

Canadians living in Canada are double-taxed. For example, in the lumber industry, if a person purchases lumber and the price of a sheet of oak veneer is $25, that price includes the federal sales tax and, on top of that, the 7 per cent provincial sales tax. There are other instances where

Canadians are double-taxed. I would be interested in seeing the government come up with a bill that would provide that Canadians not be doubled-taxed.

I am very happy to see that in this agreement taxpayers, at least, will not enjoy the tax haven which results from coming into Canada and teaching for two years without paying a penny of tax either in Canada or the country of origin. I am glad to see that this is not to be permitted. However, I wish some effort were made to review these conventions with other countries from which teachers come to this country and do not pay a penny of taxes for a year on the wages they receive in Canada. Those would be my concerns in respect of this bill. I trust that the parliamentary secretary or someone on that side will elucidate some of these points, because they are very important to me.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) should be congratulated for his attempt in this House to have a careful examination of this rather complicated piece of tax legislation. I wish to say a few words about some of the good things in the bill. I will deal first with the question of teachers.

For a long time we have had a convention with the United States under which teachers coming to Canada—I hope the parliamentary secretary will correct me if I am wrong—are given a tax exemption for two years. That is not a reciprocal tax convention; in other words, they do not have to pay the tax either in Canada or in the United States for a period of two years. I am not against international agreements with other countries, but it seems that we are being very generous with the teachers from foreign countries when we compare the treatment accorded our own teachers.

A great many of my constituents who work very hard in the lumber industry do not receive any exemption. They do not have access to the variety of deductions people have on the business side. I am pleased to see that in respect of France, Belgium and Israel we have ended this kind of situation. However, I would ask the parliamentary secretary—perhaps he has some information from which he can enlighten the House on this subject—to direct his attention to our situation in respect of other tax conventions, particularly with the United States, since many teachers come to Canada from that country, and with other countries in respect of which these tax conventions and tax concessions to teachers apparently still prevail. It is useful, of course, for someone wishing to settle in Canada to have a tax advantage, but it seems to me we are being far too generous with regard to the tax advantage given people from other countries. I am pleased to see that in these three cases we have started to move away from that particular concession.

I think the hon. member for York-Simcoe and the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) are to be congratulated for taking the stand that we should not pass these rather complicated bills without examination. Like the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge, I do not argue that we should not enter into international conventions, but we have a very special problem in Canada because of the degree of foreign ownership and domination in this country by multinational, foreign corporations.

We know that Canada's multinational corporations, such as Falconbridge, operate on a world scale and perhaps avoid their fair share in contributing to the Canadian economy and the Canadian tax purse because of the lack of conventions or agreements with third world countries. It seems to me that in respect of a company like Falconbridge which goes into Namibia and employs workers there at a rate of something like 90 cents an hour, there should be a convention with that country to rationalize the tax position of Falconbridge. It seems to me we are in the position, surely, of having a moral duty to do all we can to prevent Canadian multinational companies from exploiting workers in the rest of the world.

One way in which we may be able to put pressure on the multinational companies to act in a decent and civilized way would be through tax conventions or agreements with third world countries. It seems to me that in respect of some of our tax convention legislation there is a wide area with which the government has not dealt, an area in which the churches of Canada are giving leadership. For instance, the United Church has taken an active role in respect of companies such as Falconbridge, in which it holds shares, in seeing that the international policy of such companies is consistent with Canadian standards in respect of their operations in the third world countries.

I welcome the legislation. We find it to be good. I do not have any heavy criticism of this bill. It seems to me it is a useful step to move, now, into further conventions with countries around the world so that we can put some pressure on our own multinational corporate citizens who should be acting in a more repsonsible way in respect of the countries of the world.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Due to the fact that the parliamentary secretary has already spoken twice, he would require unanimous consent to answer the questions put forward. Does the parliamentary secretary have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Trudel: First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the reason for this bill, particularly in respect of the three countries in question, is that we are now changing these treaties according to the international code. The draft that was made at OECD has been incorporated in the treaties with the three countries.

● (1230)

Several concerns were expressed. I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to make a few comments on this subject. The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) addressed himself to the subject of patent research in this country. I would like to inform him that, although I share his concern, this bill does not deal with that matter. The hon. member also spoke about multinationals, as did the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). I think there is a convention in existence regarding multinational corporations, requiring them to be good corporate citizens, paying the appropriate taxes.

This bill does not address itself to that issue. It does not assess the rates that would be charged against these multinationals. I am concerned that they pay their proper share

and that they be good corporate citizens, whether in this country or in other countries. This subject has been discussed with various finance ministers, and I am sure it will be continued to be discussed for some years because the proper load of taxes to be carried by these various corporations should be the genuine proportion of taxation either on the international scene or in the country in which the company is operating. If these multinationals are evading taxes, then I think members of the House should be concerned about it, whether it is done by multinationals of Canadian origin or of foreign origin. None of us would like to see that.

Some concern was expressed, regarding taxation under the treaties, by the hon. member for New Westminster and the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). This bill does prevent people from taking advantage of the two-year tax-free ride that they have been having with those three countries. It is our intention to ensure that all the treaties that will be negotiated—and there are many of them—correspond with what has been decided under the present treaties, and that they be based on the same philosophy. We have 16 treaties at present, and we will have two more. At present, a treaty with France is being negotiated, but we anticipate treaties with at least 40 different countries, some of them industrialized countries and others not as highly industrialized and part of the third world.

I think I understand the interest of the hon. member for Nickel Belt. I was the one who answered the question which he posed in the House some time ago when he mentioned Namibia which is not covered under treaty although South Africa is covered at present. We have had no discussions regarding their inclusion under the treaties with which we are dealing. This is not to say that they should not be included, but there have been no such discussions.

Mr. Rodriguez: Why do you not initiate some?

Mr. Trudel: If I may answer that point, I think it takes two people to initiate negotiations. At present we have treaties some of which we are renegotiating, and six more will be coming before the House. We would like to see far more than that.

Another point made was on the issue of double-taxation in Canada. I have to agree that sometimes the same taxpayer is taxed twice or three times, but this matter is not dealt with in the bill, although it is of great concern to many Canadians that in some cases we are being taxed unfairly and at a very high rate. I am sure that this matter is being considered, and I will convey this concern to officials of the department. But it can only be rectified by another piece of legislation or by bringing in changes to other acts.

Reference was made to unfair wages paid to workers outside Canada. If all workers received the same treatment that is being accorded workers in Canada, some of the problems that were mentioned would not occur. This is of concern to the government. There is always room for improvement, but I am sure the standards we have set in Canada can be considered and applied in other countries. At the most recent international conferences some improvements in that area were made, particularly in respect of the third world, by multinational corporations regarding wages and conditions that are imposed on workers, here, again, the Department of External Affairs has been very much involved in these international discussions.

I think I have covered all the issues that were raised, Mr. Speaker. I hope hon. members will give speedy passage to this bill. I am sure that over the years other improvements will be proposed and discussed. But with the amendment which has been included in the bill, all hon. members will be able to consider the changes that will be made to the act over the years. I hope that in the few months before us other amendments and other tax treaties will be included so that we can achieve the fairness which we are seeking.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill S-32, to implement conventions for the avoidance of double-taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium, and Canada and Israel, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Sharp (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, there is somewhat greater latitude at this time to say a few things than there was on second reading. I want to make a general statement about the intent and purpose of the bill. I appreciate the parliamentary secretary's intervention and his reminder to the House that we are not talking about trade marks under this bill. I want to point out the essential difficulty with some of these international agreements, because if you wanted to find a subtitle for this bill it could be "How to make the world safe for multinational Corporations." I say that because the bill is not so much occupied with getting a fair share of the taxes from multinational corporations as with ensuring that they are not taxed in two places at the same time.

● (1240)

I appreciate that there is some element of fairness involved in this concept and we have to adhere to that element of fairness; but the consequence of a bill of this kind is really that multinational corporations can operate easily anywhere in the world. A bill of this kind facilitates the spread and the growth of multinational corporations around the world because, in effect, it provides international protection for them so they can move from one country to another and know what the ground rules are.

I am not going to diminish the importance of multinationals or anything else having a set of ground rules. I

think people should have ground rules; they should know where they stand if they are being asked to invest or if they are invited into a country in order to invest. However, what strikes me as being of far greater importance today than the signing of these kinds of agreements is that the world desperately needs an international convention regarding the behaviour of multinational corporations.

In a very lucid way, my colleague the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) pointed out the kinds of problems which are associated with the expansion of multinational corporations. Recently, at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in New Delhi, this was one of the central questions raised by all the Commonwealth members, because what is becoming quite obvious is that while many of the third world countries resent and find the yoke of the multinationals somewhat difficult, they are so desperate for development that they are willing to have development at almost any cost and under almost any conditions. Given the desperate straits of these countries and their needs, it is very easy for the transnational corporations—if we prefer to call them that, rather than multinational corporations—to strike outrageous bargains with one country, to its disadvantage in terms of taxation and its long-run benefits, as against another.

There are very few hon. members of this House who at one time or another have not been approached by people in large corporations—perhaps not directly, but in the course of conversation, debate, or on other matters—and told that, for instance, Ireland is giving the mining industry a 20-year tax holiday, or that some country in Africa is allowing 30 years without taxation, and that if Canada does not give the corporations that kind of deal they will not operate in Canada but will go elsewhere. I usually tell them to go elsewhere.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: I do not lack confidence in this country to the extent that without the multinational corporations I think we are going to have to be crawling on our hands and knees, only to be told that we are going to go digging something out of the ground. I think we are quite capable of doing our own development, and we would have been much further ahead had we made that kind of decision. But the far greater problem with regard to multinationals is that there is a need to have some kind of international agreement which would prevent their playing one country off against another.

I realize that that kind of agreement cannot be too rigid, because some countries badly need investment and may have to pay a higher price and forgo revenue in order to get investment. That should be the free choice of those countries. But very often it is not a free choice, but a condition which is imposed because there is no UN, international body or international agreement which would limit the kind of arm-twisting tactics which are employed by the transnational corporations against countries which are really not strong enough to stand up for themselves. For that matter, a country like Canada, theoretically, should be strong enough to stand up for itself, yet somehow or other it gets its arm twisted pretty effectively.

That, to me, is the central problem. It is for that reason that, while in principle very few of us can be opposed to international agreements, it strikes me as a bad set of priorities for us to rush into international agreements which are designed almost entirely to facilitate the work of transnational corporations and to make the world safe for them and their revenue, rather than—which in my view is a more important and urgent question—working out with other countries agreements for monitoring and for at least helping each other in terms of the kind of arm-twisting, and sometimes blackmail, which multinational corporations are able to inflict upon nations.

Therefore, as I said earlier, I do not see these agreements being of any great advantage to the average person in Canada. There might be a few pensioners who would benefit from this on a personal basis by not being subject to double-taxation in certain countries, but essentially it is not designed for that purpose. Whenever governments try to do something for large corporations, they always find a few widows, orphans and pensioners and throw them into the pot to show how even-handed they are and how the little man always benefits. But the point is that the problem of double-taxation in most cases does not affect those people. They do not make enough money in most cases to pay single-taxation, let alone double-taxation.

The problem is essentially that large and profitable corporations want to scoot around the world but do not want to get involved in the uncertainties of dealing with one country's tax legislation as opposed to that of another. If a corporation is a domiciled corporation in the sense that it has a physical presence in a country, it has to pay taxes on the same basis as any other corporation. But then all kinds of problems arise—and we know these problems arise—because profits are taxed. But how do we know what the profits are? The government, and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen), admitted that there are difficulties. The AIB, when we questioned it on how it was going to monitor profits, admitted that there are difficulties.

There is the transfer of royalties, which is a deduction against profits, and there is the payment of engineering fees, service fees and all kinds of other costs. In this bill, I see that those things have, at the most, a 15 per cent withholding tax on them and, at least, a 10 per cent withholding tax. That is a far greater problem, because trying to figure out what profit a transnational corporation is making in this country has been admitted by the Department of National Revenue itself to be impossible. For years the department has been trying—although I do not know how hard it has been trying—to monitor these things, but if pressed, and if it is in a particularly honest and frank frame of mind when it is pressed, it will admit that it does not have any control over these particular costs. Saying that the department is taxing the profits of multinational corporations the same as it is taxing any other company's profits is very misleading, because in very many cases the profits of multinational corporations are designed to be what they are prepared to demonstrate them as being to the Canadian government.

We see now that there is a tremendous outflow—probably a deficit of some $2 billion per year—of interest and dividend payments on foreign ownership in Canada, and we are now starting to see the bad effects. I think many of us have seen them for a long time, but more people are starting to see that the investment they made in Canada 10

or 15 years ago, which looked as if it was coming in and was going to do something about creating new jobs and doing all kinds of wonderful things, is no longer doing those things. Instead, there are these tremendous payments outside the country to pay for the investments which came in initially, and we are now on a downward slide with regard to that issue.

I would like to say something more about teachers. I do not know how we ever became involved in agreeing to two-year tax holidays for teachers.

Mr. Leggatt: That's how we got Rodriguez.

Mr. Saltsman: That is how we got the hon. member for Nickel Belt. I think we brought him in under that agreement. I am sure that had the government known the consequences of that agreement, they might have rejected it on the day it was acclaimed.

● (1250)

Mr. Rodriguez: Can this legislation be made retroactive?

Mr. Saltsman: The only thing that can be said about the agreement is that as a consequence of it we got the hon. member for Nickel Belt. There is always something good about legislation, whatever its defects.

I do not know how we ever got involved in this kind of agreement, and I do not know the thinking that went into it. It was typical of the era where some groups of people were picked out to be given favourable tax treatment and nobody seemed to think very badly of it. The argument was that if we did not give special tax treatment to offshore teachers coming to Canada, then our teachers would not get special tax treatment in the countries they go to. What is wrong with that? If Canadians go to another country, surely we expect them to contribute to the taxation of that country, whether they are there as guests or are working. We expect them to abide by the laws of the country and to be as good inhabitants as the permanent residents or citizens. I see no reason why Canadians should be given favourable treatment in other countries, or why people coming to this country should receive tax benefits.

Over the years I have received a great deal of correspondence from people working in our schools who complain bitterly about the tax load they carry in comparison to some of the people who came to Canada and who are virtually laughing at them. I guess it has been caused by the colonial mentality of some of the past governments of this country. I presume they were trying to entice people to Canada, as though we did not have enough teachers or university professors already.

If Canadians are going to countries that really are not in a position to provide their own teachers, I could understand if special financial arrangements have to be made in order to accomplish the national objectives of those countries. But why do it through the tax system? This is perhaps some of the justification for the teacher exemption in the third world countries; but most of the people who go there are not looking for special benefits, but go through a genuine desire to help. If they are to be compensated, it should be done in an above-board manner, either in the form of salary or a grant from one of the agencies involved in this country. The last thing we should do is alter the tax system to handle a few specific problems. In that way the whole system gets fouled up and creates resentment amongst all kinds of people.

The government has acknowledged that the two-year period was not a good thing, and in the new agreements it is signing it is making sure that this benefit is not perpetuated. Most of us are trying to figure out how we got into this mess in the first place. Why did the government ever agree to this kind of measure? I certainly cannot recall the rationale for this move.

Mr. Speaker, while I welcome any move in the direction of international co-operation, and I think in many ways the new agreements we are signing are somewhat better than those we signed in the past, I want to record my concern about the ease with which we take these international agreements at face value. We have done little to explore them for the long run consequences to this country. In the case of the teachers, we probably thought it was a good idea at the time, but we have all lived to regret it.

While I am going to support this legislation because it has a number of good things in it, and my colleagues have indicated they intend to support it, I think there are many things in the bill we are passing today that we shall regret in the future. I think our optimism about international co-operation will be somewhat tinged with regret at making life too easy for the multinational corporations around the world under the umbrella of easy taxation.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) has pointed out very clearly the manner in which agreements such as these tax conventions ease the world for multinational corporations. When we deal with conventions such as this, I cannot help but think of answers given in this House, and statements made in this House by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). When the question of the sale of CANDU reactors to South Korea and Argentina came up, the Prime Minister put a very rhetorical question to members. He asked, "Do we not have a moral responsibility to share our technology with developing countries?" That seemed to be a fair question to put to the House and to the country. I find it a rather interesting question. At the Habitat conference recently, the Prime Minister stated that what the world needs now is love, and what we need is a conspiracy of love.

Since my election to this House I have been raising the question of Falconbridge and its operations in Namibia. I have been calling on the government to ensure that Falconbridge does not enjoy any tax benefits from the exploitation of the resources of Namibia. This country and the United Nations many times have favoured a motion to tell South Africa to get out of Namibia.

I see it is one o'clock, Mr. Speaker. May I call it one o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do not leave the chair until two o'clock later this day.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourned for lunch I had made a few comments about Bill S-32.

Mr. Sharp: That is irrelevant.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, the government House leader suggests that is irrelevant. We shall try to show that the government moves with great speed to set up international conventions for the avoidance of double-taxation. If the government could move at the same speed in other areas, namely, those involving tax avoidance on the part of multinational corporations, we would pat it on the back. I wish the government moved half as fast with respect to multinational corporations which escape paying their fair share of taxes in this country.

Before lunch I was referring to some comments the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made about sharing our nuclear technology, and about our moral responsibility for sharing nuclear technology with developing countries. In his great speech in Vancouver he said that the world needs love; we need a conspiracy of love and love will conquer all. Those were fine words. Mother Teresa answered the Prime Minister well at Habitat when she said he should put his money where his mouth is. The same can be said with respect to this bill. When one considers what the bill is designed to do, and the financial arrangement it encompasses, one must agree that all this has been well arranged.

Ever since being first elected in 1972, I have asked the government to act on certain aspects of international taxation, but I hear only fancy responses like, "We will look into it", "We are studying the matter", and so on. One glaring example of exploitation of a developing country is to be found in Namibia, in southwest Africa. We talk about moral responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, in that regard I wish the Prime Minister and the government would put up or shut up. I wish the government were as decisive in that field as it is in the field under discussion, and would initiate, in that field, the sort of action which has resulted in Bill S-32.

● (1410)

I would be interested if they would take some decisive action to initiate the kind of action which has resulted in this Bill S-32. Namibia has been exploited by South Africa. South Africa has illegally occupied Namibia, in southwest Africa. The United Nations and this country participated in a vote informing South Africa that it ought to get out of Namibia.

Mr. Stevens: What about the Cuban troops in Angola?

Mr. Rodriguez: What about the American troops in Viet Nam? Let us not get into that; I shall not be diverted by the interjection of the hon. member for York-Simcoe. I return to the subject of Namibia. This country took a position. We said this country must be turned over to the Namibians: only Namibians could enter into long-term agreements with multinational companies to exploit those resources. What do we find? We find that the United Nations appointed an administrator, Mr. Sean McBride—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I suggest the hon. member should get back to the terms of Bill S-32.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a measure to regulate international taxation. Other members will get their turn to speak. We need an international convention which would prevent multinational corporations avoiding their proper taxation and exploiting countries in which they are operating. Earlier this morning the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge pointed out that we can come up with agreements such as Bill S-32 which very nicely regulates the flow of income and the development of multinationals and allows them to grow. But nothing in Bill S-32 speaks about the behaviour of multinational corporations and their acceptable behaviour in third world countries.

It is within this context of international taxation that we have in Namibia the Falconbridge Nickel Corporation, which is a multinational organization. While the government has a double-taxation agreement with South Africa, it has no such agreement with respect to Namibia. I have called on the government to act with some speed in this area, to make sure that Falconbridge does not write off any of the cost of its operations in Namibia. I have asked it to take this action in order to live up to the moral responsibility which the Prime Minister has talked about and which we hold up in the world because we say we have a moral responsibility toward the developing countries. This is very important. The whole question of tax avoidance is very important. The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge, speaking in the House in the same vein on February 27, 1976, as recorded at page 11321 of *Hansard* asked the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) the following question:

> On June 12, 1973, the minister's predecessor announced in a speech to the Inter-American Centre of Tax Administrators that the government was launching a campaign to crack down on multinationals evading taxes. On November 19, 1975, the current minister announced the formation of a joint U.S.-Canada committee to study the same question. On February 23, 1976, the minister's department announced that because of spending restraints, all such plans had been shelved. While a penny saved may be a penny earned, in this case, does the minister feel that the savings in wages and salaries outweigh the loss of forgone corporate taxes?

In reply, the Minister of National Revenue stated:

> Mr. Speaker, within a month after my appointment to this portfolio, I met with Don Alexander, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service in the United States. We set up a committee to look into how we might act under the Canada-United States tax treaty to get at multinationals and transnationals which are using the tax haven to avoid taxes. Mr. Alexander will be back here following the report of that committee. We will be meeting again. I, like every other minister, would like to have all the resources necessary. Personally, I do not think it is a waste of money. I think it is an investment to get back the hundreds of millions of dollars. To me, a tax haven is anathema. Within the scope that we have, both the resources, financial and man-years, we will do our best to plus these particular abuses.

Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious that many millions of dollars, over a billion dollars in taxes which the minister has estimated as being due from the corporations, are lost to this country. If we had a billion dollars more in taxes which we could collect, we would not have to cut back medicare and we would not have to introduce cutbacks in the social welfare field. But lo and behold, that has all gone

out of the window. The whole effort of trying to plug the loopholes which multinationals can use to get out of paying their fair share of taxes goes out the winddow.

This agreement with the three countries, set out in Bill S-32, is all very fine. But when we come to the crux of the problem, the tough measures which must be taken, those things seem to go by the wayside and, lo and behold, the old anti-inflation program which is used to avoid setting up the necessary machinery so that we can get these multinationals to pay their fair share of taxes.

We are not calling attention to something that is not happening. We are not talking about something that isn't so. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has said there are about 20 cases presently under investigation or before the courts, and they are there because of attempts to avoid paying taxes in Canada. The whole question of whether these corporations operate for the benefit of Canada or for the benefit of their own narrow interests is fairly obvious in these cases. As a matter of fact, Dominion Bridge, a very large multinational company, was found guilty of avoiding taxation—and it seems this is only one small example; there are many other companies which involve themselves in that sort of thing.

In the same way as it developed Bill S-32, we would have hoped the government might have acted with speed and rapidity in doing something about the Namibian situation. Why do we always have to be on the wrong side of this question? Why are we always seen as propping up the large, multinational corporations which are only interested in exploiting the black people of South Africa? It seems to me we have to stand up and say, "No more will you operate as you have been doing."

In my area, Falconbridge laid off 600 workers last fall. They get all sorts of tax breaks from both the provincial and the federal governments. By the international body we shall be seen as supporting this kind of tax rip-off, this kind of tax avoidance by Canadian multinational corporations in much the same way as our neighbour to the south, unfortunately, is viewed by the developing countries of the world. It is interesting to look at the governments in the third world with which we reach agreement: it is always with a junta or some kind of autocratic rule, and therefore the benefits of any taxation measure never flow to the people in that country.

● (1420)

We will probably end up supporting this bill, Mr. Speaker, but we do want to take the opportunity to point out some of the concerns this party has about international taxation and the sort of moves we think the government should be making in this area. We hope that the government will act with all the expedition they can summon, given their moral responsibility which they have often touted here and abroad, and this great wellspring of love that the Prime Minister seems to have discovered at the Habitat conference. I am hopeful but, knowing the Liberals, my hope may be misplaced. Hon. members opposite can hide all they want behind the anti-inflation program, but the fact remains that if the government can put the bite on collecting over $1 billion of tax lost to Canada, we can do many things with that money that we keep putting off.

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

It is too bad the minister is not here, but I see his parliamentary secretary is present. I have listened to his answers in the past about the Namibian question, and I should like to reiterate that the situation in South Africa is deteriorating rapidly, with 50 more people killed today. If the government does not take quick action we will forever seem to be among the exploiters of the third world.

I want to bring home to the parliamentary secretary the point that no one but the government can move against Falconbridge in the area of taxation and prevent their writing off their Namibian operation against their Canadian operation. The government can do this through the federal Income Tax Act, and they should do it. I call upon the parliamentary secretary to convey that message to his minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

Mr. Paproski: Filibuster.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who said something about a filibuster is obviously not interested in what is being said here today. The remarks of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) were entirely related to this bill. He was not attempting to move into areas that were not directly related to the legislation before the House, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to do exactly what he did.

Mr. Sharp: We all know that you are filibustering Bill C-68 as well.

Mr. Leggatt: I am not going to stand in this House and allow this kind of legislation to pass without proper examination. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), to his credit, made some major contributions to this debate and his remarks were directly related to the bill and the questions it raises, as I hope mine will be.

Just before the dinner hour we were dealing with the problem raised by the parliamentary secretary which has been partially solved, namely, the question of the two-year tax exemption for teachers. What I want to know—I hope the parliamentary secretary will be given the opportunity to respond this afternoon—is whether the tax convention with the United States is still operative. I have not been able to get an answer to that question, but it seems to me that it is most important since so many U.S. teachers are coming to this country and are being given this tax advantage.

Another provision which is common to most other conventions, and from which the three countries mentioned in this bill are being exempted, is this: a teacher from a third world country who comes to Canada is provided with a two-year tax exemption. He has received his training in his country of origin in the third world. We are employing someone of great talent and skill who was trained to make a contribution in his own country. I am not against bringing such people to Canada, but I am against providing this kind of major tax concession.

I hope the parliamentary secretary can tell me what is the position vis-à-vis the United States. My understanding—I will be happy to be corrected if I am wrong—is that at the present time the United States is one of the coun-

tries with whom we do not have a tax convention. Surely, if ever there was a country with whom we do need a tax convention, it is the United States. I see the parliamentary secretary is shaking his head and I will not proceed if I am wrong, but my understanding is that a conscious decision was taken to allow the last convention to lapse, partly because of the introduction of the anti-inflation program of the government. If the parliamentary secretary is better informed than I am, I should be happy to hear what he has to say.

Another problem with international tax conventions continues to be the difficulty nations have in getting a fair share of tax revenue from multinational corporations. We face the same sort of problem in Canada in attempting to impose proper guidelines on multinational corporations. We do not have control of their internal bookkeeping, with the result that by overcharging for some services, and undercharging for others, they are able to escape tax. When a product is exchanged between a parent company and its subsidiary, there is no law that says it has to be exchanged at fair market value; therefore, revenue can be attracted by the company that will pay least tax.

There is, of course, a tremendous amount of manipulation going on in the world today on the part of multinationals in order to maximize their profits and deprive countries all over the world not merely Canada, of their fair share of tax revenue to which their citizens are entitled. I could give numerous examples of this sort of thing. The situation is similar to one of our boards that tries to regulate, for example, the investments of a telephone company. They may be allowed 6 per cent or 10 per cent on their investment, but what they are doing, in fact, is getting their own subsidiaries to sell them services well above market value, thereby siphoning off the profits into that subsidiary.

Take the case of a U.S. multinational corporation that has a Canadian subsidiary. The U.S. corporation can set rental rates for, for example, computer services. They can set the charges for a variety of other services rendered to the subsidiary, and as a result the profits of the Canadian subsidiary are reduced and thus fall within the AIB guidelines. This means that they can legally avoid the tax consequence. Then the parent company, whose head office may be in Bermuda or some tax haven like the Bahamas, gets all this money tax free.

Not only the Canadian public but people all over the world are getting a little tired of multinationals ripping people off. What we need desperately, and what I hope Canada will be party, to, is not merely bilateral tax conventions but an international tax convention that is administered by an international body like the United Nations, so that finally we can have equity and justice so far as the operations of these multinational corporations are concerned. At the moment they are operating well above the law and no nation has yet been successful in controlling the sort of manipulations that have taken place for such a long time.

The question of double taxation is interesting but quite often, instead of avoiding double taxation, as a result of the convention there is no taxation at all. Let me give the House an example of this. A British citizen who resides in Britain but whose revenues are obtained from Canada does not have to pay Canadian tax on his Canadian income. He has to pay tax on his British income, but because he is a British resident his Canadian income is tax free according to the convention. This tax free money remains such, and Canada continues to lose this tax revenue. The British resident is able to obtain this tax free money because of an anomaly in the tax convention. That is not double taxation; that is no taxation at all.

● (1430)

There are many examples in this country where a loophole opens up as a direct result of that tax convention. When one looks at how aggressively this government has proceeded in terms of closing these tax loopholes, which admittedly it is attempting to do in the bill before us, it is interesting to go back through some of the clippings and attitudes of some of the ministers. For example, on June 13, 1975, in the Ottawa *Citizen* it was stated that the then consumer and corporate affairs minister, Mr. Basford, had pointed out that the government was about to strike out at those multinational loopholes. The article stated:

> Revenue minister Ron Basford plans to spend more of the government's money in order to boost its revenues by eliminating tax loopholes.

The article then stated Mr. Basford said:

> As society becomes more complex, as taxpayers become even more sophisticated, governments must invest more money in their tax systems to close the tax gap—

I have not seen any evidence in this House of that, but that was away back in June, 1975. There has been ample opportunity for moves in terms of the literally millions of dollars that Canada is losing. Let me give another example. I will quote from the February 24, 1976, edition of the Ottawa *Citizen*. The article is by Peter Cook and stated in part:

> The federal government has shelved plans to close a tax loophole that costs the country "hundreds of millions of dollars" because the government cannot afford the expert investigators needed.
>
> The loophole involves multinational firms that set up foreign subsidiaries and then divert income out of Canada to lessen tax liability.
>
> Last June, Ron Basford, then revenue minister, said the practice was costing hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue. He promised a series of proposals to "significantly strengthen Canada's compliance effort."
>
> The measures meant hiring experts to evaluate the cost of goods and materials being shipped in and out, and to set fair market values for tax assessment.
>
> Revenue department spokesmen say government austerity measures have given the project low priority.

Surely we are being penny wise and pound foolish in this House when we start to cut things like expenditures on social services, yet we at the same time cut things in areas where we could increase tax revenues, such as the hiring of tax investigators and other people who could get out and try to stop the flow of legitimate tax funds from government coffers. We should be moving in these areas particularly in regard to the multinationals, so that they do not continue to milk the Canadian public as they have been doing for some time. The article continues:

> The usual way of lessening tax payments is to underprice exports or overprice imports from a subsidiary located in a tax haven, or to charge artificially high expenses against the subsidiary.
>
> To spot this, tax investigators must have thorough knowledge of the cost of materials and true market value.

Sometimes detection is impossible if a firm is shipping a new product, or if a product has a number of components. As an example, when oil is shipped to Canada from Venezuela via a tax haven, investigators may find themselves arguing over pricing of particular grades and chemical formulas.

Oil and chemical industries can best take advantage of this method of lessening tax. Very often, extra charges are laid against transportation.

The devices are there and they are being used, and it is costing Canadian taxpayers millions and millions of dollars every year. The poor fellow who works for wages in this country, who gets no deduction for anything appreciable at all and who sees the taxes taken off his cheque every month in advance, is getting a little tired of pious statements from the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs about closing tax loopholes, while at the same time hearing statements that we cannot afford to hire extra investigators. I say this is something the government should be thoroughly ashamed of. It should be thoroughly ashamed of allowing the multinational corporations to siphon Canadian tax dollars without doing anything about it, without making the kind of investigation in depth, and without hiring the small research staff needed in terms of investigation so we can begin to attack the problem.

The bill before us does not attack the problem. It does not do anything at all about the problem. What we have done in this party is sort of give this a back-of-the-hand support. We should like to have seen some meaningful legislation which dealt with these tax and revenue transfers between the multinationals of one country and Canadian subsidiaries.

Another indication of the cost of this negligence can be found in this article by Mr. Jonathan Manthorpe in the *Globe and Mail* of October 31, 1975. This is what is said here:

Canada is losing hundreds of millions of dollars a year to people and companies that avoid taxes, and a lot of it is being lost to multinational corporations using their international status to shuffle their profits out of the taxman's reach.

James Gourley, director-general of audit for Revenue Canada, says some of the multinationals use their intricate corporate structures to minimize the taxes they pay.

He said that at present there is not the staff, expertise or co-operation necessary among countries to stop them.

Mr. Gourley said that for governments, "it's a very expensive type of tax collecting. Unfortunately we are up against the best tax brains in the world. These companies don't move today unless they know all the tax laws and then they just run around them all."

We need a combination of two things. We need to move toward international conventions in terms of the role of the multinational corporation in the world. But there is a lot we can do in Canada just in terms of turning our attention to the problem, such as hiring investigators and getting legal people to research and examine our own tax laws, at the same time looking at multinational corporations and the service charges between foreign companies and their subsidiaries. Surely we can move in this area to some extent, and then in the long range move to the international situation with world conventions in respect of this particular subject.

It is interesting to note that the government is able now to produce an international agreement between three countries and Canada which goes some distance toward rationalizing tax problems. However, our record in international agreements in another field, which involves the nuclear CANDU reactor, is a sorry one indeed in terms of providing security to Canadians. We may be very much more secure in respect of companies and taxes as a result of this particular agreement, but we are doing nothing for Canadians in the field of providing international safey as we flog CANDU reactors like vacuum cleaners around the world.

Mr. Rodriguez: Loss-leadering them.

Mr. Leggatt: We are loss-leadering them. We should be prosecuted under our own consumer protection laws for what we are doing with the CANDU reactor. That is an example of how not to go about entering international treaties. By moving very quickly in flogging this reactor we are doing a great deal to create the hazard of proliferation, for which this country may be ashamed in the future.

We will support the legislation. We understand the feelings of those countries that are interested, undoubtedly, in having the legislation passed. It is not our purpose to see this legislation unnecessarily delayed, but I must say that I resent any comment in this House that there is some kind of filibuster going on in respect of this bill. We are asking for the performance of a duty that every member of parliament should have, which calls for a careful examination of legislation that comes before them. That is what we are attempting to do in this party.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

● (1440)

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, be read the third time and do pass.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) has the floor.

An hon. Member: No filibuster.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): No; this is just good sense. Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my remarks last night that someone had handed me a blank page and that I would try to carry on from there. I now have notes and I hope to be able to be a little more to the point this afternoon.

As we know by now, this legislation provides for capping federal contributions to medicare. The provision, of course, was for a 50-50 sharing formula. The legislation now provides that for the year 1976-77 there will be a cap of 13 per

cent, that in 1977-78 there will be a cap of 10.5 per cent, in 1978-79 there will be a cap of 8.5 per cent, and that thereafter there will be authority to set ceilings. That sounds innocuous enough, but really it amounts to the beginning of a complete change of philosophy and direction by the government.

I do not think the Canadian public is fully aware of the philosophic direction in which the government is moving. I am sure the government thinks it is moving in the direction the public desires in terms of social services. I think that at the next election members of the government will be very disappointed. The fact is that the country still needs a great deal in the area of health services. We have taken much for granted since medicare came in. Admittedly, this was a significant step forward, for which by the way full credit should be given to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), who I believe should go down in history as the person who brought a decent, humane and proper approach to the provision of medical care. I hope history will give him the recognition he so richly deserves in respect of the policy for which he had fought over many years.

There are many areas into which we must move. One is the area of environmental health. An increasing number of people in this country are victims of cancer because of the way in which we treat the environment. When the federal government abandons its leadership role, and when it says, "We will leave it up to you fellows. We will give you some tax points, or you must use your own money", what it is doing is abandoning its role in providing quality medical care for Canadians.

There must be inducements for the provinces to move into new areas. By the abandonment of leadership in this field, at the federal level, we will be committing a great number of Canadians to ill health and even to death as a result of the failure to move in the field of research, the environment and preventive health care. We have completed the first phase of medicare in Canada. We have removed the financial burden which meant that a father sometimes would not send his children to a doctor because he did not have the money to pay the doctor. Much pride goes with poverty. There are examples, in the years before we had a medical care scheme, of people who literally were crippled as a result of the refusal of the family to seek charity, or simply because of their shame at not having sufficient funds.

Now, to the credit of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, and to the credit of people who came after him, such as Lester B. Pearson, that particular burden has to a large extent been lifted. However, we have not gone into the second phase, which must be a change in the delivery system relating to health care in Canada. That does not mean that we will eliminate private medicine, but we must have a two-stream medical system. In fact, we can provide a public health and public medical system and stream it alongside the private system. The two systems can be rationalized one with the other. In this way we can have public health services and public health doctors for treatment in those areas where we have difficulty establishing private medical clinics.

All through the north and in areas of my province there is need for a two-stream medical service delivery system. I do not have anything against private medicine in particular; I think our doctors do a good job in Canada. However, there are many other areas of health where treatment is needed. There must be an expansion of medical services into the public area so that we can get to the real problem of health in respect of Canadians. I refer not merely to the treatment of sick people but to the question of keeping people well.

This lends itself more to the public health sector than to the private sector. There is an element of inefficiency in the private sector. Too often, if we go to a private clinic we see a large X-ray machine and other equipment and then see that equipment duplicated in the hospital down the street. It seems to me that the medical profession in the private sector could do a great deal to release some of the great amount of funds available to it.

One thing medicare has done is make sure that the doctors are reasonably well paid for their services. In the days before medicare, when some of us were young lawyers, a good percentage of the medical bills were never collected. Some doctors sent them to a collection agency, while others did not. A large percentage of the charges were not paid. That situation has been cured under the medical care scheme, and so it should be. The fact is the profession has been treated rather well by the medical care scheme.

I am pleased to note that the medical profession does not have a closed mind in respect of alternative methods of delivery. A great many of my friends in the profession talk about a two-stream system whereby we might place reasonable emphasis on the preventive area.

In respect of our medicare system, I believe we have a program which is superior to that in the United States. I do not say it is superior to that of countries in western Europe, because I think many countries are ahead of us. If we examine the percentage of the gross national product used for the provision of medical care in the United States, we find that it is 8 per cent. In Canada, even though we hear complaints about people going to doctors when it is not necessary, which I do not believe really is the case in many instances, the percentage of the gross national product is only 6 per cent for medical care. That is an indication that medicare is efficient.

The decision of the government to abandon medicare, in the sense of capping it, really flies in the face of the example which medical care schemes have provided. Canada's medical care scheme may be very closely copied in the next United States election as a platform for the Democratic party. We should be proud of what we have accomplished, although there is much more to be done. The government does not seem to be giving the Canadian people the leadership they want. The people do not want a fractionalization of the scheme. They do not want different standards for Prince Edward Island and Ontario. They want a national standard. They want to move into the area of prevention as a main lifestyle. Prevention means taking another look at the advertising of tobacco and alcohol.

An hon. Member: Better tell that to Stanley.

Mr. Leggatt: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is one of the best examples of a man in good health clothed in an ambiguous body.

● (1450)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Leggatt: When we look at prevention we must consider smoking, alcohol, and the provision of drugs, both medical and non-medical, which in my view are abused to a great extent. We must look to the government for leadership in lifestyle modification, changes in habits in terms of advertising and of trying to change public habits and attitudes in those areas which are so thoroughly unhealthy.

The next matter we should consider is nutrition. A dramatic example is the one of the farmers on Parliament Hill, which should make us realize that in a country which overproduces milk to the extent we do now, and where Coca-Cola is sold at approximately the same price, there is something wrong. We can make national provision of milk for school lunches right across the country without any trouble and at minimum cost. In the long run this will lower our medical costs because of the nutritional value of that product, which we should be pushing in our schools rather than pop and other junk foods.

We should encourage all Canadians to continue to have routine medical examinations. The result of this legislation will be the beginning of deterrent fees, a clear backward step from what we have become accustomed to. When we get back to the reasons for the bill, the argument is that costs are rising so fast and are so out of line that we have no choice but to cap them at this end. When you examine the figures, you find that sort of argument questionable indeed. The figures for the increase in medical care costs, the increase in the federal contribution, are quite interesting. When you break them down on a national basis, you find that in 1972-1973 the increase was 7.6 per cent; in 1973-1974 it was 8.8 per cent; and in 1974-1975 it was 6.6 per cent. Each year the increase was well below inflation in Canada, yet here we have a government which does not even want to keep its increasing contribution in step with the rate of inflation. Even that is too much. This is a niggardly, Scrooge approach to the question of the provision of medical care.

It is interesting that in my own province of British Columbia the federal contribution was 13.9 per cent in 1970-1971. It was reduced all the way down to 5.9 per cent in 1974-1975, and 1974-1975 was the year of the NDP government in that province which allegedly was squandering money; at least this was the theory abroad. It is certainly not indicated in the provision of medical care in that province or the reduction of the federal government's contribution to those medical services. As I say, the capping is unnecessary. The costs are not increasing at a rate which is inordinate or unreasonable, and by limiting the increase we are taking away the provincial inducement to move into new areas.

One area with which I want to deal now and which I think is most important is environmental health. More and more in this country we find that as we alter the natural state of the environment, as we provide new chemicals and new pesticides, and as we provide insulating materials such as asbestos and new plastics, new forms of cancer emerge. We cannot let that happen to the Canadian people. But by abandoning the federal contribution in medicare that is exactly what we are doing. The standard of living that we have in this country in the south is now becoming dependent upon the poisoning of Indians in the north.

It is to our shame that we see at English river, in northwestern Quebec, in Mistassini and other places, our native people suffering from Minamatas disease. The reason they have been suffering from Minamata disease is that the standard of life in the south is higher. We have industrialized areas in the north and we have taken risks with the future of the Indians. What are we repaying them with? The most we are doing at English River is to tell them not to eat the fish.

It is time we did something in terms of full compensation for native people but, most important, it is time we learned a lesson from Minamata disease in this country, that you do not move into an area in a rush for spoils, profit and money in the process of which you destroy the environment and kill the native people. That has been the tradition in this country. Let us make no mistake about it. We have nothing to be proud of in the way we settled Canada, in terms of our native population. That is what we are still doing when we consider the mercury poisoning that is now taking place in these areas of Canada.

We have a real problem with vinyl chlorides in the provision of plastics. Liver cancers are developing at an alarming rate. The interesting thing about preventing cancer is that it takes 20 years for lung cancer to develop in asbestos workers. The workers themselves do not feel the immediate risk, although they are running a high risk daily. They need the money, they have to continue to work. We cannot sit idly by as parliamentarians, nor can this government sit idly by and let this continue. We still do not have mandatory regulations regarding the use of masks in asbestos mines. Admittedly, we brought in some ambient air standards.

We still have not done anything with regard to tailings or with regard to drill standards. The wind can blow tailings all over the place. Only a minor amount of asbestos causes cancer. Are we to abandon the fight against cancer because of this government's niggardly approach to medical care and its tragic departure from principles in which they once believed? There is no question that what we are seeing in Bill C-68 is the end of the purported just society and the end of those great promises of 1968. It is all over now.

● (1500)

Mr. Rodriguez: The society of love.

Mr. Leggatt: The flower children are gone. They are now working in the asbestos mines.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): And eating contaminated fish.

Mr. Leggatt: We are now living in a so-called society of love.

I feel very strongly that we should try to do what we can to prevent the government from moving in such a disastrous direction and that we should not deal with this bill at this time. I am convinced that this is a very inappropriate time to do so. Indians are in need of help, and medical services still need to be provided. I believe it is now time to

hoist this bill and give the government a chance to have another look at what it is doing to a program in which all Canadians have taken pride for so long.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth):

That Bill C-68 be not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day six months hence.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment put forward by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) is a very wise one indeed. What we see happening with respect to the actions of the government with regard to medicare reminds me of the definitions of a Tory and a Liberal. A Conservative is one who stands at the seashore, sees someone drowning 20 yards offshore, throws out a rope which is 15 yards long, and expects the drowning person to show initiative and swim the other five yards to catch the rope. A Liberal is one who stands at the seashore, sees someone drowning 20 yards offshore, throws out a 20 yard rope, and when the drowning person grabs the rope and starts pulling, the Liberal drops it. That is the kind of thing we see in Bill C-68. The government is trying to beat a hasty retreat from a program which has proved to be what the government expected it to be.

Mr. Fairweather: All you do is throw out the Regina Manifesto.

Mr. Rodriguez: I do not know. There are some Tories who would do other things with the rope.

The medicare program in Canada has been held up by the government as an exemplary program. The United States sent representatives from its Senate, led by Senator Ted Kennedy, to come here and study our medicare program, the universality of our program, and the way the program is operated, because the Americans do not have a similar program. This government was very proud to run around beating its breast and holding up its program as being exemplary.

However, what do we find the government attempting to do in Bill C-68? The government has proposed a withdrawal from an area which is vital to the national health and security of this nation. Indeed it is rather interesting to note the unilateral action which is being proposed by the government. Here we have a government which has talked about co-operative federalism and said that the decisions in Canada are made through discussions between the federal government and the provincial governments, and that they try to work out co-operatively decisions which are acceptable to all sides. Bill C-68 jettisons that whole concept of co-operative federalism, and the government is taking a unilateral position with respect to medicare.

When we entered into medicare, it should be noted that it was the socialists of Canada who pushed and pushed for a minimum level of medicare and of health services in this country and finally obtained it. After having been promised it since 1919, we finally ended up with a medicare program.

The present program was held out by the federal government, and the federal government encouraged the provinces to join and participate in providing medical care coverage. It might not affect wealthy provinces so much when the federal government withdraws from some of the areas of medicare coverage, but it seems to me that the poorer provinces in Canada will have a very difficult time reaching even that minimum level of medicare and health services to which their citizens have become accustomed. It seems to me that it is only right that the whole question should be reviewed after six months, instead of moving with such undue haste into this area. This is what we are saying in the amendment of the hon. member for New Westminster.

This motion would give the government the opportunity to go back and sit down with the provincial ministers of health to try to work out an agreement which would ensure that the medicare services of this country are maintained. Indeed, they should not only be kept at their present level but should be expanded to cover many of the other areas which the hon. member for New Westminster pointed out in his excellent presentation this afternoon.

We on this side of the House have said time and time again that any tampering with the present medicare act will result in a loss of services to parts of the country which cannot afford to pick up the cost of carrying the program. There can be no doubt that this bill may damage forever both the quality of health care in Canada and the quality of our health insurance program.

Canada's health system has served the people of this country very well, and it is only right that at this point in time this party should vehemently protest any changes which will cause a reduction in the delivery of health care services across the country. When our party first introduced this idea in Saskatchewan, it fought the vested interests. There is no question that there were some who were opposed to medicare. This party fought for the right of every man, woman, and child in that province and in the country to have the benefits of decent health care. This party fought for an idea which would guarantee access to the needs of life, and it also fought so that we would not have to depend on wealth alone to provide what is essential and what is a right of Canadians.

Where were the Liberals and Tories at that time? We knew where they were. They opposed that idea. They used all kinds of excuses. They called it socialism and interfering in the lives of the Canadian people. Then they used the old bogeyman of cost and said that we could not afford a universal medicare program. We have experienced that kind of opposition over the years, and that is why we are so leery about Bill C-68. We see it as the thin end of the wedge to revert back to the situation where only those who have wealth will be able to enjoy health care. That is what we are leery about, and that is why we take such a firm stand in opposing any changes of this kind in a unilateral way.

● (1510)

We know that the Liberals in Saskatchewan fought medicare tooth and nail. It was only because of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) and his colleagues that the Liberals of Saskatchewan were dragged kicking and screaming into the twentieth century. Looking back at the scene in Canada, that seems to have happened federally as well. The federal government did not like medicare but gradually we forced them to accept it

because it worked so well elsewhere. They are all running around now boasting what a fine medicare program we have, yet they are ready to use the scalpel on it. The Liberals had never liked the program. I would be the last member in this House to accuse them of being politically motivated, but they finally picked up the idea and saw it had some relevance and acceptance in the country.

Were the Tories any different, Mr. Speaker? Look at them in Ontario today. Frank Miller runs around the province like some avenger, just turning up at a hospital and telling the administrative staff that it is being closed down. We saw that with Doctors' Hospital in Toronto, but the staff there won a stay of closure in the courts. Now the Ontario government has appealed that. The Doctors' Hospital was serving the ethnic people in one area, and indeed some of the staff speak many languages. This is the kind of action which can only discriminate against newcomers to this country who might not be familiar with our ways. The Tory government in Ontario talks about restraint, but not about restraining itself. Why does it not start restraining its own expenditures instead of hacking away at essential services?

The federal Tories are not any different. The Canadian Medical Association tells us of the need for psychiatric care, but here in the Ottawa area they are cutting down on psychiatric beds, and this after we have been told they are one of the biggest needs in society today.

The Tories and Liberals have never supported programs like medicare but have always opposed them. It was only because of the vision of people like the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands and members of his party and of the CCF who fought for and achieved their goals that we have this program today. Now the government wants to hack away at it, but we are not going to stand here and let it take it apart piece by piece in this phony fight against inflation. It is all right to fight inflation, Mr. Speaker, but the government blew $16 million bucks and we have not got even one plane for it. Members of the government should be ashamed of themselves. They go out and elect one guy who has an ego as big as the Olympic project, and build the Olympic project for $1.5 billion without batting an eyelash.

Today we talked about the multinational corporations getting away without paying over $1 billion that is due in taxes. The government talks about fighting inflation but what kind of fighters are its members? It has often been referred to as "the law of the sea" kind of thing—it is women, old folks, and the unemployed first, but the corporate citizen sits back at the Rideau Club with his Liberal and Tory friends and gets the benefits of the fight against inflation. That is shameful. Then they have the gall to say they are interested in people.

The government says we are spending too much on medicare and on the health of the nation, but as has been pointed out previously the percentage of our Gross National Product spent on health care has been dropping, not increasing. One thing we cannot afford in this country is to have people debilitated by lack of proper medical care. We hear a lot about the man days lost through strikes and lockouts. The Tories are famous for asking questions in the House about this, but do we hear about the number of man days lost due to sickness? The number is triple that of the time loss due to labour problems, and it is growing. Why do we not tackle that type of problem?

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

We know something about industrial diseases in my area. Surely the government could do something through Atomic Energy of Canada or the commissions and acts that exist. It is the government's responsibility to ensure that people working in the uranium mines are not exposed to undue danger. Would it not be cheaper to prevent a person contracting silicosis that to treat him afterwards? This government and the Ontario government have reneged on their responsibility to see that safety levels are enforced. We read of the asbestos workers at Kananaskis walking around with asbestos fibres in their feet and breathing the fibres that float around the atmosphere. We have to ask what price we are going to have to pay 25 years from now perhaps to support their widows and orphaned children. We are now faced with the cost of the carelessness of those people who had responsibility for enforcing health standards at the INCO and Syncrude plants.

The cost of preventive medicine and delivery of services to those parts of the country that do not have them surely cannot be considered in the same light as the health of the people. Surely there is no comparison, Mr. Speaker. There are certain things that Canadians have a right to such as decent housing at reasonable cost, and education for the people as far as their abilities will take them. And we have said, although this government has never accepted it, that every Canadian has the right to a job. There ought to be a policy of full employment. Surely the other right that Canadians have is the right to adequate health care whether they live in the outposts of Newfoundland, in Vancouver, Toronto or Nickel Belt. Surely Canadians who live in the slow growth areas of Canada have as much right to the best medical services available as Canadians living in downtown Toronto who may earn $40,000 per year.

● (1520)

Surely all of our people have a right to decent medical care. My party believes that the government, by introducing Bill C-68, has retreated from that concept. For that it should hang its head in shame. Its action is despicable. It is limiting the rights of the people of this country to proper health care.

Those are not the only rights the governments has eroded. The right to free collective bargaining, for which many people were jailed, for which others were knocked on the head, and even died, went through the window when the government introduced the anti-inflation program. At present the right of our people to decent health care and medicare is being attacked and eroded by the government. We shall oppose that process of erosion as far as we can. We have proposed an amendment which we hope is accepted.

The government ought to consider again, with the provincial ministers of health, the status of the present program. That, it seems to me, is only fair. We should not cut back with regard to medicare. Instead, we should consider expanding the program. When the government talks about saving money by cutting back on health care, it does not take into account what these cutbacks will cost the people. Those costs one cannot calculate.

We ought to be concerned about the nutrition of our children. Having taught for 16 years in the province of Ontario I am aware of what some children eat and know how well nourished or otherwise some of our school children are.

An hon. Member: So you are responsible for the mess.

Mr. Rodriguez: No, the provincial Tory government is responsible for the mess in the Ontario educational system. They loused it up. They centralized the Ontario educational system; yet we hear the Tories talking about decentralizing government services. I have never heard such phony nonsense spoken in all my life. That party is sucking and blowing at the same time.

An hon. Member: So are you.

Mr. Rodriguez: The whole gang of them are doing it. You will see when we become the government in Ontario what we shall do to this province's educational system. It will be the envy of the world. I ask, how much money do we waste in our schools trying to teach children who cannot learn because they have not been fed enough of the right foods. Half the time, instead of teaching these kids, we tranquilize them. I have seen this time and again. Our dairy farmers are prepared to dump milk. I suggest that we could clear up the milk surplus at once by giving each of our school children a quart of milk a day.

An hon. Member: Dump a quart a day down each school child's throat.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is an excellent suggestion. That way we could clear up the surplus in no time at all. Such nutritional help could be of great advantage to children and does not come under medical care.

I have seen the results of the Nutrition Canada survey commissioned by the government. I do not think government members read reports which the government itself has commissioned. We spend taxpayers' dollars on these reports. The survey clearly shows that eating the wrong foods leads to tooth decay, obesity, and ill health.

An hon. Member: Just look across the way for some examples.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, looking at the Liberals I can say that I have never seen a sleeker looking lot of people anywhere, except in the ranks of the Tories. I have never seen a sleeker looking bunch of fat cats than when I have been in the Ontario legislature looking down at Bill Davis and his cats.

Mr. Paproski: The hon. member looks pretty sleek.

Mr. Rodriguez: The hon. member is purring. Government members should be encouraged to read government commission reports. If they did, perhaps they might be more inclined to spend money where it ought to be spent, instead of cutting back on essential services.

Government members ought to be encouraged to read the Treasury Board's report about injuries in the Public Service of Canada in 1974-75. According to that report, in the year 1974-75 there were 22,218 accidents in the public service which cost us, directly, over $7 million. Over 10,000 of these injuries took place in that department which considers itself the friend of the working class, the Post Office. Almost 7,000 of those injuries were disabling. As I said, the total cost of public service injuries was over $7 million. That cost does not include the cost of medicare given to the people involved. I suggest that the true cost of the injuries would be much higher if one included the cost of medical care.

In Ottawa, I discovered that the majority of lung-related diseases are caused by smoking. In the riding of Nickel Belt, lung-related diseases, in the main, are to be found among people who live too close to the smoke stacks of Inco and Falconbridge. Whenever it seems that corporate profits may dip, the first item of equipment to be sacrificed is anti-pollution equipment—thanks in large part to the attitude of federal and provincial departments concerned with the environment.

I have spoken of ways to improve the quality of life with preventive medicine. We are lagging in that field. It seems to me that preventive medicine can lead to cuts in medicare cost. We should be thinking in terms of such cost cuts, instead of in terms of such arbitrary cost cutbacks as the federal government is now proposing, cost cutbacks which will lead to a lowering of the already minimal level of the country's health and medical care services.

An hon. Member: What about home care nursing?

Mr. Rodriguez: I agree with the hon. member. At present we have chronic care patients occupying active care beds which cost us at least $100 per day.

Mr. Benjamin: That's an example of government waste.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is right. We need more efficiency in the field.

In Ontario, because of the Tory government's approach to hospital costs, many nurses will be out of work. I understand that some 3,000 nurses have already been laid off in Ontario. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) blames the nursing schools and universities for not projecting properly the job market. But how could the universities know that the federal government was to cut back its participation in medicare?

The minister has blamed the universities, whereas the fault lies with the government which created the difficulty in the first place. It is like blaming the rape victim for her own predicament. That is despicable. Why did the minister not tell the universities beforehand that the government intended to cut back with regard to medicare? Why did not the Tory government in Ontario take the universities and post-secondary institutions into its confidence and tell them what it wanted to do? The nurses are available. Surely we need not keep chronic care patients in active care beds at over $100 per day.

We have heard little about rehabilitative programs. Surely it would cost less per diem to apply rehabilitative measures than to keep certain chronic care people in active care beds, at great cost.

The government has not even considered the paramedical field. Many people in remote parts of ridings must travel over 100 miles in order to get emergency attention.

Surely such attention could be provided by paramedical workers. Little has been done in this regard.

The government can do all sorts of fine sounding things. It can bounce a signal off a satelite to provide television and communication coverage for corporations and frontier regions.

Mr. Benjamin: You can't bounce a signal off a Liberal's head.

Mr. Rodriguez: It would reverberate round the Chamber.

Mr. Benjamin: It would be like bouncing a signal off cement.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is right. We can build all sorts of fancy buildings. For the last four months an outhouse has been under construction on Parliament Hill. That looks like a make-work project, and it seems to me that these things all cost money. Some of these projects cost a heck of a lot of money. But we are not afraid to do this.

● (1530)

The Bank of Canada is erecting a building across the road made of glass. When it was started it was to cost a modest $30 million. The figure has now jumped to $75 million. They have some exotic plants in there now, the like of which I have not seen since I left Latin America. I go over there, Mr. Speaker, when I want to feel at home. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it will cost $75 million, and they don't bat an eyelash.

Mr. Saltsman: They have been building like that since the Spanish conquistadores.

Mr. Rodriguez: The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge is right. Ever since the conquistadores came to this country.

The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) got up in this House and said we are to have a national lottery to raise money until 1989 and then we shall be able to pay off the Olympic debt—if it costs every widow the last ten dollars she ever had. We are prepared to go to those lengths for the kind of monuments Shelley referred to, the kinds of monuments that will stand in the desert and just crumble apart in the sands of time.

When it comes to those services which affect the quality of life for people, surely the government has to say: those things we will not touch—there are certain agreements we will not back away from. On the contrary, we should be expanding those particular kinds of agreement in the areas we have mentioned before.

I remember the time when I taught in the schools. We had no money to pay for speech therapists. Children with speech disabilities received no special attention: their problems were ignored in the hope they would go away. School boards and taxpayers could not afford to support speech therapists in the school system. The same was true of children who were hard of hearing. We were not prepared to let a private member's bill go through this House—the Tories were dragging their feet on it, I know—which would set the upper limits of noise levels in any one place to 85 decibels. They were not prepared to let that

through. I thought it seemed to me to be a very fine bill, one which we could do with in the work places in the Sudbury area; the vast majority of those who work for the mining companies are suffering from some kind of hearing disability.

There is something which will always be held against the government sitting over there. It is the fact that it was not prepared to move in an aggressive way in the area of preventive medicine. Surely, we on this side of the House ought not to be the ones to stand up and press the government to retreat from its position—a position which we consider to be a totally backward step with respect to the provision of medical services.

I have talked about some of the documents which were commissioned by the government. I want to read from the Ontario Economic Council report a rather interesting section on health issues and alternatives, published in 1976. This is what is contained in this particular document:

> The situation with respect to industrial health and safety may be worse than it seems because many industrial health problems remain undetected or unreported and in the Council's view we lack professionals specializing in industrial medicine. We have too few investigators and inspectors. There are several thousand toxic chemicals used in industrial processes but standards have been set for only a few hundred.

If the government wants to spend money, if it wants to avoid wasting medicare support, the best way to save is to spend money in these particular areas of industrial health safety and preventive kinds of health problems that are presently put upon society. If, beyond that, the government wants to save money, it can do it.

One of the comments made by the hon. member for New Westminster was that we should start taking a look at home care so that we can assure that active care beds in hospitals are occupied by active care patients. It seems to me this step would be a good one for patients, not only because they could be taken care of in their home environment enjoying the love and comfort of their family, but also because it would mean saving money for the taxpayers of Canada.

As I mentioned before, there are many parts of my own riding where we have to depend on emergency services which may be a hundred miles away. The people who live and work in those areas do not get a cut on their OHIP premium—they just pay the same OHIP premiums as I pay, living in a town where medical services are close and readily available. The effect of this bill will be to create even more difficulty for these people.

We talk about dental problems. The government has no dentacare program at all. It has been left completely up to the private sector; it has been left to workers in a particular situation getting into a collective agreement. But the minute they get a dentacare program established, what happens? The dentists put their fees up overnight to grab the highest possible charge they can. The government has reneged in this matter. It is fairly obvious that those who are in an organized shop can get the benefit of a dentacare program. But, once again, those workers who are not organized, usually lower-aid workers who do not have the strength of collective agreements, are left without the benefit of a dentacare program for themselves and their families. The government has not moved in the area of expanding medical services to include a dentacare program

which would be of preventative benefit. Instead, it is quite prepared to sit back and cut away existing programs.

I have said that the Liberal government which sits over there is not unlike the Tories—we have seen an example in Ontario. One of the costs which drove up medicare in Ontario was the rip-off which took place by the private labs. There we saw the doctors and the private labs working hand in glove and ripping off the taxpayers.

An hon. Member: All of them?

Mr. Rodriguez: No, not all of them, but certainly more than 2 per cent of them. I am glad the hon. member has raised the question because I stand around in this House and hear of all these people who rip off the unemployment insurance fund, who rip off the welfare system. Studies in Ontario and elsewhere in this country have shown that approximately 2 per cent rip off any social welfare program. Interestingly enough, in Ontario the rip off of the OHIP program among doctors was 10 per cent—five times as great, Mr. Speaker. So when the hon. member on the government side of the House talks about percentages he should keep things in proper perspective. We have seen this kind of rip off by the private labs in Ontario, and it has added to the cost of medicare. Some hon. members give the impression that only the working class and people on welfare rip off the system. Rip-offs are not confined to poor people, the rich people rip off the system more so.

● (1540)

Mr. Reynolds: What about the NDP ripping off British Columbia?

Mr. Rodriguez: When the story is told we will find out who ripped off British Columbia. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) will find out that in the long run the people of British Columbia benefited. Dave Barrett certainly did not put the money in his pocket.

I think I have given some very good reasons why this bill should be put off. The motion moved by the hon. member for New Westminster is a very reasonable one. If we put this bill off for six months it will give the government a chance to recover—

Mr. Leggatt: —its sanity.

Mr. Rodriguez: The government never had any sanity. Let them grab this rope and we will pull them to the shore safely.

Mr. Firth: My hon. friend is too much of a humanitarian.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is in the nature of a New Democrat. The New Democrat throws out the 20 yard rope to the drowning man to grab, and will pull him safely to the shore. We are giving the government the opportunity to hoist this bill for six months, and it should grab it.

It is rather interesting to see the condition of federal-provincial relationships. I can see why the government might not want to take this opportunity since the provincial premiers left in a huff. I can understand them not wanting to go back. In view of what they are proposing in regard to federal-provincial shared programs they will be jumping out of the frying pan and into the fire.

In conclusion—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: I hear the Tories applauding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time has now expired. If he wants to continue he will have to have unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to prolong this debate; I just want to make a couple of points. The New Democratic Party in particular has tried to portray this bill as being a cutback in expenditures on hospitalization and medicare. In fact it is no such thing. It simply sets out the growth rate at which the federal government will continue to participate in the medicare scheme. The NDP persist in talking about cutbacks in hospitalization. This bill has nothing whatsoever to do with hospitalization.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) made a few valid points and it is too bad he wrapped them up in so much red rhetoric. I can understand why it is he would want to increase expenditures on medicine; it is because he is suffering from a bad case of verbal diarrhea this afternoon. The fact that must be on the record is that this bill has nothing to do with hospitalization. It deals only with the limit to which the federal government will go in increasing expenditures on medicare.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak at all on this bill, but after the nonsense I have heard from the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) I feel I must say a few words. If my party ever had any intention of helping the NDP, it certainly has not after the speech of the hon. member for Nickel Belt. My party has been against this action by the government because it felt it was unilateral. The idea behind the bill is a good one; it is an attempt to control expenditures. However, we do not think the government should do this unilaterally without first negotiating with the provinces.

The NDP are in a great position to tell us what they would do. If anyone recalls what they did to the province of British Columbia within the short space of three years, they drove the province into half a billion dollars worth of debt.

Mr. Rodriguez: All right, let us have an election there now.

Mr. Reynolds: If we had an election in British Columbia right now you could be sure that the NDP would not be returned to power. It will be 20 or 30 years, if ever, before the NDP form another government in British Columbia. The people of Canada had a better idea of what the federal NDP was all about than did the people of B.C., as we can all see from the small number of that party left in this House after the last election. I think that after the next federal election they will have even fewer members.

The party that did win the last election in British Columbia is basically a Conservative party anyway, and it got rid of a party that was bankrupting the province. I think in the long term the Conservative party has a much better future ahead of it in British Columbia than the NDP ever did. I see the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) is in the House. Had he sought the leadership of that party, perhaps it would be in better shape than it is right now.

I say these things to the hon. member for Nickel Belt because I think it is wrong to hoist this bill for six months. We did not suggest that the capital punishment bill should be delayed; we wanted to put it to the vote and get it passed by the House. I do not know why the NDP is making this move now unless it is to delay the business of this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment. All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it has been agreed among the House leaders that a vote on this motion should be delayed until a time fixed by agreement among the House leaders.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I agree. I would even delay it for six months.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion that has been made. Is it agreed that by unanimous consent a recorded division be deferred, pursuant to this special order, to a date to be decided among the House leaders?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, so there is no misunderstanding—decided after consultation among the House leaders. I am sure no one wants to have a veto on the time of the vote, so that it can be put off indefinitely. My suggestion is that it be decided by the House leaders after consultation among them. It would not give any House leader a veto.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hope the suggestion is clear to everyone, that the vote will come before we recess anyway. It is so ordered.

● (1550)

Mr. Paproski: Five o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There seems to be a suggestion that we call it five o'clock. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday at two o'clock p.m.

At 3.51 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 21, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FINANCE

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF INFLATION ACCOUNTING FOR FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the terms of Standing Order 43. In light of the impact of inflation on the declared profits of the Canadian corporate sector without sufficient provisions to alleviate this problem and, furthermore, since Canada is lagging behind other nations in implementing inflation accounting which would properly measure the economic progress of business, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies):

That this House instruct the Minister of Finance to initiate a study to bring about a long-range program to implement inflation accounting in all federal government departments, Crown corporations and agencies as an example for the private sector to follow.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Standing Order 43 requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED COMMITTEE STUDY OF FISHERIES ZONE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN ST. PIERRE, MIQUELON AND CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. The failure of the government to reach agreement with France in negotiations over boundaries between Canada and St. Pierre and Miquelon now creates serious problems as a result of declarations by both countries over the extension of 200-mile limits. In view of the fact that the last discussions on the delineation of boundaries was held in 1972, and that the government refuses to comply with motion for production of papers number 70, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That the whole matter be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to such a motion under Standing Order 43?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR STUDY OF EFFECT OF NEW DAIRY POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the position just taken by the Quebec Order of Agronomists, which asked the federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) to postpone the application of his new dairy policy because of the serious effects it may have, namely possible shortages of dairy products which would result in further price increases for consumers, and considering also that the effects of that dairy policy are already causing an important decline in farm machinery and feed sales, which may have an impact on other vital sectors of our economy, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House immediately analyze the short- and long-term consequences of the new dairy policy so that it can be reviewed thoroughly in the light of that reevaluation, before Quebec agriculture is completely broken up and other sectors of our economy are affected.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CONNECTION BETWEEN ALLEGED DEFRAUDING OF COMMISSION AND TRAFFICKING IN NARCOTICS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity concerning the investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Unem-

ployment Insurance Commission of the defrauding of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, particularly in the Ottawa area. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That the Minister of Manpower and the Solicitor General give details to the House of the specific aspects of this investigation being made by the RCMP, by Real Meilleur, Chief of UIC benefit control and two of his control officers, Mike Richard and Claude Charron, into the possible and suspected connections between the defrauding of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and trafficking in narcotics.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSAL THAT SOUTH AFRICA ABANDON POLICY OF APARTHEID—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact it is obvious that the policy of apartheid, or racial separation, of the government at Pretoria is the source of the recent massive violence and bloody riots there, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin):

That the Canadian government call on the government of the Republic of South Africa to consider these events as a warning that they must once and for all abandon a system which is clearly unacceptable under any criterion of human rights.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

AGRICULTURE

PROPOSED CONGRATULATIONS TO ORGANIZERS OF WORLD HEREFORD TOUR AND CONFERENCE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the World Hereford Tour and Conference commencing today and ending July 9, when representatives from 50 countries will visit some of the world's leading farms and ranches across Canada, culminating in Alberta, with 1,000 delegates expected at the conference in Banff June 27-July 2; an anticipated attendance of 2,000 at the Alberta Hereford Centre, Innisfail, July 6, the only place in the world where a breeding association does its own recording of performance testing; the Hereford Show at Calgary, July 8-9, where over 700 Herefords will be shown, 110 from the United States and 620 from Canada; I move, seconded by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave):

That this House request the Speaker of the House of Commons, on behalf of the members of the thirtieth Parliament, to send greetings, salutations and congratulations to members of the tour on their ingenuity, independence and importance, to Mr. Warren Smith, President, Central Alberta Hereford Club, Olds, Alberta,—

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

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Bruce-Grey.

* * *

TRADE

IMPORTATION OF BEEF

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As it has become apparent that the importation of Australian and New Zealand beef has increased by 34 per cent as of the end of May this year over the same period last year and that prices for imported beef—

Some hon. Members: Order.

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

* * *

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION OF SITUATION OF A. J. PERRIER IN CONNECTION WITH LEASES NEGOTIATED BETWEEN CAMPEAU AND THE CROWN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the Prime Minister's recently expressed views concerning conflict of interest and in view of the fact that Campeau Corporation is the largest landlord renting space to the federal Crown not only in the Ottawa area but in the whole of Canada, and in view of the fact that these lease arrangements in the Ottawa area between the federal government and Campeau have increased over 900 per cent since 1968 and that these leases with Campeau now have an annual cash flow of nearly $10 million, and in view of the fact that the government rents 90 per cent of Campeau's available commercial office space in Ottawa, and in view of the fact that the incumbent assistant deputy minister, Planning and Development for the Department of Public Works is actively involved in leasing functions with Campeau—a company he was vice-president of until 1973—a situation which could give rise to a possible conflict of interest—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a motion perhaps he might put it.

Mr. Huntington: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. McKinley):

That this House instruct the government to launch an immediate and in depth inquiry into the possible conflict of interest existing in the situation of A. J. Perrier in regards to leases negotiated and arranged with his recent former employer on behalf of the Crown.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED APPLICATION OF BILINGUAL POLICY AND TO DEAL SEVERELY WITH RECALCITRANT CONTROLLERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provision of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion dealing with an urgent and important matter.

As the irresponsible and disgraceful actions of the English-speaking controllers who want to prevent the use of French in Quebec province whose population is francophone, and as those controller's blackmailing threatens Canadian unity by giving Quebecers the impression that one cannot be a Canadian in French, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House order the government to go ahead with its bilingual policy in ground-to-air communications, and that severe sanctions be taken with anglophone controllers who spurn the law and our courts.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

DATE OF APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER TO INVESTIGATE SAFETY OF BILINGUAL TRAFFIC CONTROL—REASON FOR DELAY

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. In light of the fact that a majority of the aviation community has brought air traffic movements to a halt in Canada on

the grounds that it is not safe to fly in present circumstances, and noting that the Minister of Transport has promised an inquiry into the implications for safety of the possible introduction of bilingual air traffic procedures which were to be conducted simultaneously with the MOT simulator study, can the Prime Minister tell us when a commissioner is to be named to conduct this inquiry?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the search for a commissioner or commissioners to replace the one who resigned recently is actively going on and we hope to be able to name a commissioner very soon. I would point out that the work in which that commission would have to engage would probably take a period of several months and it is hoped that the pilots and air traffic controllers will await the outcome of that study. This being the case, I find it very regrettable that some of them would be engaged in a strike because the strike in itself cannot advance the very basic requirements of the commission's work which would be to see how safety could be maintained in every way and be made compatible with the bilingual capacity.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): My supplementary question is directed to the Acting Minister of Transport or to the parliamentary secretary. In light of the fact that approximately two weeks ago the Minister of Transport requested from the air traffic controllers suggestions as to names for people who could satisfactorily be commissioner or commissioners, could there be some explanation of why there has been a delay and whether official communications have been concluded with the air traffic controllers to say whether or not the proposals they have put forward are acceptable.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the minister, before his departure, and certainly officials since that time have been in rather regular communication with all parties interested in the decision which is to be taken. As the hon. gentleman will appreciate, the job which the commissioner or commissioners will have to do is extremely important and one that requires substantial expertise and sensitivity to the issues that are involved. Therefore, it is our hope that we will be able to find the best person possible to conduct that inquiry, so we are conducting the broadest possible search in order to find the individual or individuals who will do the job that is necessary.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

POSSIBILITY STRIKING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS WILL BE SUBJECT TO PENALTIES

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the President of the Treasury Board.

Can the minister tell the House whether it is true, as has been announced, that the Treasury Board is in the process of penalizing the controllers as provided by the law?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

POSITION OF GOVERNMENT ON SAFETY OF COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS IN VIEW OF THREATENED STRIKES

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister advise us what position the Minister of Transport is taking in view of the refusal of air traffic controllers to report for work? Is it the position of MOT that, notwithstanding the absence of air traffic controllers at a number of airports and threats to not work at others, it is still safe for commercial flights to be continued?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman will appreciate, the inactivity or the lack of operation of certain air traffic control towers in the country very obviously complicates the problems of managing the traffic flows from one part of Canada to another. The ministry is very actively observing the situation at present, and obviously flight operations will not be allowed under circumstances which are unsafe.

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON POSSIBLE BREACH OF INJUNCTION BY PILOTS

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Is it the government's position that the airline pilots are in breach of the injunction obtained against them yesterday? I ask this in view of the fact that under all circumstances individual pilots who have reported for work are in the invidious position of having to make their own decision as to safety.

● (1420)

Mr. Ralph Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the position of the air line pilots is something which was determined by a legal proceeding initiated by the airline companies, and the relationship between the companies and their employees is a matter for them to sort out, with the assistance of the courts.

SUGGESTED WIDENING OF INQUIRY TO INCLUDE ADEQUACY OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport who, I understand, is attending the funeral of his father—and all hon. members extend their sincerest sympathy and condolences—I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government would be willing to widen the terms of reference of the commission of inquiry to include not only the matter of bilingualism in air traffic control, but also the adequacy of equipment which air traffic controllers have to use at airports generally in Canada, and their working conditions, in the light of the kind of stress they have to work under in present circumstances.

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government has just finished negotiating with the air traffic controllers, and as I understand it, there has been a satisfactory conclusion of the contract on every point. The question of bilingualism is the only non-contractual matter which is outstanding, and I do not think it would simplify things if we were to introduce into the work of the commission the various extraneous propositions put forward by the hon. member. They are, of course, of interest to the government, and the parliamentary secretary indicated just last Thursday or Friday that if there were anything particular that the government should do to increase safety by way of instruments, it would gladly hear any representations, of the hon. member or of anyone else.

Mr. Benjamin: Whether air traffic control is carried out in one language or six, we cannot separate working conditions from the quality of the equipment they are using in the performance of their duties. When the Prime Minister is considering the terms of reference for the commission of inquiry, he should be aware that at the Vancouver airport there are 900 aircraft movements on one runway per day—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely if the hon. member is seeking information, the question ought to go forward, but if it is a representation with respect to details, that ought to be made in another way.

Mr. Benjamin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister asked me if I had some specific points. I will begin the wording of my question in a proper and accepted way. In view of the fact that there is an average of one equipment failure per day at Vancouver airports, that they are using world war II receivers, that radar which has been installed is not working and that surface detection radar, ordered six years ago, has still not arrived and they cannot see planes on the ground in a fog—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Benjamin: —would the Prime Minister reconsider the terms of reference of the commissioner or commissioners so that it will be more than just bilingualism in air traffic control which will be considered? Should the considerations not include the adequacy of equipment which is available for the controllers and their working conditions?

Mr. Trudeau: Apart from the representations which have been made, which I will look into, the answer to the question remains the same.

Mr. Benjamin: I might also ask the Prime Minister the following: in view of the circumstances and the atmosphere presently prevailing in the country, particularly with regard to air traffic controllers, pilots and the Ministry of Transport, is the government now prepared to provide sufficient assurances so that the Ministry of Transport, the air traffic controllers, the pilots and the public can cool it on the matter of how and when bilingualism comes into air traffic control until the findings of the

commission of inquiry have been reported and fully discussed among all concerned?

Mr. Trudeau: I think that is a very proper suggestion. I suggest that this House in some way should adopt the suggestion of the hon. member that the pilots and the air traffic controllers should cool it and agree to do their jobs and stay within the law until this point has been properly decided.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

INQUIRY WHETHER DAIRY POLICY WILL BE MODIFIED AND WHEN

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

The Quebec Order of Agronomists analyzed the new dairy policy of the federal government last weekend and underlined the serious consequences which are already being felt in this area, namely the sale of major farm equipment which is close to zero and the decline of 50 per cent in the sale of feeds.

Considering that industrial milk producers have really agreed to lower their production in the last two months, can the minister tell the House whether his department proposes to change the dairy policy enunciated a few months ago and when.

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, over a week ago we announced what we were considering at that time whether any changes were to be made in the policy. I would remind the hon. member that the dairy policy was agreed to by the dairy farmers of Canada. The dairy farmers of Canada will have to agree to any new conditions in the dairy policy. It will not be without any discussion with them if changes are to be made. This is an agreement signed by the dairy farmers of Canada and the provinces. The real problem is the distribution of quotas within the provinces themselves. If the provincial people would quit passing the buck to Ottawa, it would be better for all producers concerned.

* * *

TRADE

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF QUOTAS ON TEXTILE IMPORTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As the United States retains 90 per cent of its domestic textile market for its own producers, the European Economic Community retains 80 per cent and Canada retains only 46 per cent, is the government planning to introduce quotas on textile imports which will more closely approach those of our most important trading partners and thereby make it unnecessary for the large scale and steadily increasing lay-offs and closing of plants which have been taking place in recent months in the Canadian textile industry, due to a steadily increasing stream of cheap imports from law wage countries?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, it was only last week that there was full and detailed debate on this subject in this House. I answered many of the questions at that time. I can assure the hon. gentleman I used the words "more quotas" than at the present time because we have quotas on a great number of commodities and textiles. We are presently considering additional ones relating to such things as outerwear. As I told the House during the debate last week there is an industry, government and provincial committee with labour representation on it which is asked to report to me by the end of this month the further steps that should be taken.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the minister stayed very clearly away from this issue of increased quotas in his speech in the House last week, and as those people in the industry with whom he has been dealing and will be meeting later on are unanimously and strongly of the opinion that the only way to correct this disastrous and increasingly serious situation is to increase quotas to levels more approaching those imposed by the European Economic Community and the United States, I again ask the minister if he will give serious consideration to bringing Canadian quotas to a level closer to those of the countries with which we deal on a larger scale, the United States and the European Economic Community, so that this industry, which is in very serious condition right now and is getting worse day by day, will not perish?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my comments the other day we are looking at whether there should be a different arrangement of quotas or an expansion of the quota system. The hon. member says it is the unanimous view that this will solve the problem. I would say to him that there are certain sectors that are by no means of that view. There is a certain degree of conflict which we are seeking to eliminate at the present time. I have indicated that we are flexible and that if some proposals come forward that make sense and would bring about the result that the hon. member desires, and which we all desire, we certainly would look at it very seriously and quickly.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

SUPPORT FOR PROGRAM OF SENATOR LAWSON IN VIEW OF SALARY INCREASE ACCEPTED

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance and it concerns a member of the other House, Senator Ed Lawson who was appointed some four years ago by this government. His salary has been boosted as vice-president of the International Teamsters' Union from $18,000 to $22,500, an increase of 25 per cent. In addition to that he draws a salary as director of the Affiliated Canadian Conference of

Teamsters and is president of the Union's B.C.-Yukon Board. As the senator gave such strong support for the guidelines providing for increase of between 8 per cent and 12 per cent, has he been in touch with the government to advise that he would not be accepting this increase, so unjust to the enforcement of the guidelines and to wage earners earning comparatively low wages, but yet, in this case, apparently defended by the senator who previously gave his full support to the guidelines?

● (1430)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the senator has not been in touch with me, but I will be glad to inquire to see if he has sought advice in this regard.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

EFFECT OF AEROSOL SPRAYS ON OZONE LAYER—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON PROPOSED BAN OF AEROSOL SPRAY

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of the Environment arises from recent reports, the most recent one being from the University of Denver, which suggest that chemical reactions occurring from gases released by aerosol sprays are threatening to erode the atmosphere's layer of ozone. As such erosion could result in a substantial increase in skin cancer, will the hon. gentleman tell the House whether he has investigated this latest evidence and, if it is factual, will he consider introducing legislation to ban the use of aerosol sprays?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, it has not been proved thus far that the use of aerosol sprays causes an irreparable damage. The U.S. Academy of Science made a study and came to the conclusion that nothing proved that the use of aerosol sprays could cause damages such as those he mentioned.

[*English*]

Mr. Jarvis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister. This is the single voice in opposition to the proposal that has been advanced by the University of Denver and other groups. Be that as it may, is the hon. gentleman aware that, according to the Canadian Cancer Institute, it is estimated that a 10 per cent decrease in the ozone layer will result in a 20 per cent increase in the incidence of skin cancer and that, at present trend rates, we shall reach that point within the next quarter century? Does the hon. gentleman propose to take action to protect Canadians from the threat of this dread disease which last year afflicted over 11,000 Canadians?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I missed part of the hon. member's question, but I agree on the consequences of the destruction of the ozone layer. As for the second part of the question, of course we are interested in the problem raised. We are following it closely and seeing by what means we can prevent an increase of that destructive element in the atmosphere.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INDUSTRIAL MILK—SUGGESTED CONSULTATION WITH PRODUCERS

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. As industrial milk producers are now in severely straightened financial circumstances, having received in the month of May one quarter of the income they received in the same period last year for the production of milk, and since the minister has intimated that he will be consulting the dairy farmers of Canada, can he now confirm that he will consult them, and when?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, an ongoing subcommittee of the market-sharing quota committee has been studying the problem. It is made up of producers from all over Canada. I understand they are to meet today or tomorrow in the city of Toronto, if they can get there, to further discuss the distribution of provincial quotas. I repeat, the dairy farmers of Canada producing industrial milk are the highest paid in the world. The reason for the problem in Ontario and Quebec has to do with the way the programs are administered in those provinces, programs with which I have nothing to do.

* * *

TRADE

ALLEGED DUMPING OF BEEF BY AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As it has become apparent that the importation of Australian and New Zealand beef has increased by 34 per cent by the end of May this year over the same period of time last year, prices for imported beef having been from 15 cents to 25 cents lower per pound than that paid for the same beef delivered to the United States, and as it would appear that this practice is very close to dumping by Australia and New Zealand, would the minister tell the House what steps his department has taken to prevent this practice from continuing to the detriment of Canadian cattle producers?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Agriculture some days ago referred in the House to this problem. Since that time, indeed, I think before then, representations were made to the governments of New Zealand and Australia. I personally, in the absence of my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, met with the minister of agriculture from Australia. They have undertaken to reduce the differential in price between sales in Canada and the U.S., but some details are still to be worked out at the official level. As soon as this is done no doubt some kind of public statement will be made.

ENERGY

ALLEGATION BY MINISTER THOSE OPPOSED TO NUCLEAR POWER ISSUING MISLEADING STATEMENTS—REQUEST FOR INQUIRY

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources concerns the statement he made last week in which he condemned those opposed to nuclear power for issuing distorted and misleading information laced with scary sensationalism. Since the Liberal convention of 1975 called for a full public inquiry into this matter, and the Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility also called for a full public inquiry, will the minister advise the House why he still opposes a full public inquiry, since any misleading information could be defused during such an inquiry?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I was making the important point in my remarks that lots of people are taking advantage of public ignorance and public fear to put forward very scary, alarmist statements which cannot be supported by fact. I hope the hon. member shares with me the call to those who report on the generation of nuclear power to exercise more responsibility and look at the facts before they make statements or write an article.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTRE TO DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ON GENERATION OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—TYPE OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATED

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, that is a good argument in support of a public inquiry. I am pleased to note the minister making it. Since the minister has called for the establishment of a public information centre to disseminate information, may I ask, will that centre be providing for new evidence available from responsible sources showing that the export of the CANDU reactor brings no compelling economic benefits to third world countries and that, according to IRDA, an agency of the U.S. government, the CANDU produces twice the amount of plutonium, which could be used by terrorists, of any other reactor and that the CANDU is the most dangerous reactor being exported in the world. Is the minister ready to see that kind of information disseminated by the public information centre the establishment of which he is calling for?

An hon. Member: The IRA want a CANDU.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, a number of responsible agencies and groups in the country are interested in advancing public understanding of nuclear power generation, not only for Canadian use but for use outside. I was speaking specifically about the use of nuclear energy in Canada. It seems to me we have not marshalled the important resources of universities and the expertise and opinions of the public responsibility group to which the hon. member referred, the Coalition for Nuclear responsibility. I have written, or am in the process of writing, to a number of groups such as the Science Council of Canada and professional groups, including engineering groups, suggesting that perhaps we should form, with their assistance, some kind of public information body on resources. It should not be a propaganda agency; it should be a publicly supported agency which can deal with this question on a factual basis. That is one way of going about it. The other way is by proceeding by way of interaction between these various groups, and that has been going on. I am interested in getting the views of those most concerned and most knowledgeable in this area, and their advice.

* * *

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

ALLEGATION MR. BISSONNETTE IS LINKED WITH COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance follows the question asked by my colleague the hon. member for York-Simcoe on June 15, and also arises out of a newspaper article printed last Saturday linking Mr. A. L. Bissonnette, another member of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal, with the private business activities of the tribunal's chairman. Is the minister in a position to inform this House whether he widened the inquiry he undertook last week and when he will most likely be able to report to this House with respect to his findings concerning Mr. Bissonnette?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have had a discussion with Mr. Bissonnette and expect to be able to make a statement about the chairman tomorrow.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INDUSTRIAL MILK—REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN THE INTERPROVINCIAL QUOTA TRANSFER SYSTEM

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture is on the same lines as another question asked earlier this afternoon. It has to do with dairy policy. Since Manitoba has remained within its quota for the last two years but at present faces the prospect of severe cutbacks under our dairy policy, I ask if the minister has put forward, or is prepared to put forward, any proposals to the provinces and the Canadian Dairy Commission for changing the operation of the interprovincial quota transfer system, which, as it presently operates, appears to reward provinces contributing to the surplus while penalizing those which have kept their production under control? Manitoba is one of the provinces which seems to be penalized.

● (1440)

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, Manitoba increased its production last year over and above the 5 per cent. However, Manitoba has probably one of the fairest systems of any marketing program in Canada because it has a complete pooling system for number one milk. They are not without problems in Manitoba. I addressed the annual meeting of the Manitoba milk producers. They made some representations. How-

ever, I can state that they are a lot happier in that province than in any other province, including Ontario and Quebec, because of the system under which they operate.

* * *

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR MAINTENANCE OF PROVISIONS FOR MOVEMENT OF GRAIN TO EASTERN CANADA

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Minister of Transport. In view of the fact the government has agreed not to proceed with Bill C-87 before the summer recess and as there is considerable fear that the provisions of clause 15 of that bill will be enacted in anticipation—what I speak of is with regard to the act and East rates and the handling of grain at the Great Lakes terminal—can the minister give the House and all those involved some assurance that the previous pattern of grain movement will be retained until such time as clause 15 of Bill C-87 is amended, withdrawn or a new bill drafted for the next session? Also, will he advise the wheat board that this grain movement should be maintained because to act upon the provisions of a bill that had not been passed would be to act unlawfully.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Of course, Mr. Speaker, if a particular provision of a bill has not been enacted, it does not become law. The existing statute will therefore continue in force as it has in the past.

* * *

[*Translation*]

STATISTICS CANADA

INQUIRY WHETHER EMPLOYEES WHO ARE TO BE LAID OFF WILL BE HIRED BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Since several employees of Statistics Canada will be dismissed on September 30 next, allegedly because the staff ought to be younger and less numerous, if they have not been restored either to their same functions or hired in another service in the federal government, can the minister tell the House whether he intends to contact Statistics Canada's officials so that these employees may be rehired by other services in the same agency or in the federal government?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not know of the particular matter to which the hon. member refers. With regard to the second part of his question, I will certainly take this up immediately with the head of Statistics Canada.

[Mr. Whelan.]

HOUSING

OFFERING BY TRUST COMPANIES OF ONE YEAR MORTGAGE AT REDUCED RATE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I will direct my question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. It arises as a result of the parliamentary secretary's answer in the House last week that it is common practice to offer lower interest rates on one year mortgages on the part of the trust companies. Will the minister indicate whether he is aware of this practice of one year mortgages at a reduced rate of a half per cent and does he intend, either in his own name or in the name of his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to take action to prevent this bait and switch method of mortgage financing?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that. Looking at the whole picture of the rollover of mortgages, it was CMHC which in 1969 introduced the five year rollover. It is designed to bring more mortgage money into the market. The reduction in cost of the one year rollover might be a difference on the one quarter of one per cent. This seems to be reasonably stable now with the five-year planning. I am looking at it. We always keep all options open. I will discuss it with my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO NEAR ACCIDENTS WHICH HAPPENED OUTSIDE QUEBEC

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport.

In view of the allegations made by members of the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association that near accidents have occurred in the last few weeks in places other than the province of Quebec, and since there are some doubts in the public opinion concerning the causes of these near accidents, can the parliamentary secretary inform hon. members of the House whether inquiries are now under way at the Department of Transport to identify the causes of these near accidents, share the responsibilities of the parties involved and take the measures and necessary action to prevent their repetition or sue those who spread a false rumour?

[*English*]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, whenever incidents of this kind are reported to the Ministry of Transport, they are investigated quickly and thoroughly. I can assure the hon. member that in the particular instance to which he is referring, an investigation will be undertaken to determine if there is any validity to the allegation which has been made.

NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION

PROPOSED INCREASE IN RATES—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT CONSUMERS

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and concerns the proposed rate increases by the Northern Canada Power Commission. For the past several weeks, people in the Northwest Territories and Yukon have been expecting the minister's reply to reports on NCPC by the Public Utilities Boards and by citizens groups in the two territories. Is the minister now prepared to make public the action he will take to protect northern consumers from these drastic increases in the cost of electricity? The minister has gone on record as saying he favours a reduction in the interest rates on loans to NCPC. Will this be one of the methods the minister will use to protect northern consumers from this increase?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite correct. I have received the two reports of the public utilities boards in each of the territories as well as the Dalby report. Virtually all of the matters with which it dealt fall within the competence of the Northern Canada Power Commission and have been taken in hand by the chairman of the NCPC. The one matter that will have to be examined by the federal government is the question of the capital debt. We are currently looking at this. We are not sure it can be handled by a lightening of the interest charges, as the hon. member suggests, or a diminution of the actual amount of the outstanding debt. These matters involve departments other than my own. We are currently looking at this and hope to have some sort of proposal to present before the summer months expire, while people in the north are enjoying minimum power consumption.

Mr. Firth: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whether there will or will not be a rate increase announcement?

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, there have been rate increases announced. It is our intention that these will proceed. As I indicated, it is our hope that during this period of low power consumption during the summer months we can examine this and see if we can roll back part of this increase.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST THAT BOARD STUDY RATE INCREASES PROPOSED BY AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. The automobile insurance companies are increasing their rates as of July 1 by 10 per cent after a 12 per cent increase on January 1 of this year, making a cumulative increase of 23 per cent on top of a 40 per cent increase last year. Acknowledging that the insurance companies are losing some money, but with the imposition of seat belt legislation and lower speed limits, the picture will be a little brighter, does the minister intend to ask the Anti-Inflation Board to take an especially close look at the justification of these increases and perhaps ask that the increases be phased in over a longer period of time?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it was specifically because of this concern that we put this industry under the AIB control.

* * *

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT

DATE OF PUBLICATION OF REGULATIONS RESPECTING COMPENSATION FOR LIVESTOCK DESTROYED

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the minister indicate when we might anticipate receiving the new regulations respecting compensation for livestock that have been destroyed under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act? Also, what efforts are being made to ensure that this information is available to Canadians prior to the summer recess of parliament?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that it will be ready by then.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ALLEGATION DOMESTIC DEMAND WEAK—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the minister's statement in Jasper that the budget maintains a substantial amount of fiscal stimulus in order to maintain a high level of domestic demand, and as Statistic Canada now reports that the domestic demand was a weak point in the economy with a high buildup of inventory, can the minister now say if his assessment of the strength of the domestic economy was wrong?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member that the national accounts for the first quarter of 1975 indicate an increase in that quarter of 2.7 per cent and that consumer spending, current government spending, housing and inventory accumulation were all the sources of that strength. The hon. member might go back and reread the article.

* * *

● (1450)

FINANCE

DATE OF INTRODUCTION OF BUDGETARY BILLS—NUMBER OF BILLS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Would the minister indicate when we may expect some budgetary bills, and specifically how many bills might be tabled?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, that will be in the next session. Very likely there will be two bills; it will depend on the nature of the actual tax changes.

Mr. Stevens: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister at least give first reading to the budgetary bills to enable people over the summer period to have the chance of reviewing the provisions of the bills, since many people in the private sector are disturbed at some of the aspects of the budget now before us?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the interval would be better used in discussing with people in the private sector the ways and means resolution that is now before parliament, so that this discussion can be taken into account in the drafting of the bills.

* * *

MANPOWER

LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW JOB-CREATION PROGRAM

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the continuing and pressing need to create jobs in Canada, can the minister tell the House whether a decision has been made with regard to the reintroduction of the LIP program or any other job-creation programs, when will he be making the announcement, and what date will the programs start?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will be making an announcement within a very few days about the $100 million Local Initiatives Program for the fall and winter of 1976-77. We anticipate that this will start in the fall. The details will be similar to those which apply in the previous two years, but with some increase in influence on the allocation of funds to areas of high and chronic unemployment. Some of the other criteria I will be announcing in detail, as I say, certainly before the end of the month.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

POSSIBILITY NEW ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES IN FORCE AFTER JUNE 15, 1977—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I have not been able to get an appropriate answer from the Secretary of State, I should like to direct my question to the President of the Privy Council. Under the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act the draft order was presented on June 7, it was proclaimed on June 11 and I believe gazetted on June 16. Have all steps been taken such that any election held after June 15 of 1977 will be on the new boundaries? If not, would he explain what steps have to be taken?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that within the next couple of months returning officers have to be appointed for all the new ridings. I think the situation is this, that you could not hold an election before the date mentioned by the hon. member. I do not think I can yet give assurances that one could be held immediately thereafter; that would depend upon the chief electoral officer, if he is satisfied.

* * *

URBAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. When will the reorganization of the ministry, as announced to the press on May 28, the day after his estimates were passed by the committee, take place? Since this in fact represents a major reorganization of government, does the minister intend officially to notify parliament by way of a statement in the House?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the reorganization has been underway, is currently underway and largely in place. It was dealt with when the estimates were before the committee and we talked about the restructuring, co-ordination and new positions within CMHC and the ministry. This process is proceeding smoothly and we think it will have a great beneficial effect in making the ministry even more effective in the future.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question. Would the minister be prepared to make a statement in the House as to the timetable of the reorganization, and can he confirm to the House the plans of the government to appoint the present president of CMHC as deputy minister or undersecretary in the new ministry?

Mr. Danson: Mr. Speaker, I thought the information was pretty clear. The information given out was certainly discussed before the committee. I would be delighted if the hon. member would choose an opposition day on which we could discuss this in some detail. I think all hon. members would find it of very great interest and a great step forward in the reorganization of government, making more effective use of resources which were complementary but not sufficiently well co-ordinated, as will now be the case.

* * *

HEALTH

MERCURY POISONING—PROPOSED CLOSING OF ENGLISH AND WABIGOON RIVERS TO FISHING

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister of health concerning mercury poisoning in northwestern Ontario. Is the minister or the special study group on mercury poisoning in his department aware of the contents of a special report in the hands of the Ontario minister of health which recommends that the English and Wabigoon river system be closed to all

fishing, and is the federal government prepared to take such action under the Canada Water Act?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of such a report. However, I know that consultations are now under way with Indians and between Indians and Ontario government ministers on that matter, and I am sure we will have the opportunity to discuss it soon with the Ontario government.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

INQUIRY IF NEW REGULATIONS APPLY TO LEBANESE VISITORS TO CANADA

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration a question.

Would the minister inform the House on the new situation concerning Lebanese visitors to Canada, and confirm whether it is true that new regulations have been decreed last Friday concerning Lebanese visitors to Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are, effective today, going to offer the opportunity to some 1,000 Lebanese people here in Canada in the category of independent immigrants or who are here as visitors to apply for landed immigrant status through order in council, provided that with assistance from the Lebanese community they can be successfully established in Canada. Immigration officers will review their applications in those terms under relaxed criteria. Indeed, persons with or without relatives who arrive with visas will be admitted in the category in which they are seeking entry.

On the other hand, those who come to Canada illegally—that is, without visas—from countries other than Lebanon will be returned to the country from whence they came; that is standard immigration policy. We will be offering to those people here who do not have relatives, and who are here as of today, the opportunity to apply for permanent residence within Canada through order in council.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LEBANON—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO EVACUATE CANADIANS

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question has a very related and important connection. May I ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, in light of the successful efforts by the United States to evacuate a number of their nationals from Lebanon and activities by other countries in Europe, she can advise the House if Canada is taking any steps to evacuate the 200 or so Canadian nationals who are still in that war torn country?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the House may know, the airport at Beirut is closed and this does not give us any possibility of sending Canadian aircraft to take out Canadians. Our information indicates that there were no Canadians in the British organized convoy which arrived in Damascus on June 18. On the other hand, I was just informed that there were nine Canadians included in the 263 civilians being taken to Athens by the U.S. navy.

* * *

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF PRICE OFFERED BY CORPORATION FOR WHITEFISH

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State (Fisheries). Has the minister received a request from the fishermen of northern Saskatchewan for a review of the price offered by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation for cutter whitefish of as low as two cents up to 7¼ cents, which is less than half the price offered last year; and can these fishermen expect any support under the fish support program?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen a request of this type but I will obviously check into it right away. I might say to the hon. member, on the other hand, that the price is set by the corporation, its board and advisers, including a large number of fishermen represented on the advisory committee and on the board itself.

* * *

TRADE

INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS DEFICIT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO COUNTERACT

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In light of the massive deficit on current account of international payments reported by Statistics Canada last week, is the minister considering any initiatives designed to improve Canada's trade position in relation to its level of exports?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Very much, so, Mr. Speaker, and a great many of them are underway. I am sure the hon. member has been advised of them. If not, I will be very glad to make them available to him. They include various missions to different countries as well as a number of missions coming here to look at the potential for export, and there is a wide range of other activities. So that the total package is quite impressive. Of course, as I mentioned to the House some weeks ago, particularly on the trade account itself, it looks as though last year's deficit is in fact being turned around and we will wind up with a small surplus.

Oral Questions

● (1500)

FINANCE

PROPOSAL TO MODIFY LEVEL OF FOREIGN BORROWING AND ALLEVIATE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS POSITION

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. Does he intend to take steps to modify the level of foreign borrowing, particularly by provincial governments, in order to reduce the level of interest paid from Canadian sources in respect of such borrowing, thereby alleviating to some extent the very serious balance of payments situation facing this country?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I take it what the hon. gentleman is advocating is a very loose monetary policy, and it would not be the intention of the government to ask for that action by the Bank of Canada.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

PRICE OF BEEF IMPORTED FROM AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that is supplementary to one asked earlier of the Minister of Agriculture. It relates to the matter of imports from Australia and New Zealand of frozen carcas beef and boneless beef. Would the minister, perhaps in consultation with his colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, suggest that Canada should insist that all such imports from down under be brought in at a price no less than that for equivalent types of meat going into the United States and not at any discount, whatsoever, particularly the six-cent a pound discount we have heard about?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I, too, met the Minister of Agriculture for Australia, but in another city, namely, Rome. We discussed this very topic that the hon. member has mentioned. I did say I would discuss it with my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, at the first opportunity, but I have not had that opportunity so far. I am satisfied that the Minister of Agriculture for Australia is quite serious about bringing this whole matter of the sale price of their meat in Canada in line with what it is selling for in the United States.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

TABLING OF REPORT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO MARKETING OF BEEF AND VEAL

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table, in both official languages, the report of the commission of inquiry into the marketing of beef and veal.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF COMMUNIQUÉ ISSUED FOLLOWING FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table, in both official languages, a communiqué issued following the federal-provincial conference of attorneys general held at Vancouver on June 17 and 18, 1976.

* * *

SUPPLY

NOTICE OF MOTION TO CONCUR IN MAIN OR SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there was a technical slip-up at the end of the week. I should, therefore, like to move a motion, which I understand carries the support of my colleagues the House leaders of other parties, as follows:

That, notwithstanding Standing Order 58(4)(a), during the period ending June 30, 1976, twenty-four hours' written notice shall be required for any motion to concur in main or supplementary estimates.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have had some communication in respect of this matter, and we are prepared to concur in the motion. I should like to commend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) for not following the precedent of his colleagues in criticizing his public servants for the slip-up that occurred and for accepting the responsibility himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we agree to this method of correcting this error.

Mr. Beaudoin: Nous sommes d'accord, monsieur le président.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion of the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) which is introduced without notice at this time with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 5,362, 5,392, 5,401, 5,417 and 5,420.

[*Text*]

REVIEW OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ANSWER TO QUESTION 3,703

Question No. 5,362—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Have any officials of the Department of Justice examined the answer to Question No. 3,703 in which it is stated that the Public Service Commission "is restrained by the provisions of section 13 of the Public Service Employment Act to the consideration of a prospective candidate's place of residence rather than his or her place of birth" and, if not, for what reason?

2. Are there any regulations or orders issued pursuant to section 13 and, if so, have they been examined by the Department or its officials and, if not, for what reason?

3. Does the answer to Question No. 3,703 have the nature of a legal opinion?

Mr. Francis Fox (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. No. The Department of Justice has not been requested to provide legal advice to the Public Service Commission on this question.

2. Section 9 of the Public Service Employment Regulations, which were made by the Public Service Commission in 1967, deals with the determination of the area in which applicants must reside in order to be eligible for appointment. As required by section 4 of the Regulations Under Section 9 of the Regulations Act (which were then in force), the Public Service Employment Regulations would have been examined by the Clerk of the Privy Council in consultation with the Deputy Minister of Justice to ensure that the form and draftsmanship thereof followed established standards. An examination of those Regulations also would have been made by the Department of Justice under the Canadian Bill of Rights.

3. No. Government legal opinions can only be given by the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada by virtue of the Department of Justice Act.

PRAIRIE GRAIN ADVANCE PAYMENTS ACT—INTEREST ON ARREARS

Question No. 5,392—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. For the crop years 1974-75, 1973-74 and 1972-73, how many producers, in each of the provinces, were charged interest on arrears arising from default under provisions of the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act?

2. What was the total (a) aggregate amount (b) for each province collected by the Canadian Wheat Board for interest in lieu of default under the provisions of the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act?

3. Were any producers successful in appealing the decision of the Canadian Wheat Board to levy interest and, if so, how many?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Canadian Wheat Board statistics, relating to producer accounts for the crop years 1974-75, 1973-74 and 1972-73 that were placed in default and assessed interest under the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, are not maintained by province. The total number of producer accounts placed in default and assessed interest for each of those crop years are: 1972-73, 3,657; 1973-74, 3,555; 1974-75, 1,999.

2. (a) 1972-73, $453,829; 1973-74, $751,822; 1974-75, $397,259; (b) Not available by province.

3. No.

MIRABEL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 5,401—**Mr. Beatty:**

What was the total cost for the building and opening of Mirabel Airport?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The actual total cost, as of March 31, 1976, for the building and opening of Mirabel Airport is $324,858,000.

COMMITTEE ON THE OPERATION OF THE ABORTION LAW

Question No. 5,417—**Mr. Reid:**

1. With respect to the answer to Question No. 3,938, does the government have a statement from Dr. Marion C. Powell that she has not been and never has been a member of Doctors for the Repeal of Abortion Laws?

2. Is the government aware that in an advertisement in the CMA Journal of June 21, 1975 (Vol. 112, 1419) the name of a Dr. Marion C. Powell, Toronto, Ontario appears, and has the government investigated to discover if this Dr. Marion C. Powell is the same Dr. Marion C. Powell appointed to the Committee on Abortion Law Study and, if so, what were the results of the investigation?

3. If the two Dr. Marion C. Powells should happen to be the same person, does the government consider that the neutrality of the Committee on Abortion Laws is destroyed by virtue of having a committed advocate of one side of the question on the Committee and, if so, what action does the government intend to take to redress the balance and to ensure that other sides of opinion are represented on the Committee?

Mr. Francis Fox (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. No, but the government does have such a statement from Dr. Marion G. Powell.

2. If the name appearing in the advertisement of the C.M.A. Journal of June 21, 1975 (Vol. 112, 1419) was intended to refer to Dr. Marion G. Powell, I am informed that she did not authorize the use of her name in this advertisement.

3. The terms of reference of the Committee on the Operation of the Abortion Law, tabled in the House of Commons on October 15, 1975, make clear that the government is not asking the Committee to make recommendations on a policy with respect to abortion. The government considered it more appropriate to establish a committee to conduct a scientific study of the way in which the existing

abortion law is actually operating. All the members of the Committee were carefully selected on the basis of their knowledge and experience and their ability to carry out this kind of research.

MIRABEL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 5,420—**Mr. MacKay:**

What is the total cost of Mirabel International Airport to date, including approved estimates relating to (a) original land acquisition (b) supplementary land acquisition (c) court and legal costs arising out of land acquisition and expropriations (d) consulting fees to CAIM (e) consulting fees to outside consultants excluding CAIM and related to Mirabel (f) construction costs as approved by the New Montreal International Airport Project Office and costs of ancillary equipment for operations?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The total actual cost, as of March 31, 1976, of Mirabel International Airport is $324,858,000. This includes the airport proper (including land used as airport operational zone), the air navigational aids (some of which are used exclusively for Mirabel), the meteorological services and ancillary equipment for operations. The total estimated cost, as of March 31, 1976, of Mirabel International Airport, including approved estimates relating to items (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) is $336,437,000.

N.B.: (a) Some 17,000 acres of land used as the airport operational zone were acquired for an approved estimated cost of $18,000,000. This cost is charged against the airport costs. In addition to the land used as airport operational zone, some 76,000 acres of airport peripheral land were acquired for an approved estimated cost of $143,000,000. This cost is not charged against airport cost; (b) there was no supplementary land acquisition; therefore no cost; (c) $1,280,603 have been spent as court and legal costs arising out of the total (some 93,000 acres) land acquisition and expropriation. Therefore, these costs are charged to the airport or to the airport peripheral land in proportion to the area of land. The proportion of these costs chargeable to the land used as airport operational zone is included in the $18,000,000 mentioned at item (a). (d) $25,637,500 have been approved for consulting fees to CAIM; (e) approximately $16,000,000 have been approved for consulting fees related to Mirabel to outside consultants excluding CAIM; (f) the total construction costs as approved by the New Montreal International Airport Project Office is $336,437,000. This figure includes, among other items, the estimated cost of the land used as airport operational zone, fees to be paid to consultants, the estimated cost of ancillary equipment for operations, the air navigational aids and meteorological services. The estimated costs of ancillary equipments for operation is $10,121,000.

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Are the remaining questions allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Fox.]

[*English*]

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding a question I placed on the order paper on June 8. It is a starred question and is in respect of which members of the cabinet were on the Treasury Board on December 2, 1975, dealing with the LRPA contract. This is an answer that could have been provided in one day and I would appreciate it if I could be provided with an answer by not later than tomorrow.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—CONDEMNATION OF GOVERNMENT FOR ITS ALLEGED CYNICAL BEHAVIOUR AT HABITAT CONFERENCE

On the order: Opposition motion for the supply period ending June 30, 1976.

That this House condemns the government for its cynical behaviour at the Habitat conference held recently in Vancouver, first, in its position on land speculation; second, its policy of placing commercial criteria ahead of any others in the sale of nuclear reactors; and third, the obvious conflict between the government's bold statements on such environmental matters as clean water and its inability or unwillingness to enforce minimal standards in Canada, as in the case of the Syncrude plant in northern Alberta—Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a day for confessing errors. I am grateful to the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) for pointing out a drafting error in the motion which our party has put down for debate today. As an old printer, I emphasize that it is a drafting error and not a typographical one. At any rate, the last phrase of the motion that will be debated today reads, "as in the case of the Syncrude plant in northern Alberta." It should read, "as in the case of the Great Canadian Oil Sands plant in northern Alberta". Like my hon. friend across the way, I will take the blame for it. Like him, I have discussed the matter with the other House leaders, and they have agreed that consent be given to making this change so the motion will read as I have indicated.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is quite right, and I should like to join him in congratulating the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk).

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, the motion which is on the order paper will be amended, by consent, so that in the last line the words "Syncrude plant" will be changed to read "the Great Canadian Oil Sands plant". Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview) moved:

That this House condemns the government for its cynical behaviour at the Habitat conference held recently in Vancouver, first, in its

position on land speculation; second, its policy of placing commercial criteria ahead of any others in the sale of nuclear reactors; and third, the obvious conflict between the government's bold statements on such environmental matters as clean water and its inability or unwillingness to enforce minimal standards in Canada, as in the case of the Great Canadian Oil Sands plant in northern Alberta.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion today refers to the recent United Nations conference in Vancouver on human settlements which was hosted by Canada and was called Habitat. This conference of over 125 countries, involving 4,000 persons, was a follow-up to the UN conference held in Stockholm on the environment, the conference in Rome on food, the conference in Belgrade on population, and the conference in Mexico on the status of women. Hon. members will note that in the motion I am critical of the performance of the government of Canada. It was outvoted, outclassed and outmanoeuvered, and played a role of compromise, cajoling, pleading and begging instead of giving leadership and direction to the problems of human settlements.

I am not critical of government ministers who represented Canada. The Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson), who acted as president of the conference, is a decent, open, honest and compassionate person—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1510)

Mr. Gilbert: —who spoke from the heart in the hardfisted business of politics. But the head as well as the heart must be used in respect of these problems.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) worked hard and long trying to defend the indefensible and trying to reach compromise solutions. What annoyed many Canadian delegates and observers was the weak and vacillating position of the government on the main issue of land, nuclear reactors, clean water and the new international economic order. I should like to demonstrate the government's poor and pitiful performance. The moral tone of the conference was set by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau), Mother Teresa, the Vancouver symposium made up of Barbara Ward and 23 other world-renowned human settlement experts, and the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. I should like members to listen to what the Prime Minister said at the opening of the conference. He said:

> Love is all you need—

But ordinary love will not be enough, according to the Prime Minister.

> The only type of love which would be effective in the tightly packed world we already live in would be a passionate love—

Then he quoted Teilhard and said:

> Love one another, or you will perish.

Then he said:

> Life would become intolerable if one failed to love one's neighbour, the only path is a "conspiracy of love"—in this lies the salvation of human settlements and the hope held forth by Habitat . . .
>
> The ordinary people, the youth, of whatever age, the participants in the parallel Habitat forum—all have a commitment. And of all the factors bearing down on the conference, Trudeau stressed that urgency was as important as any.
>
> The long years of experience, the specialization, the advanced knowledge and the wisdom of the delegates of Habitat, mixed with the imagination, the originality, the spontaneity, the boldness and the irreverence to be found at Habitat forum will produce, I am sure, an effervescence of quality.

That is what the Prime Minister said at the opening of the conference to set the moral tone. Let me relate what Mother Teresa had to say. Mother Teresa, the saint from the Calcutta slums, told people at the Habitat forum to put their love into living action and to give love until it hurts. She said:

> Let us not just put this love into words. Let us love until it hurts.

Mother Teresa responded to the words of the Prime Minister in respect of a conspiracy of love by saying that the Prime Minister of Canada should match his words and his actions in accordance with what he stated at the opening of the conference. The Prime Minister's actions and Canada's actions were deafening by their silence and inaction. The third group to set forth the tone of the conference was the Vancouver symposium lead by Barbara Ward and 23 other renowed human settlement experts. The following is a news release:

> The Vancouver conference is about the whole of life, says the declaration. "It is in settlements that mankind achieves happiness, justice and dignity—or suffers rejection, despair and deepening violence—Let Vancouver be remembered as a city where a new hope was born".

Then they set forth some of the problems which we are facing in respect of human settlements, and offered some solutions. They said that every encouragement must be given to the citizens themselves to arrange, build and diversify their communities. The declaration contains a strong commitment to public control over development land. The unearned increment created by changes in land use must return to the community, the 24 experts said, and not to private land owners. They also propose a moratorium on nuclear power and the transfer of research and resources to income-energy systems like solar power. The fantastic waste of resources and energy in western technologies, the declaration states, are errors and extravagances which all countries, developed and developing alike, can and should avoid. This was the statement led by Barbara Ward, Margaret Mead, Buckminster Fuller and others who set forth the moral tone.

May I relate what the Minister of State for Urban Affairs said. I quote from the Vancouver *Province:*

> Danson said the ultimate reason for poverty is not a lack of resources but a lack of political will. "We have an opportunity here to change that choice. This, to me, is what we mean when we speak of Habitat as a solution-oriented conference."
>
> Danson later held his first news conference as Habitat president. He repeated the position that industrialized nations must increasingly share their wealth with the developing world.
>
> "If we try to isolate ourselves from other parts of the world, there will be despair and violence and from that we cannot escape, nor should we escape."

May I deal with the performance of Canada with regard to the Habitat conference. Canada's performance was disappointing and duplicitous. It was duplicitous in the sense of pretending to listen, but not acting. Senator Perrault was the embodiment of the duplicity in the sense of being all things to all men. The Prime Minister, on Monday at the opening of the conference, spoke of the conspiracy of love. On Tuesday, the day after, he said that Canada will not stop the sale of nuclear reactors to other countries. On Wednesday, Maurice Strong, the chairman of Petro-Canada took an opposite view and expressed the need for a

moratorium to study the impact and safeguards with regard to nuclear reactors. You could hear and feel the crash of the moral tone as a result of the statement by the Prime Minister with regard to a moratorium on nuclear reactors.

Second, with regard to the land issue, the conference started off with the principle that unearned increment should be returned to the community. Canada played the role of compromise, the role of waffling and vacillating with regard to the particular course Canada should accept. Mr. Speaker, this begged the question of how much of the unearned profits should be returned to the community. Should it be 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 95 per cent, or 100 per cent? The Minister of Justice summed it all up to the delegates. He said that this is a political question to be determined by the particular government. The final draft read:

> The unearned increment resulting from the rise in land values resulting from change in use of land, from public investment or decision, or due to the general growth of the community, must be subject to appropriate recapture—

Again it begged the question: What is appropriate recapture. Is it 5 per cent, is it 10 per cent, or is it 100 per cent? The problem with regard to the recapture of unearned profits was a problem that Canada had because it was in the grips of the land developers. It was in the grips of William Teron, the president of CMHC. It was in the grips of Keith Morley, the president of Costain Land Development Company, and it was in the grips of the minister of housing for Alberta, William Yurko. It was they, and they alone, who set the vacillating and compromising position of Canada which Canada took with regard to the recovery of unearned profits relating to land. I shudder to think what would have happened to Canada's position if the persons representing the non-governmental organizations had not applied pressure to the delegates and the ministers concerning this problem.

● (1520)

The third issue is that of clean water. Practically every country there agreed on the general principle that we should have clean water either by 1986 or 1990. Clean water should be available by those dates to all persons throughout the world. What did Canada do? Canada did not make any dollar commitment to implement this principle. The best Canada could do was to have one of their delegates from the Department of Finance, Brian Hunter, come to the NGO meeting and say, "Really, gentlemen, this falls under CIDA. We have $1 billion to spend under CIDA, and perhaps we can spare $70 million to $100 million under this program. But really it is up to the developing countries to determine whether they want this money." If Canada had wanted to show leadership and direction, they would have said that we have money available immediately outside CIDA to implement this program. Then they would have had the support and encouragement of all the other countries. But no, they vacillated, they compromised, they refused to act.

The other area was with regard to the new international economic order which would have taken care of monetary reform, trade patterns, resource development and multinationals, because all these have formed part of the problems of human settlements. The answer of the Canadian government was that they could not discuss this because the problems had already been discussed at the other UN conference of UNCTAD and therefore Canada could not disturb what took place there. You can see the position of refusing to act on a moratorium concerning nuclear reactors. There was waffling and compromising with regard to land, no action with regard to international economic order, and no dollar commitment with regard to clean water. Is it any wonder that Canada's performance was disappointing and duplicitous?

The real performers at the conference were the non-governmental organizations which were represented by approximately 200 persons. They were chaired by Mark Dorfman and the co-ordinator was Bernard Daly. It was they alone who had a real appreciation of the problems of human settlements, and it was they alone who forced the government to take the small steps that it took. I should like to read from the resolutions that the NGOs put forth to this government. I will summarize them because they are rather lengthy. In the Canadian NGO manifesto they said the following regarding the new international economic order:

> 1. Regarding the new international economic order, let Canada take action to lead in establishing new international agreements and arrangements regarding trade, monetary systems, industrial strategies and resource development programs that are advantageous to the developing countries. Let Canada's response to the needs of poor countries not be only aid through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).
>
> 2. Let land be treated as a community resource and not as a market commodity . . .
>
> 3. Let Canada lead in establishing a moratorium on expansion of nuclear power, with accompanying emphasis on alternative power sources and on energy conservation.
>
> 4. Let there be an end to fragmentation of housing programs among the federal, provincial and municipal levels of government. Let priority in housing be directed to special-need groups, especially by means of government action at all levels to control the cost of land and the cost of money for housing.
>
> 5. Let there be a Canadian dollar commitment now to programs for clean water . . .
>
> 6. Let indigenous land claims be settled prior to the undertaking of development projects in Canada; and let special attention be paid to advancing the equality of indigenous women and to the general needs of native peoples in such matters as housing and jobs . . .
>
> 8. Let there soon be right to information legislation covering all levels of government in Canada.

They also added to that the need to develop a conservation-oriented society. This is what the Canadian position should have been, and what the Canadian delegates should have expressed at the conference. If they had, they would have had a splendid response, not only in Canada but throughout the world. The least that can be done now is for the Minister of Justice and the Minister of State for Urban Affairs to meet at a post-Habitat conference in Canada with the representatives of the non-governmental organizations and address themselves to the answers to the problems and to the solutions that they set forth to the government.

One of the main problems—and I dealt with it in a way—was the problem of land. Canada's position with regard to land and to the United Nations reveals a weakness at the federal, provincial and municipal levels. The high cost of housing in Canada is made up of three components: the cost of materials, the cost of financing, and the cost of land.

We in the NDP have pointed out to the minister on many occasions that the high cost with regard to financing is due to the fact that mortgages are in the control of the financial institutions which control the flow of moneys and determine the interest rates. Is it any wonder that people in Canada today are paying between 11.5 per cent and 12 per cent for mortgages? It is because the control and flow of mortgage money is in the hands of the financial institutions instead of under the control of the government.

The control of land for housing in Canada is in the hands of developers, and the government aids and abets the developers and speculators to increase their profits at the expense of home buyers. When I heard the Minister of Justice, the developers and the minister of housing for Alberta, Mr. Yurko, speak with regard to the recovery of unearned profits on land, I heard them say that in Canada they can recapture these unearned profits through the capital gains tax, the special speculation taxes in certain provinces, the corporation taxes, the municipal taxes and the impost taxes with regard to services. All these instruments do not work, and land developers are gouging the purchasers by unwarranted, unjustified and unconscionable profits in land development. They are treating land as a commodity instead of a community resource.

● (1530)

This philosophy is expressed by the developers and they are aided and abetted by the government. Back in 1973 this government commissioned Peter Spurr to make a special study with regard to the land problems across Canada. He prepared a report and gave it to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. CMHC did not publish it for public use, but James Lorimer, who is a specialist in urban affairs, a teacher, writer and publisher, published the work of Peter Spurr with regard to land. The real thrust of his report is that in all the main cities across Canada, with the present exception of Montreal, land for housing purposes is in the hands of small groups of developers who make enormous profits and who pay little or no taxes on these profits because of the tax laws with regard to capital cost allowances, and the accounting and reporting procedures of these land development companies.

This is the price the Minister of State for Urban Affairs has had to pay to accomplish an increase in housing starts across the country. He had to give to the developers all the tax advantages available to them. This is the rip-off to which home buyers in Canada have been subjected to obtain shelter.

Let me deal with two examples. Let me deal, first, with the example which was raised by Wendy Day on CTV this past week when she said that in Erindale, Mississauga, in 1972 a three-bedroom bungalow on a 50-foot lot cost $32,850. To qualify, a purchaser required an annual income of $12,000. A down payment of $9,000 was made, which the purchaser obtained from the sale of his former home. With the down payment of $9,000 and a mortgage of $25,000 at 8¾ per cent interest, the monthly payment for principal and interest amounted to $204.96; with taxes, $270 a month. Today, less than four years later, the same bungalow two miles away, situated in Erindale, Mississauga, costs $63,995. That is almost a 100 per cent increase.

The purchaser now requires an income of over $20,000, and with a down payment of $15,500 and a mortgage of $48,480 at 11 per cent, the payments are now $466.83 for principal and interest; and with taxes included, $530 a month. That dramatizes how the cost of homes has increased in the short period from 1972 to 1976. In 1972, 50-foot lot in Mississauga cost $12,850. That same lot, in 1976, sells for $30,934, 2½ times the price of 1972. This situation with regard to Erindale is true of all the major cities in Canada.

In an article by James Lorimer published in the *Globe and Mail* of May 22 he pointed out that in 1972 in Calgary a three-bedroom home on a 50-foot lot cost $25,000. In 1976 the same home on a 40-foot lot costs $54,000, an increase of more than 100 per cent; and an income of over $21,600 is required. In 1972, the average 50-foot lot in Calgary cost $6,320. In 1976 it costs $20,400, three times as high. Mr. Lorimer points out that the largest Canadian development corporations are in the land banking and land development business on a very big scale indeed.

Information collected by Peter Spurr for 1973 showed a total of 119,192 acres owned by 47 development corporations in about 21 Canadian cities. These private land banks in many instances are large enough to supply all the new land required for housing for the next five years. I am going to repeat that: these companies have enough land within their control to supply all the housing needs of Canada for the next five years. Around Ottawa and Hull—and I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Gauthier) will be interested in this—nine corporations were found to own 9,416 acres. That is almost 15 square miles of land. It is an eight-year supply at current new house densities and projected growth rates. Around Toronto, 24 firms were listed as owning 41,198 acres, and nine large firms held 87 per cent of that land. The same pattern prevails across the country with regard to the control of land by the development companies and with regard to the cost, profiteering and release of that land.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The parliamentary secretary wishes to ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to answer the question when I have finished speaking. My time is very limited and I want to finish what I have to say. It is not only that land developers have land under their control; the government aids and abets the developers through capital cost allowances, and some provinces are permitting them to charge carrying costs. One would think that all these land developers who make such high profits would pay their proper share of corporation taxes. In James Lorimer's article of May 29, 1976, it is pointed out that in 1974 S. B. McLaughlin and Associates made a profit of $2,254,000 and paid taxes of only $376,000. In 1973, that company made a profit of $3,224,000 and did not pay one cent in taxes.

Daon Developments in Vancouver made a profit of $3,096,000 in 1974 and did not pay one cent in income tax. The Cadillac-Fairview Development Company, which is a Toronto firm, made $13 million in profits in 1975 and paid $440,000 in taxes. Why is it that all these land development

and building companies can make such huge profits at the expense of Canadian home buyers and not pay the proper taxes? The reason is that the tax laws of this government with regard to capital cost allowances provide loopholes to these companies so that they can get away with their enormous profits. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) will not take action with regard to these companies because he knows as well as I do that in Toronto the profits of Cadillac-Fairview, Bramalea, and S. B. McLaughlin are enormous. He knows that by permitting these companies to take advantage of capital cost allowances, they get away without paying any, or very little, taxes.

What should we in Canada do to reduce the cost of housing for the ordinary person? The first thing we must do is develop the philosophy that land is a community resource and not a commodity. The minister must learn that principle quickly. The second thing is that we must have public land banking. The minister will say that we have a form of public land banking. It was instituted by the present Minister of Justice. It is mere token land banking. What is needed is an immediate thrust with regard to the—

● (1540)

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my colleagues. I certainly will not abuse the privilege given me.

I say that the minister has to set forth on a better land banking program which will immediately get within the control of the federal government, the provincial and municipal governments a sufficient number of lots which can be released to purchasers at a reasonable cost. I say "at a reasonable cost" because the experience, not only of CMHC but of some of the municipalities, as they have released the lots at an inflated price compared to what they paid has had little or no effect on the cost of land.

The government must purchase selective land development companies across the country so that we will have a yardstick with which to compare the price of land of private development companies and of public development companies. I am sure the Minister of State for Urban Affairs knows of the British Columbia experience when a private company was taken over. It provided them with a yardstick for the price of housing and the price of land. It was used for comparison purposes when the private developers tried to tell the provincial government that they were not making money on land and homes.

Another measure would be to close the loopholes with regard to capital cost allowances. These companies are permitted to charge 5 per cent of the cost of the buildings that are on the land. Experience has shown that in most cases the buildings on those lands have not depreciated but have, in fact, appreciated. In the financial statement given to shareholders, the figures of the accountants and auditors show that it does not come anywhere close to the 5 per cent; in fact, it is much less than 1 per cent. What the minister must do is persuade the Minister of Finance to close the loophole with regard to capital cost allowances.

These suggestions are only starters with regard to the problems of land, Mr. Speaker. If the minister would take them under consideration, we could go to the next United Nations conference and make a real contribution to the problems of human settlement. We would not be seen to be wavering, vacillating or compromising on the question of land.

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), I, too, have some critical comments to make about the government's performance at Habitat. I want to begin on a positive note, however, by congratulating the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) not only for his chairmanship of the entire conference, where I thought he conducted himself with great dignity and did credit to our whole country, but I want to pay him a particular tribute for his speech on Thursday night at the climactic moment of Habitat. As he, himself, described it, it was a speech from the heart, a speech that I think spoke for many Canadians who saw in Habitat a chance to make a forward move in the whole direction of international development.

Having said that about the minister, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the House to consider some of the reasons the government's performance was indeed, as the hon. member for Broadview said, so cynical with respect to Habitat—cynical for a much deeper reason than the three mentioned by the previous speaker.

The motion deals with the specifics of land speculation, the spread of nuclear technology, and putting water in settlements, it says that the government was cynical with respect to those three matters. I could agree with that, but I think, despite the lip service that the hon. member for Broadview paid to Barbara Ward, he indicated that he still thought Habitat was fundamentally a housing conference. Habitat was far more than a housing conference, Mr. Speaker. In order to have any kind of realistic evaluation of what it was trying to do, what it failed to do, and why the Canadian government was cynical in its conduct during that conference, Habitat has to be seen in its total perspective.

It is quite true that the press of this country branded Habitat a failure. The press, that paragon of wisdom, reported up and down this country that Habitat was a failure because of the Arab-Jewish enmity which was carried from the halls of the United Nations in New York into the Queen Elizabeth theatre in Vancouver, turning a conference that was designed to provide settlements for people around the world into a prolongation of that terrible conflict in Palestine, and because of the Arab intransigence in insisting that the final declaration of principles contain an oblique derogation of Israel, forcing Canada along with 14 other countries to vote against the declaration. The press has regarded this whole performance as a failure.

That is too superficial a view of what Habitat was. I do not say that Habitat was a success. I deplore as strongly as anyone the ugly Mid-east battle that took place in Vancou-

ver, a battle of words, a battle of resolutions, a battle to slow down the very slow progress being made in the area of international development. But to tell the Canadian people that Habitat goes down the drain because of this resolution is to miss the point of what Habitat was. What did Habitat try to tell us, what was it trying to tell the world? Why was it more than just a housing conference?

One third of the entire urban population of the developing world lives in slums and settlements. Thirty per cent do not have water within 100 metres of their home. More than half the people in developing countries do not have electricity. Those are just the opening statements in the description of a world scene in which hundreds of millions of people in the 35 developing countries, now called the fourth world, live under conditions of absolute poverty and deprivation. It forms a global ghetto which closes in on them while pressing out on the rest of the world.

In many small, developing countries where dramatic growth has occurred, the benefits have not reached all the people. Of course, the question of numbers enters into it. The figures of the growth of cities, especially in the third world, are horrendous. Of the 17 cities in the world that are now called the "ten million" cities because they have populations in excess of ten million, ten will shortly be in the developing world where there is a desperate shortage of existing social services to provide the inpouring migrants with a semblance of human dignity. It did not take Habitat to tell us the situation of global disparity which produces this mass poverty.

● (1550)

The United Nations, through the series of conferences of which Habitat was but one, has shown us the global picture. The environment conference of 1972, the population conference, the world food conference of 1974, and the status of women conference in 1975, together with related conferences, culminated in the seventh special session of the United Nations in 1974-75 which gave us the new economic order. These factors, considered together, give us an overview of the global scene today, of which Canada is one part, and show us how serious the situation has become.

The situation has arisen because of the manner in which we and other industrialized nations maintain our standard of living and growth. We do it with the continued acquisition of technology, capital and resources which feed the ever-growing demands of our societies. The problem is terribly complex and can only be resolved by a new international partnership of developed and developing nations. I add, parenthetically, that the days of aid are over. I am talking of aid in the sense that it can raise the standard of living of people trapped in countries without resources, technology and capital. Aid is a "way-station" on the way to true reforms of social and economic systems which will allow the peoples of the underdeveloped countries of the world to become self-reliant. Basically, that is what Habitat was all about. It was concerned with specific questions relating to human settlements.

We should not think, by any means, that the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) at Habitat, and the speech of Mother Teresa, earlier referred to this afternoon, set the tone of Habitat. The previous speaker suggested that the tone of Habitat was set by the Prime Minister of our country and Mother Teresa speaking eloquently and rhetorically about love. That tone was quickly dissipated by the President of Mexico, President Echeverria, in the most under-reported speech of the whole conference. President Echeverria, who headed the delegation from Mexico to Habitat, was given a standing ovation in the plenary hall. He excoriated the industrialized nations for not following their rhetoric of the past few years with action which would help developing nations. I shall quote a paragraph or two of President Echeverria's speech to show the mood of Habitat, a mood to which Canada failed to respond. That led to cynicism. President Echeverria said, in part:

> How could the human tide that is moving the cities actually be kept in the rural areas with a decent standard of living when the prices of food and raw materials are at the mercy of mercantile monopolization and iniquitous international speculation? . . .
>
> The attitude which the industrial states have recently adopted in economic matters reveals the extent to which their real dispute is waged not in the sphere of worldwide ideological conflict but rather in that of specific economic interests, and how easy it is for powerful minorities to reach circumstantial agreement when the majorities make specific demands and organize for action. When matters come to a head, however, questions of profit and loss have always proved more powerful than the standards of freedom, democracy, justice and solidarity.

The President of Mexico told the world and delegates to Habitat that despite the gravity of conditions facing developing nations, the industrialized world is not backing its sentiments of love with concrete action. It has not adopted the great resolutions previously passed by the United Nations. He specifically referred to the fourth UNCTAD conference which ended in Nairobi a few days before the Habitat conference began. Hon. members will recall that we discussed the work of the conference in this House a little over a week ago. It turned on the validity of the principle of a common fund being established for some ten buttressed commodities which developing nations export and on which they depend for foreign exchange, exchange with which they pay for the manufactured goods and commodities they need.

Although the matter was highly technical, the main line of the argument became clear. It was this: an integrated system to protect the prices of primary commodities produced in developing countries must be in place if those developing countries are to be given a chance at being self-reliant. Canada at the beginning of the UNCTAD conference gave lip service to the idea. At the end of the conference we said we would go along with the establishment of the common fund provided it was actually established. That quasi-commitment was dragged out of Canada in the course of the UNCTAD conference.

I mention the UNCTAD conference while talking of Habitat because both conferences are very much connected. Both Habitat and UNCTAD bear some relationship to the principles set forth in the UN charter of rights dealing with duties of states, and with the new economic order. These matters were raised in the declaration of principles. Canada voted against the declaration of principles which the Habitat conference finally produced. We voted against the declaration for reasons set out by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), the head of the Canadian delegation, to the effect that the declaration contains an iniquitous section derogatory of Israel. Since the Canadian gov-

ernment made it clear that it will not tolerate any UN resolutions which link Zionism with racism, we found it easy to vote against the entire declaration of principles.

Mr. Lalonde: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to hear the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) applauding.

Mr. Lalonde: I will applaud again. Are you in favour of racism?

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the minister that I have not successfully communicated with him this afternoon. I thought I made it clear at the beginning of my speech that I deplored that point as much as anybody.

Mr. Lalonde: The hon. member should be consistent with his own speech.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, if only the Canadian government would be consistent with its own announcements, we would be a lot further down the road to development. I am sure the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) knows precisely what I mean. Canada voted against the declaration of principles presumably because it contained the anti-Zionist section. Actually, the declaration contained other points which made Canada uncomfortable and for which we did not want to vote; and as the Minister of Justice himself said during the two weeks, those points gave Canada a great deal of trouble. For instance, may I quote point 14 of the declaration of principles, which reads:

To achieve universal progress in the quality of life, a fair and balanced structure of the economic relations between states has to be promoted. It is therefore essential to implement urgently the new international economic order, based on the declaration and program of action approved by the General Assembly in its sixth special session, and on the charter of economic rights and duties of states.

If hon. members wish to know in more detail Canada's difficulties with that resolution, I direct their attention to an article written Mr. Bernard Daly in the Ottawa *Journal* of Friday, June 18 last. He points out that the intransigent position of the Arabs provided a smokescreen behind which Canada was able to hide its opposition to some of the bitter facts which developing nations were including in the declaration of principles. A balanced structure of economic relations between status has to be promoted, yet Canada is not ready for that kind of action.

● (1600)

The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) was interviewed by the press at Habitat. It was widely quoted across Canada. He said that we could not expect Canada to go along with any of these substantial changes because the government would risk electoral defeat. That is to say that the people of Canada and the Minister of the Environment would not support the changes called for in such declarations as the declaration of principles of Habitat because the government would risk electoral defeat. That is a very interesting point indeed. Is that to say that the government's own five-year strategy of international development co-operation that was published before the seventh special session opened last September—a 21-point dimensional strategy, a structural reform that puts it together as our own policy, which I have several times said in this

House that I support—will not be implemented because the government is afraid of electoral defeat?

Let us follow this down to hard specifics. I know the Minister of State for Urban Affairs is extremely familiar with this. I quote from our mutual friend, Barbara Ward, who wound up her brilliant and masterful book, "The Home of Man", which was the overview of the Habitat situation, by asking: What is it we are really trying to bring about in these structural changes? I quote:

A sustained determination to end hunger in the next ten years—

Is the government afraid of electoral defeat for trying to do that?

—a committed plan to provide every human being with clean water by the mid-eighties—

Will that plan throw the government out of office?

—a strategy for decent shelter for every family as the new century dawns—

Is that program going to defeat any Canadian government? I say that any Canadian government afraid to implement such a program is not worthy of holding office.

The remarks of the Minister of the Environment were widely noted by delegates from around the world when they read the Vancouver press. That minister ought to be excoriated by this House for failing to indicate the true Canadian position, a position supported by all sides of this House, for the movement forward of Canada's meaningful participation in international development. That policy is contained in a report to parliament from the subcommittee on international development, representing all parties, which studies this issue extensively.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Roche: I thank my colleagues. I will not abuse the privilege. I want to make it clear that the policies for international development that we are talking about are incorporated in the report to parliament by the subcommittee on international development. It is still on the order paper awaiting debate. I will get to that in a second. I will read just one paragraph from the policy that supports this parliamentary policy and supports the government's own five-year strategy about which they are worried they are going to be defeated. I quote:

We realize the need for realism and for a long-term view of the role Canada can play in the global resolution of these difficult issues. Canadian influence must not be overestimated, but neither must it be underrated. Canada's own interests and economic influence place this country in a strategic position in a number of these debates, and Canadian credibility is reasonably high among most groups of countries.

That is just an inkling of the words that are found in that policy. However, Mr. Speaker, the problem gets down to this very simple reason about which the Minister of the Environment is concerned regarding electoral defeat, namely, that the Canadian people do not know what is going on; they have not been told about this policy.

We are debating Habitat this afternoon on an opposition day motion. We debated UNCTAD on an opposition day. We are always doing this. Why does the government not bring in its own motions, resolutions and legislation in order to state in this House its position in a positive way so that we can respond positively? It is wrong for parliament to be debating international development in the context of an opposition day. The government must become committed to promoting its own policy. Do not tell me that they are promoting it. If you go to the shelves of the CIDA library you will find 25,000 copies of the government's five-year strategy, unused and uncirculated. What is wrong with a government that allows its own policy to sit on the shelves?

There is a lot more to be said. I will not say it because my colleagues will speak on some of the specifics with regard to land speculation and the nuclear and water sections of the NDP motion. However, as the first speaker for our side I would be remiss if I did not attempt to point out the true reasons for Canadian government cynicism at Habitat. We went there with an excellent delegation, good leadership and a terrific program brought out by the NGO participation group throughout the country in the preceding year.

Talk about information overload! There was so much good material that even an expert could not absorb it all. There was no reason for the Canadian government not to seize the moment of leadership. UNCTAD centered around a common fund. Habitat centered around the provision of clean water for every human being by 1990. Canada did not stand up and say, "Yes, we will live up to this with a dollar commitment." During the course of Habitat, the Prime Minister said in the House that we are giving money to regular CIDA programs; nothing more special needs to be done. The Minister of State for Urban Affairs knows as well as I do that there was a moment lost at Habitat because we did not live up to our words. That was the true cynicism.

We covered our reluctance to move ahead with the declaration of principles to join in what could have been a consensus. We covered by hiding under the smoke screen of Arab-Israeli resolutions which I deplore. These are terribly complex plans. The United Nations is in great danger of losing the dwindling support it has in the western world. Read the letters to the editor in last Saturday's Toronto *Star* and you will get the mood of the Canadian people with regard to the UN following the Habitat conference.

The government has a terrific obligation to promote its own policy. That policy is incorporated into its five-year strategy. It centres around industrial co-operation, transfer of technology, trade liberalization and a better pricing policy for the commodities of the world. That is the true way to help the developing nations. The government has a great responsibility to promote that policy and show how it plugs into the United Nations systems of conferences, of which Habitat was one, and how all of that relates to the provisions of the new order. That is the way we are going to make progress.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) is co-chairman of the continuing conference of international economic co-operation, the conference of rich and poor producing and consuming nations that meets in Paris. If he is going to maintain his credibility, he will have to be backed up by a government that is willing to move to show the Canadian people the tremendous responsibility we have, and also the opportunity. This is the most important moment in Canadian history because we can move ahead in the global community in which we live by a profound, positive policy of enlightened internationalism.

● (1610)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the opposition motion condemns the government for its cynical behaviour at the Habitat Conference. It includes land speculation, nuclear reactors and environmental matters such as clean water and the necessity to enforce minimal standards in Canada.

In reading the word "cynical", Mr. Speaker, I could not believe that a political party represented in the House—in this case the NDP—had chosen to impute motives as contemptuous and outrageous as they did to the Canadian delegation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is not the government of Canada that attended the Habitat Conference but a delegation made up of representatives from all levels of government and non-government organizations: ministers, members of this House, provincial ministers and representatives of provinces and municipalities—

Mr. Lalonde: Including NDP governments.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): —including NDP governments. The delegation was further enhanced and completed in a serious and professional manner by spokesmen for several organizations or near government agencies, representatives of various Canadian citizens groups as well as by organizations of specific interest, such as minority groups and those with a particular vocation.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, as the first speaker on this side of the House in this debate, allow me first to report to the House, as an alternate delegate, on our experience in Vancouver. For me—and I understand for many other members—it was a very enriching one, a period that was very well spent. I should like to stress at the beginning that the government is convinced that the results have justified the considerable effort and expenditure over the past few years in arranging to host the conference and participate in it. Much of the press and others have suggested that the conference was so bedevilled with political issues that all else was obscured. I cannot agree with this view.

On the other hand, it is too soon to be certain that Habitat was a success. Its organization was certainly a success. I should like to thank the members of the opposition for recognizing the role that the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) played. He displayed a very human approach to the problems. Although his position was sometimes difficult, he showed an understanding of the situation and gave leadership and constant direction in spite of the stress he was under. He has been for Canada an example of statesmanship, and I want to recognize that here this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Habitat Conference

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): In my judgment, Habitat will produce lasting improvements. Our experience in Canada indicates a much greater public awareness of the issues which must form part of human settlement policies, and a greater acceptance by all levels of government that these issues must be handled in a comprehensive manner, with full co-operation among the various jurisdictions involved.

In passing, may I say that we seem to have difficulty in Canada with the word "national". We define it as "a confederation", and recognize it has both a federal and a provincial definition. In preparing for and participating in Habitat, we have had to stand back and take a good look at ourselves, our settlements policies and institutions, and consider our values and our hopes for the settlements in which we must live. This process involved not only the federal government but also the governments of the provinces, municipalities, public groups, business and private citizens. Much of this consideration went into Canada's national report to Habitat entitled "Human Settlement in Canada," and into the three short films which we prepared for the conference.

This wide participation was reflected in the Canadian delegation to Habitat, and I would like to express my thanks to all those who so generously gave of their time and effort to join with the federal government in this fully representative delegation. I think that all will agree that the experience has been beneficial in itself and has set the stage for further co-operation among those concerned with settlements in Canada. From our observation at the conference, it seemed clear that many other nations had similar beneficial experiences in preparing for, and participating in, Habitat, and that we may expect that all nations, separately and jointly, will be approaching the problems of human settlements in a more coherent manner and with a greater sense of urgency.

Canada's objectives at Vancouver were twofold. First, as host government we were responsible for providing the extensive facilities and services required for such a conference and for the parallel, non-governmental meeting, the Habitat forum. I can report that our host arrangements, with the single exception of the weather, met with universal praise and were a credit internationally to Canada, to the province of British Columbia and to the city of Vancouver. In addition to the usual conference facilities, we provided extensive facilities for television coverage and for the use of audio-visual presentations, and many of these new techniques will undoubtedly be incorporated into future world conferences as a result of their effectiveness in Vancouver.

We were a participant in the Habitat conference, as well as host, and we took a very active role and received from every member a full measure of co-operation. We put forward a clear and balanced view of our national settlements policies and tested these policies in discussions with other nations. We have learned a good deal about what is happening in other nations, some of which will undoubtedly find its way into our own practices and will show us how best we may assist other nations who will require considerable outside assistance in improving the lives of their people.

[Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier).]

In this last regard, I believe that the conference has provided an important new focus for development efforts, a focus on the place and the manner in which people live, rather than some impersonal objective such as GNP or tons of metal ingots. The message of Habitat has been that we must address ourselves more directly to the improvement of the life of the individual if we are to improve the lot of the whole. It is for this reason that the Canadian delegation repeatedly stressed the need to identify specific targets in matters which directly affect people's daily lives, such as the availability of safe drinking water, and committed ourselves to assist in the achievement of such goals.

There were several other Canadian initiatives at the conference which I would like to mention. The offer of the University of British Columbia, supported by the federal government and the government of British Columbia, to house a continuing United Nations audio-visual library on human settlements was well received by the conference. Arrangements for this program are now being completed between the university and the United Nations and it is expected that the library will commence operation within a few weeks.

The delegation also succeeded in putting forward some fairly distinctive Canadian views on policy recommendations dealing with the control and the value of land, the rights of indigenous peoples, nuclear energy, the conservation of resources, and the participation by the public in the formulation and implementation of settlements policies and programs. We were also able to gain acceptance for a more positive approach to the role of environmental policies in settlements planning, rather than the purely negative considerations which have been current. Over all of the recommendations for national action discussed at the conference, we sought minor amendments to make them more applicable to federal states such as Canada.

Debate on international co-operation was divided into discussions of new programs which might be undertaken following Habitat, of how the appropriate section of the United Nations secretariat might be reorganized to deal with increased programs, and on a declaration of principles to be issued by the conference to emphasize the role of settlements policy in national and international affairs. The Canadian contribution to the debate on programs included a general commitment to give favourable consideration to settlements projects within our development assistance programs, and several specific commitments: to create the audio-visual library at the University of British Columbia and to continue and expand our support for a human settlements training program at the Asian Institute of Technology at Bangkok. We also indicated that we would be prepared to participate in similar programs in other regions.

● (1620)

On the reorganization of appropriate United Nations secretariat resources, the Canadian delegation argued for a rationalization of all available resources in a single unit, with headquarters in New York but with its staff and activities deployed as much as possible at the regional level. In a fairly extensive debate emerged a fairly broad consensus on what should be done, but it appeared that many nations were not ready to take decisions on the location of the secretariat headquarters or its precise

attachment to the United Nations' framework. This will be the subject of further discussions at the summer session of the UN Economic and Social Council and at this fall's General Assembly.

The discussions on the declaration to be issued by Habitat provided the sharpest division among governments at Habitat. At the end of the first week the group of 77 brought forward an amended version of the original draft declaration, a version which included some greatly expanded references to a new international economic order, and an unacceptable reference which would have linked Zionism to racism. Subsequent negotiations failed to improve these aspects of the draft, and in the end the Canadian delegation, together with many others, was obliged to vote against the declaration as a whole when attempts to obtain a paragraph by paragraph vote proved fruitless. The vote was 89 in favour, 15—including Canada—opposed, with 10 nations abstaining. In explanation of the Canadian vote, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) stated that had it not been for the paragraph which sought to link Zionism with racism, Canada would have been in a position to join in a consensus on the declaration.

The vote on the declaration received a great deal of publicity and I think it is important to keep it in perspective. The objectionable feature which led to our negative vote is a matter of a few words in a lengthy document, most of which we did, and shall continue to, support strongly. While the declaration lacks the weight of consensus, it is nevertheless a valuable statement of some of the basic thoughts which should guide nations in improving the lives of their peoples. In addition, the debates on the declaration and the divisions they produced were largely separated from the main bulk of the conference's work and did not detract from the more positive achievements in other areas.

On the whole, therefore, I think that the Canadian delegation can be proud of the twin roles, as host and as a participant in Habitat, and I think we can be confident that this conference will yield great benefits to all peoples over the years to come.

[*Translation*]

To finish, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on the results of the conference and the wish of some people who want to quantify everything. It is impossible to measure the results of such a conference quantatively. One has to attend it to realize what forces were at play and to really take part in it to understand that it is not always possible to reach a consensus by mere good will. It seems utopian to me to quantify the conference in the sense that, for instance, Canada has a national policy to provide clean water to all parts of the country by 1986. A consensus was reached for 1990. We would have preferred it sooner, for all countries. Still, to answer one of the comments made by the opposition, I do not think Canada wants to be paternalistic and impose any programs which might not be well received now in underdeveloped countries.

Problems at the international level, and I think particularly of the terms of the exchange, are acute. The fact remains that, as Mrs. Barbara Ward said, we are dealing with an international problem in which we have the world of the wealthy endowed with a conscience and the world of the poor whose will and force to strike can cause concern. Habitat, Mr. Speaker, may have given us opportunity of becoming aware of the international problem, of exchanging view, of realizing that audio-visual aids are fantastic.

We saw, thanks to electronic devices, what goes on in other countries. For my part, the experience was rewarding. For most of the delegates, it was obviously the experience of a lifetime. I hope the press and hon. members will understand that to quantify the conference in terms of government measures was not the aim of the conference. Its objective was to give an awarenesss of the situation, to give the opportunity to elaborate, to think, to discuss and to exchange views: if the conference has had positive results, I trust they will be given concrete form.

As for speculation, there is a long way to go. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) said, I know, that we are up against a problem that is difficult to solve. Still the fact remains that the collective will of the people, expressed through the various levels of government, by government representations, in terms of what is a fair profit or gain, will be decided by the governments themselves and not imposed by them, by the government at the top. We have a long way to go, we have a lot to do. Of course, it is important that we should conserve what arable lands we have. We must have overall policies that induce us into conserving them. We must elaborate new policies, as well as new ways and means. I think the minister, in convening his tripartite conferences has found a formula that might work, because town planning is a matter for municipalities and provinces and not the federal government. But I think that to get a group of government bodies in Canada to plan the common good, everyone will have to show considerable good will and recognize the fact that we have not solved all our problems, that we have much to do and that though, in the final analysis, the Habitat Conference may have brought some solutions it did not solve them all. We must continue to work at it.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) will take the floor tonight. He will listen with interest to hon. members' remarks, and I hope those remarks will be positive. In addition, we will have some spokesmen who will discuss certain particular points in the debate, with a view to answering as much as possible hon. members' concerns and questions.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I want to devote my time this afternoon to the third complaint contained within the NDP motion, that is, the complaint regarding pollution of the Athabasca River from one of the tar sands extraction plants. Just to put this in its proper perspective, I should like to spend a little time on background in so far as the development of tar sands is concerned in a general sense. I believe it is fair to say that this party is every bit as concerned about environmental matters as the author of the motion we are debating, and perhaps even more so than some of the members of his party. But we also want to be realistic and practical in talking about these developments.

We know the Alberta tar sands can produce all the crude oil Canada will need in the foreseeable future if they are developed in an orderly manner. A couple of months ago

the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) told the House that Canada is short of oil and gas. I think everybody knows that, and knew it at the time of his statement. He went on to say that the future looked so bad that we would be investing $181 billion in energy projects in this country between now and 1990, and by crossing our fingers the best we could hope for would be limiting our demands on oil imports to one-third of our needs.

I want to question the minister's projections because I think they are not necessarily accurate. We will have to spend on oil exploration and development, according to the minister, $40 billion in 1975 dollars. In return for this massive investment of capital we will increase our productive capacity by 500,000 barrels, or one-third of what the province of Alberta is producing today. But the energy department's own figures and graphs show that development of the Athabasca, Peace River, Wabasca and Cold Lake tar sands would give us the same amount of oil for $6 billion. In fact, the price spread would be still greater because frontier oil has to be carried down from the north in pipelines which are very expensive and, as yet, unbuilt. Pipelines from the tar sands would be shorter and much less costly to construct.

● (1630)

How much oil would we have if we spent $40 billion on new tar sands plants? When it comes on stream in 1978 or 1979, the Syncrude plant at Mildred Lake will produce about 125,000 barrels of synthetic crude oil per day in return for a capital outlay of $2 billion. Other things being equal, it is just simple arithmetic to see that $40 billion would buy us 20 plants with the same productive capacity as Syncrude and would give us 2.5 million barrels of oil per day. Moreover, the civil servants of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) have been estimating that if world prices for petroleum remain high, close to $6 billion will be spent on tar sands plants without any particular encouragement from the federal government.

The three plants which an additional $6 billion would buy could produce 375,000 barrels of oil per day, bringing total tar sands' production, when Syncrude and Great Canadian Oil Sands are counted in, to over three million barrels per day. As it happens, three million barrels per day is greater than the total Canadian demand for oil is expected to be in 1990. And all this is to say nothing about the enormous savings in pipeline costs which investment in tar sands plants would bring, the very large economies of scale which would come from the building of 20 or more plants, or the tremendous benefits which might accrue to the national economy if Canadian industry were geared to producing the machinery for these plants.

Finally, 20 or 25 tar sands plants would require in excess of 100,000 workers on a permanent basis and would constitute a partial answer to the unemployment from which so many Canadians today are suffering. I am trying to make the point that the development of the Athabasca tar sands, as well as the other three tar sands areas to which I referred earlier, is essential to Canada. Beyond that, I also want to say that Canadians should not expect that Alberta alone should be responsible for developing these plants just to supply energy to the rest of Canada. In other words, there is also a role which the consuming Canadian provinces can play in this development. One of them, Ontario, already is doing that to some extent in that it is participating in the Syncrude project directly.

[Mr. Yewchuk.]

However, there are a number of things which need to be done before development takes place in accordance with what I have described as a possibility. Those requirements are that the processed synthetic crude should have access to world prices, as has been guaranteed to Syncrude but so far refused to anyone else who has indicated a desire to develop a plant. The federal government should become less greedy and get away from double-taxation. I realize that greed is one of the government's greatest assets, but I think it should dispose of that asset and get away from the idea of disallowing royalties to be deducted for tax purposes. I think the government should also bring in a program for earlier depreciation write-offs, when we consider, for example, in respect of the Syncrude plant that there is perhaps a $3 billion capital outlay, or between $2 billion and $3 billion, before one single barrel of oil comes out.

Finally, we should consider the tragedy for Canada which would result if the crew of experts, the construction teams, were allowed to disintegrate in 1978 when the construction at Syncrude is finally completed. I think the government should plan that new plants would be started at least as frequently as would be necessary to keep this crew of skilled people assembled and working.

I wanted to put that background material on the record because it emphasizes the proper perspective in respect of pollution control in so far as the plants are concerned. I think the NDP motion complaining about pollution by GCOS originated from a *Globe and Mail* article of June 9 written by Mary Kate Rowan and entitled "The Athabasca foul-up". In that article there is a suggestion that 400,000 gallons of polluted water is going into the Athabasca River from the tailings pond at the GCOS plant site. This plant and the tar sands happen to be in the middle of my constituency. For that reason alone, if not for any other reason, I usually keep in close contact with the developments in the area. I have been informed by a representative of GCOS that the statement indicating that water from the tailings pond is going into the river is totally erroneous and that indeed there is no polluted water going into the river from the tailings pond.

However, 400,000 gallons of water are going into that river, but they come from a filtering system contained within a large dike built of sand which forms a portion of the wall of the tailings pond. Some tests have been carried on in respect of this effluent. I have a report here which was produced by Environment Canada in September, 1975, concerning this particular problem. I wish to quote from this report because I think it will help clarify the matter before us. The report reads in part:

> The liquid effluent being discharged from the effluent holding pond during the sampling period demonstrated no acute toxicity and the chemical parameters measured were all reasonably low. Notably the oil and grease values were low, particularly in comparison to some reported values for this effluent stream. Analysis for metals indicated that all were below detectable limits except for zinc and vanadium. However, the one detectable zinc level was low and could not be considered a problem in relation to other treated industrial effluents. The significance of the vanadium value is uncertain and is currently under investigation by Alberta Environment and Environment Canada. However, it is evident that the vanadium levels present in the effluent did not cause acute toxicity to rainbow trout.

There was also some testing carried out with regard to the effluent which comes from the drainage pipes which are the outflow of the filter system I mentioned in the dike forming part of the tailings pond. The effluent from this did contain some toxic materials and the toxicity to rainbow trout was indeed significant. The cause of toxicity could not be conclusively specified from the water chemistry, but the relatively high concentration of total organic carbon and total dissolved solids would likely include the specific compounds or elements responsible for toxicity.

Separation and identification of organic compounds from the organic fraction was shown to be feasible and produced some interesting compound identifications. Further work to comprehensively separate and identify the organic compounds and classes should be pursued under the auspices of the Alberta oilsands environmental research program. I wanted also to read that, because it suggests quite clearly that the industrial people in question are indeed making reasonable efforts to control the pollution.

● (1640)

There has been some toxic effluent from the drainage pipes in the dike. I am informed by this report, as well as by a representative of the industry, that engineering studies are under way which are aimed at collecting this effluent into a collection system of some kind and pouring it back into the settling pond. However, there are some fairly serious problems with that, one of them being that the location of the dike is close to the river and that the collection ponds which might be erected could well be taken away with the spring flow when the river levels are high. That could be a serious problem.

However, I am also informed that tests have been carried out on the river water above, as well as below, the outlet of these pipes and that there was no significant difference in the quantity of the toxic material above and below the outlet from these drainage pipes. The reason for that is that the volume of 400,000 gallons is so small in relationship to the total flow of the river that a substantial dilution of this toxic material takes place immediately, so that the river water is not at all toxic to the fish in it and, indeed, there is an abundant fish supply in the river in that region.

The ratio of this 400,000 gallons to the total river flow is around 3,300-thousands of 1 per cent of the daily river flow or, in other words, .00033 per cent of the total water flowing in the river. This suggests that the volume is so small in relation to the river that there is not much danger. When we compare that to some other areas of pollution right on our doorstep here in Ottawa, we can see that the problem here is much more severe. When the city of Hull pours 10 million gallons of raw sewage a day into the river, and the city of Montreal pours 300 million gallons of raw sewage a day into the St. Lawrence River, we can see that the problem of water pollution much closer to Ottawa than the Athabasca River is substantially greater and, I suggest, perhaps warrants a great deal of immediate attention as well. But for some strange reason our left-wing friends to my left neglected to make any mention of that kind of pollution. I find that rather strange. Of course, I find them a rather strange bunch anyway.

Mr. Gilbert: I had only 30 minutes. I could not cover everything.

Mr. Yewchuk: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), for whom I have a great deal of admiration, is the epitome of humanitarian concern. If he had a chance, I think he would smother half the people of Canada to death, particularly the poor and the aged, with his affection for them and concern for their welfare as individuals. If we consider the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), perhaps he might liquidate the other half of the Canadian population because they happen to be successful on their own without government assistance.

Mr. Jarvis: Right on.

Mr. Yewchuk: We can see what would be the result of the NDP policies on the population of this country. No one would be left. Half the population would be smothered, and the other half liquidated.

Mr. Gilbert: And you would like to exploit them all.

Mr. Yewchuk: It seems to be a curious mixture of sadism and humanitarianism which moves the NDP. No wonder there is difficulty in giving serious credibility to their arguments.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Physician, heal thyself.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Good advice; take it.

Mr. Yewchuk: The extremely original statement which we have just heard from the member for Winnipeg North Centre will be duly noted by me. I will see what I can do about it.

I will carry on for a moment because there are a few more things that need to be said about this problem. One of them is that an attack has also been made on Syncrude and GCOS by my friends to the left in so far as the emission of sulphur into the air is concerned. I am told that GCOS is licensed to put out 348 long tons of sulphur, mostly in the form of sulphur-dioxide, and the permit which has been granted Syncrude allows them to put out 287 long tons of sulphur a day. Some reports on this matter have been produced—one of which I have here—again by Environment Canada or the regional department of the environment task force. Through the application of the best available technology, total sulphur emission could be reduced from 287 long tons to an estimated 40 long tons.

I have looked into this problem and I am informed that this equipment to which reference is made is still unproven. Both companies, involved as well as the provincial government, suggest that this equipment is indeed unproven and perhaps not at all practical at this time. I am told also that the use of energy in the operation of a plant with this kind of equipment would be very high and the efficiency of such a plant would be drastically reduced. In addition, no real need has been demonstrated to reduce emissions below that level because studies have been done, again in relation to CGOS which has been operating in the area of 348 long tons a day, and a study was conducted by the Canadian Wildlife Service in 1973, as well as a more recent study in 1975, to determine whether there has been

any damage whatsoever to the soil or vegetation within a radius of seven miles around the plant in question—and they all indicated there was no evidence of damage of any sort. So insofar as the Syncrude plant is concerned, it seems difficult to conclude from these two studies that there is a any real need to reduce the emissions beyond the amount granted in the licence.

Finally, in so far as Syncrude is concerned, it is difficult to estimate the cost of installing such equipment. If it were ordered today, I am told it would not be available for another five years, but it may well raise the cost of construction by $1 billion. So we have to consider all these factors before we become too raucous in attacking provincial governments and industry about the decisions which have already been made regarding further development.

I would like to conclude my remarks by stating that I am very concerned that some politicians in this country, and perhaps some other people, are making a lot of unwarranted attacks on the tar sands development. I do not know how much influence that has had upon the federal government, but perhaps it has resulted in a situation where the federal government is turning its attention from the tar sands and is looking to frontier development. According to the figures which I have given, this is a ridiculous decision on their part because such a move is extremely costly and a total gamble. You do not know where or whether you will find the oil, whereas with the tar sands there is no gamble, the development costs less and you wind up with a greater supply of energy for Canada. We are all interested in pollution control but also in self-sufficiency in energy. I would like to suggest that everybody concerned should stop being hysterical about possible errors made in construction associated with the tar sands. We should be very careful to ensure that proper attention is paid to the environment, but we should not be so hysterical as to retard development in that area.

● (1650)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Labour Conditions—Lockout of Air Canada finance branch employees—Possible resumption of mediation; the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn)—Energy—Proposal for location of uranium processing plant in Saskatchewan—Public participation in site decision; the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens)—The Canadian Economy—Area in which jobs will be created this year.

[Mr. Yewchuk.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—CONDEMNATION OF GOVERNMENT FOR ITS ALLEGED CYNICAL BEHAVIOUR AT HABITAT CONFERENCE

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

That this House condemns the government for its cynical behaviour at the Habitat conference held recently in Vancouver, first, in its position on land speculation; second, its policy of placing commercial criteria ahead of any others in the sale of nuclear reactors; and third, the obvious conflict between the government's bold statements on such environmental matters as clean water and its inability or unwillingness to enforce minimal standards in Canada, as in the case of the Great Canadian Oil Sands plant in northern Alberta.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to deal particularly with the clause in the motion which refers to the government's policy of placing commercial criteria ahead of any others in the sale of nuclear reactors. But before I get to that specific subject, I would like to make one or two general remarks.

I do, indeed, support my colleague, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), in his criticism of the government's actions at the Habitat conference, but I want to say that I do not think it follows from that that we wish to criticize the Habitat conference as such. There is too much cynicism about some of these international activities. Of course things happen in international forums which are distasteful to us, but we should not jump from that to saying that the whole thing is a failure. Indeed, to put it mildly, that is premature because it destroys the foundation of the concern and the enthusiasm which is necessary if we are to do the things internationally that the welfare of the people of the world in every country, including Canada, requires.

I do not in any way, by being critical of some of the points of view taken by the government, wish to denigrate the importance or the significance of the conference itself, nor of some of the things the government did.

However, we are an opposition and we look with a critical eye. We frequently find, in the actions of the government, a considerable gap between rhetoric, on the one hand, and action on positive issues on the other. I have been to quite a few international conferences. I have never found a single reason to complain about the rhetoric of the Canadian spokesmen; it has always been of the highest order. But when it came down to practical decisions on practical issues, a different story is told. I want to say to all members of the government that they should try to reconcile their rhetoric with practical actions, and there are many fields where that injunction should be carried out and taken seriously. To get to the question of nuclear reactors, I would like, first, to quote what Albert Einstein said, as follows:

The splitting of the atom has changed everything, save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift toward unparallelled catastrophe.

The subject of nuclear energy which came up at the Habitat conference at Vancouver from time to time is one about which very many serious-minded people in Canada are deeply concerned, but I am afraid the Canadian gov-

ernment's action at this conference was inadequate, to put it mildly. There is a fairly new organization called the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility. Its supporters include the Primate of the Anglican Church and Moderator of the World Council of Churches, the Very Rev. E. W. Scott; the founder of the Club of Rome, Dr. Aurelio Peccei; and Maurice Strong, president of Petro-Canada, who is well known for his deep concern about these subjects. They have joined others in signing a petition asking for an inquiry into the whole nuclear field. The petition has been signed by General Burns, who is well known not only as a soldier but as a statesman, who is the former head of the U.N. peacekeeping force; a gentleman named Joe Clark, who I believe is known to some hon. members in this House; Alex Campbell, who is Premier of Prince Edward Island; and Gerry Regan, Premier of Nova Scotia, among many others.

This petition deals primarily with the question of the increased reliance on nuclear energy to deal with our energy crisis. The pamphlet which the coalition put out says that the government expects to see 112 CANDU reactors in operation in Canada by the end of the century. The pamphlet goes on to point out that the industry has been exempted from having to carry full accident insurance because no insurance company will risk issuing such a policy. The coalition points out that the inhalation of dust particles and radioactive gases in mines has caused 450 cases of silicosis and/or cancer in Canadian uranium miners. That is something which could have been prevented if the proper controls had been adopted.

The coalition to which I have referred calls for complete public accountability on the subject of nuclear energy, accompanied by a full disclosure of all pertinent information, and as a possible mechanism for realizing these objectives the coalition is challenging the federal government to conduct a public inquiry into all aspects of nuclear power development in this country. I ask the House to note that this refers to all nuclear power development, not just nuclear power for reactors for export but the nuclear power which is going to be used to supplement our energy resources. The coalition says that the proposed inquiry would investigate a host of unanswered questions about the Canadian nuclear program, questions of safety, economics, energy requirements, social impact, health and pollution and the decision-making process itself.

In speaking to this motion I would like to take this opportunity to urge upon the government, as has been done before in this House, that it proceed with such a public inquiry so that the very grave disquiet which many informed people feel on this subject can be allayed by the disclosure of the facts or by the necessary action to prevent these developments.

At the Habitat Conference the question divided itself into two parts. One was about the increased demand, domestically, for the production of nuclear power, and the other was the sale of nuclear reactors abroad. I wish to deal with them separately. I believe the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) addressed himself at the conference to these matters and was very explicit. He said that it is the Canadian government's policy to proceed with the sale of nuclear reactors on a commercial basis, and he linked that with the need for the development of developing countries.

I want to challenge the Prime Minister on the suggestion that the developing countries are seeking nuclear reactors, on the whole, for the purpose of developing power. I want to point out what was said at the conference by Mr. Arjaun Makhijani, who works on practical energy solutions in a village near Bombay, which certainly is a part of the world which is underdeveloped. He attacked the policy of imposing large-scale energy projects like nuclear power plants on societies which are not suited for such schemes. Mr. Makhijani said that it is not a question of emotionalism but that nuclear energy is extremely capital-intensive. It must be used 80 per cent of the time in order to be economically efficient, and in the underdeveloped countries it could be used only about 40 per cent of the time, and in villages only about 10 per cent of the time. Because the highly centralized nuclear energy must be used in such an intensive way, it is unsuitable to types of societies, to the underdeveloped countries and to their mainly rural village populations, he said. He went on to say that we could save enough power to deal with this much better and much more cheaply by other methods. He said he rejects, on behalf of developing countries, the theory that the nuclear option is the one that will really solve their problems—problems which not only require scientific developments but require labour-intensive developments to give employment in the countries concerned.

● (1700)

The Prime Minister started out at the conference with what I think must have been a cold douche for the enthusiasts thereby reiterating Canada's stand and basing it on what I suggest is the false belief that this is the best way to help developing nations.

This matter was raised at the NGO conference forum, and was raised again by the group led by Barbara Ward—I think they called themselves the Vancouver symposium—and it was raised in the final conference resolution which, when dealing with the subject of shelter, infrastructure and many other things, recommended an extreme examination of the whole question of energy. An effort was made to add to that the special consideration for hazardous developments in this field and they sought to be put in the words "for example, nuclear power" as a main example of the type of development that was hazardous and ought to be examined. It is my understanding that the Canadian government did not support that, and that the official resolution had no reference to nuclear power. I say they were failing to give the leadership that this country could give and should give in this field.

I should like to turn to the subject of the sale of nuclear reactors. It has been fully debated in this House a number of times, so there is not much point in repeating what has been said at length. I believe the three opposition parties joined in a motion criticizing the government for the sale of nuclear reactors to certain countries and urged that we stop this particular policy. The government responded by saying that sales would continue on the grounds that we had safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked to General Burns and other people who believe that the safeguards are totally inadequate; they are only safeguards if you trust the word of the people who sign the agreements. Of course, in international affairs we have to trust other countries to some extent,

but why do we make nuclear reactors capable of being transformed into making plutonium for weapons purposes? Why do we do that with a country like South Korea, which has a militant dictatorship in charge and does not try to conceal its warlike attitude toward North Korea? Only recently in the Argentine we have seen how unstable their regime is, yet we sell reactors to them.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) constantly tells us that the safeguards are the best answer. But are they good enough? He has never been able to answer that question or deny that the agreements we have depend on the good faith of the people with whom we make them. He has never been able to defend the fact that some of the people we make agreements with are not to be trusted in this particularly dangerous field although, of course, they may be trusted in other things.

I, therefore, feel that the right of this House to pass a resolution regretting the government's policy in dealing with nuclear reactors is not adequate; there was no leadership in this field and, in fact, the reverse attitude was adopted by government representatives at the Habitat conference in Vancouver.

I just want to mention one other subject, Mr. Speaker, and that is the new international economic order. Once again, we have subscribed to that and have given full lip service to it. But what was wrong with reiterating our concern about it? The minister says we have to let the people of Canada know about it. Why not use the opportunity of such a forum as Habitat to say it once again? It may be repetitive, but we have to keep on repeating the tremendous importance to the world and Canada of making the structural changes that would bring about a new economic order throughout the world. I say that Canada showed lack of leadership when they failed to join with those—which included the NGO and the Barbara Ward group—who urged that there be specific reference to the new economic order. There is none at all.

While we feel that the conference was worth while and that much of great value may emerge from it, we will do our best to urge that action be taken on things like clean water and other matters that were raised. We are duty bound to say to the government that their leadership at that conference was inadequate. That is the purpose of this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to say a few words on this motion put forward by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) concerning the Habitat conference and the resolutions relating to clean water, energy and land use. I had an opportunity to speak at one of the non-governmental organization conferences on nuclear energy, and even though I did not agree with all who attended some of those NGO conferences and their view of nuclear energy, I think it is well that these things are discussed at an international conference of this kind.

I listened very closely to the arguments opposing nuclear energy and I did not find anything very new or exciting in them. I applaud the suggestions that we should have stronger conservation programs. These fit in very well with this government's policy as announced earlier this year by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) and in earlier announcements concerning conservation by the former minister. I certainly agree with their aim that over the next few years we should move toward greater use of renewable energy resources.

It is rather interesting that Barbara Ward, who was one of the principal speakers on the panel that I took part in, said in glowing terms that we want to see, 40 or 50 years from now, a greater use of renewable energy. Who does not? We all do. We all know that in the long haul we are going to see very extensive use of renewable resources. That is why the government is investing more in windmill energy, tidal power, solar power, and other renewable forms. But governments today cannot just plan for 40 or 50 years; they have to make plans for this year, next year, the immediate future, the intermediate future, and the long haul. We cannot permit ourselves to say we will spend all our resources for something that is going to be important 40 or 50 years from now. That is why we see nuclear power being very important during the intermediate term, and perhaps the long-term as well, let alone the position that holds right now in our country.

• (1710)

The hon. member for Greenwood suggests that because the government does not agree with some of the positions or resolutions coming from the NGO conference, the government is wrong. Mr. Speaker, international forums of this kind are set up to allow us to discuss these questions. Surely, everyone will not agree with every motion put forward by every individual group.

The motion suggests that Canada places commercial considerations ahead of all others in the sale of nuclear reactors. This is not so. The person who wrote the motion was either cynical about the position Canada has taken over the years or, worse, ignorant of what the federal government has done in fields of safeguards related to nuclear energy. Canada has participated in the International Atomic Energy Agency. We were one of the early signatories, in 1970-71, of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. One of the important parts of that international treaty concerns the sharing of nuclear energy and technology internationally. We have done this; we have provided power plants to various countries. We have done it in the form of providing cobalt beam therepy units for medical purposes, and isotopes for agriculture. Surely, such uses of nuclear technology are an important part of our international trade and assistance to other countries.

Canada has always given safeguards high priority. Indeed, the safeguards which Canada announced in December, 1974, are the toughest in the world. They apply not only to the reactor itself; they apply to uranium fuel used in the reactor, to nuclear technology and to the spent fuel, no matter whether it originated in Canada or elsewhere. The safeguards are to last the full life of the reactor, not just the life of the Np treaty which will run out in less than 25 years. They prohibit experiments which could result in a nuclear explosion of any kind. They provide for fallback inspection, and for monitoring of the use of nuclear energy if the country which is a signatory to the bilateral treaty should abrogate or withdraw from the NPT. Likewise, Canada this year is participating in the discussions and negotiations of the nuclear supplying

group, sometimes known as the Club of London. Canada is to encourage that group to adopt international safeguards similar to those Canada has asked of other countries. We are playing an important role in those negotiations.

People who think Canada should get out of the business of supplying nuclear technology and equipment to other countries have not considered how much clout or impact Canada would have with the nuclear-supplying nations if it opted out of sales to other countries of reactors and nuclear technology. It is a question of being on the outside and looking in, rather than of being on the inside and trying to influence other countries to adopt the highest possible safeguards to ensure that our nuclear technology and equipment are used for peaceful purposes.

One of the encouraging ideas at Habitat was that of providing clean water to all peoples of the world. Indeed, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), speaking in the House, indicated that if this were to be a priority of countries receiving our aid, our government would surely co-operate in any way possible. When we are concerned about clean water, we may be talking about water containing chemical and mineral impurities which make its drinking unsafe for health, we may be talking of bacteria in water which will make it unsafe to use, or we may be talking about salt water. As the world's population grows—and it was suggested at Habitat that the world's population will double during the next 30 years—more countries will look to salt water as a source from which to obtain pure water. Many countries are already looking in that direction but many do not possess the oil, coal or other resources needed to produce electricity for desalinating water. Such countries may be thinking of using nuclear energy for desalinating water and for pumping or otherwise transporting that clean, fresh water which is important for human life.

I now shall speak briefly about the CANDU system. It upsets me to note that many in our country who have not studied this system, have not visited Pickering or the new plants at Douglas Point or Bruce, criticize the CANDU system. Most agree that Canadians should not be hewers of wood and drawers of water and that we should advance by becoming an industrialized economy using high technology. Yet such people often criticize the CANDU.

In the world today two basic nuclear systems are in use, the American system, used by many countries, under license from U.S.A. and the CANDU system which produces electricity in our country at rates competitive with those produced from non-nuclear sources of power. It can be equally useful in other countries where it is difficult to produce electricity. I think we should not care lessly criticize this important Canadian technological achievement which enables us to produce energy at low cost. For example, a recent study demonstrated that the Lambton generating station, which is coal-powered, produces electricity at 16 mills per kilowatt hour, whereas the Pickering plant, of roughly comparable size, produces electricity for about eight mills per kilowatt hour.

Further, Pickering uses natural uranium, of which we have a good supply. We have ensured that supplies will last well into the future. The spent fuel does not require reprocessing; to produce electricity economically. In other words, in order for the reactor to be an economically feasible proposition, the spent fuel does not require reprocessing.

The safety advantages of the CANDU have been mentioned many times. Significantly, there has not been one accident anywhere in the world involving commercial, civilian nuclear reactors which has resulted in loss of life.

● (1720)

I want to touch on a couple of other points. The Pickering reactor has operated at 75 per cent efficiency. That compares very well with other reactors around the world. It can be refuelled at full power. It does not require a shutdown. That is one of the reasons it has operated so efficiently. It produced more electricity by January of this year than any other reactor in the world. We should not listen to the glib comments of people criticizing the CANDU system without challenging them.

One of the arguments that was made very effectively in the group with which I participated at the Habitat conference was the efficiency we are now seeing with the Pickering reactor compared to coal reactors. Although there is a large capital cost in setting up nuclear reactors, in a day and age of high inflation the cost of the fuel is a relatively small part of the cost of the electricity produced. If we are going to energy systems which are subject to inflation, the nuclear reactors are relatively less subject to inflation after the initial capital investment. It is rather interesting to note that Pickering B, which is a 2,000 megawatt station identical to the Pickering A station which is now operating, will in fact cost less in constant dollars than the Pickering A station. That is an important point to note in the efficient generation of electricity.

One member opposite, I believe it was the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), pointed out that nuclear energy is not a good source of energy for many less developed countries. That is very important. I completely agree. The government's review committee which reviews the sale of reactors and uranium always takes this into account. If a less developed country has coal, oil, gas, hydro or other sources which often require less capital-intensive programs, that is a much better system for them. However, some countries do not have any of these indigenous sources of energy. In those cases, nuclear energy may be a suitable system for them. Of course, they need to have an adequate technological base. They need a large enough grid system to accommodate it. No electrical grid should receive more than about 10 per cent of its power from one station. There are these important constraints on nuclear power stations.

Every country cannot use nuclear energy effectively. In spite of this, we have a growing demand in the world for energy. Many countries will be moving to nuclear energy in the future. This is not just because of the situation we have seen in the past, where it was a sort of status symbol to have a nuclear generating plant, but because of the serious shortages of energy, whether from the increased price of oil or a lack of indigenous coal, hydro and other sources. To Canada, these factors are important. Even more important is the fact that the country is willing to submit to safeguards and inspections of the International Automic Energy Agency and is willing to submit to the bilateral safeguards agreement Canada has imposed which go beyond the non-proliferation treaty.

We see that the generation of electricity is going to increase around the world in future. Canada has been able to cut back its 1974 estimates from some 40,000 megawatts by 1990 to about 25,000 because of the reduction in demand that we foresee.

I wish to spend a moment on the suggestion by the hon. member of the opposition, that there be a moratorium on all nuclear sales to foreign countries. I have already dealt with this in the context that Canada is exerting its influence through the London Club, the nuclear supplier countries, to move toward higher safeguards to ensure that nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes.

In some ways the non-proliferation treaty was really a bargain between the nuclear weapons countries and the countries which have a nuclear know-how, like Canada, and the non-nuclear weapons countries. The non-nuclear weapons countries said they would forgo acquiring these weapons if the nuclear countries would provide the transfer of technology so that they could generate electricity and take advantage of the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We will have to ask ourselves if nuclear countries like Canada—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Foster: If the countries with advanced nuclear resources say to the countries which do not have nuclear know-how that they are going to cut off the transfer of this technology, are these less developed countries going to keep their side of the bargain of the non-proliferation treaty? In conclusion, Canada has always worked for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy through the IAEA, the non-proliferation treaty, to which we were one of the first signatories, the bilateral safeguards which the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources announced in 1974, and through the work of the nuclear suppliers' club of London to ensure that we have the highest possible safeguards in the world.

Our policy is to support the developing countries with regard to their energy problems, with the use of nuclear energy, provided there are adequate and strong safeguards. It is not to say to them that nuclear power is fine for us, but no good for you. The challenge facing Canada and the world is not to opt out of the problems and difficulties, both domestically and internationally, that nuclear power poses. Rather it is to work with these problems to ensure that it is used for peaceful purposes, and to overcome the tremendous energy problems that face us today and which will face us in the rest of this century.

● (1730)

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, the motion proposed by the New Democratic Party affords us an opportunity to step back for a moment and reflect upon Habitat. If the House will forgive me not only do I want to do that but I want also to take a look at some of the other what might be called meetings on specific subjects under the aegis of the United Nations through the years. I recognize that I do not have very much time and that only in general terms will be I be directing myself to the issues raised. Nevertheless I feel that we in this country, and as a matter of fact the United States too, are entering a period where, unless we are very careful, the public urge government to withdraw altogether from the United Nations or its agencies. I think this would be a very great mistake, and it is in this context that I want to say a word or two about Habitat and the United Nations, an organization that is reaching its thirtieth anniversary.

A wise Canadian, John Holmes, in a speech on December 1, 1975, to the Canadian Club had this to say:

> Canada's reputation in the UN is based on a long-standing disposition to avoid dramatic postures, look at critical situations as we find them, accepting the balance of forces as facts of life, and then see that what could be done to move us from a real situation to something better, denouncing the wicked, calling upon legions which do not exist to punish them, or demanding a new United Nations is self-indulgent.

Not only do I admire John Holmes but I certainly believe that what he said is true, that we could indulge in a luxury. I could indulge in a luxury today, if I wished, in castigating the national and international press for its coverage of Habitat. Some people who know more about this than I—therefore most people—tell me that it was easier to get despatches from Bucharest when the world was discussing population, that it was easier to get information from Nairobi when the world was discussing trade, and that it was much easier to get information from Mexico City than it was from the Minister of Justice's (Mr. Basford's) cosmopolitan city of Vancouver. I have no way of judging that, but there are many people in the Department of External Affairs and in government generally who have been quite distressed about the coverage of Habitat on the part of the press of this country.

Of course people were, it seems to me, waiting to pounce on the inevitable. As I understand it, the inevitable came in the last couple of days when an amendment was proposed by, of all people, Cuba, to the principles that many of us hoped could have been unanimously adopted. The Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) is here today and we all heard his eloquent plea that these principles be adopted.

I wonder why it is that we are unable to judge what might be called the humdrum, or that we are unable to get publicity for such basic requirements as clear water, adequate housing, and a better standard of living for people of the world, yet when a mischievous amendment is introduced equating racism with Zionism, the headlines are stark for all to see, and the success of the entire conference, according to some journalists, hinged on whether that malevolent and extraneous part of the whole is acceptable or not to the majority.

I am glad to say that one reviewer in Canada at least, writing in the Montreal *Star* for Saturday, June 19, Mr. Terence Moore, had this to say:

> It is important not to judge the United Nations Habitat conference simply on the basis of what it said about occupied lands and aggression and resettlement of refugees. Those are subjects of intense legitimate interest and friends and supporters of Israel are naturally upset by the conference's implied condemnation of Israel.
>
> But it has been clear since last November where the great majority of Third World governments stood on Middle East politics.

The headline writers should not have been surprised at that intervention at Habitat. We should really judge other parts, and I hope that the motion introduced by my hon. friends of the New Democratic Party will allow us to focus as well upon the positive aspects not only of Habitat but of the United Nations in general.

A journalist said to me even today, "How does Habitat affect your constituency or your province of New Brunswick?" I suppose that after a while in this House one gets used to xenophobia of that kind, and had I more time to reflect I might have been able to give this journalist friend of mine a catalogue of potential lumber orders that could have been processed in the province of New Brunswick, interesting new techniques in building and so on, which obviously the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce would want to promote around the world. Many of these techniques have their origin in the province of New Brunswick and in my constituency.

Must we always measure things, Mr. Speaker? Surely we must not. I pose the question and then answer it. Surely we cannot pose questions having only to do with what is a functional problem of housing and water, or such functional problems as food supply as were posed in Rome, or of pollution in Stockholm, or population in Bucharest, or of how women are treated in contemporary society in Mexico City. In some of these conferences there were political interventions, but this should not surprise the member of parliament. It should not surprise anybody who is an advocate of the United Nations and who realizes how essential is the United Nations to the future of mankind.

I once read what was said, I was going to say by a distinguished Archbishop but I suppose that archbishops do not need any such adjectives so let me just say by the Archbishop of London and leave it at that; others can judge of his distinction. In a sermon or homily he asked that immigration be taken out of politics. As a practising politician I resent, with great respect to the reverend gentleman, the concept that such things can be taken out of politics or public life. This is the place of politics, and I think that is right. It will be of no surprise to anybody that the UN is a place of politics. It so happens that many recent conferences have dealt with the functional problems faced by men at the time of their movement, and I profoundly hope upward movement, toward a better life.

● (1740)

I think it is good news that the New Democrats of Canada have taken the government to task on various parts of Habitat. I prefer not to do that, but not because of any feeling of bon ami toward the government. God forbid that ever happening to me, although I suppose it might in a weaker moment just before Christmas. Otherwise I am prepared to take the government to task on any occasion.

What I am really trying to say is that we should not worry that the world is engaged in the political process. We should not worry that the New Democratic Party has seen fit to try to dissect some problems faced by Canada and the world. After all, this was only the host country at Habitat.

My belief in this aspect is that we must be careful not to become so obsessed with political issues and manifestations of them, amendments to resolutions and so on, that we lose the concept or the real purpose of the United Nations, which is to harmonize—and this is part of the charter—the national interests of the states which belong to the United Nations.

I get increasingly worried about people who would like to step back from the UN and throw it up because they happen to be in opposition to the majority, or even equate the majority with some form of tyranny. I think this is hyperbole that does great damage to the UN as an institution, and also that it is terribly self-serving. Many states, if they have any historical perception at all, could presumably turnabout and suggest that for many years there was a majority in the interests of those states, that are now part of the majority, that was equally as tyrannical. That is a terribly complicated sentence, and I realized that as I got it half out. What I am really trying to ask is, is a majority any more tyrannical because it occurs in 1976 than one which occurred in 1953, 1954 or 1955? Was the majority of the veto, that excluded for a whole generation a quarter of the world's population, a tyrannical majority? I think not.

Canada is in a very interesting position because next year, if present indications go as expected, we will be once again a member of the Security Council, and we will have the opportunity to work very carefully and, as some wise observer of the scene informed the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), the hon. member for Saint-Michel (Miss Bégin), and myself the other day, the Secretry of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) will have to have a good hotline down to Port Hawkesbury when Canada sees what becomes of members of the Security Council. Officials of the department will need instructions instantaneously, and perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs will have a hotline in his aircraft when he shuttles back and forth to his beautiful riding.

Miss Bégin: In a gas station.

Mr. Fairweather: The hon. member for Saint-Michel talks about a gas station, if I heard her correctly. That might be one way, of course, of publicizing the United Nations and Canada's interest in it. It might be one way to inform Canadians of the implications for all of us of the responsibilities that will be on the government and on the parliament of this country when we become a member again of the Security Council, because the gas station, or wherever it is the Secretary of State for External Affairs gets his telephone calls from Ottawa, will be the point of information for the public in that community. This is the dilemma the Minister of State for Urban Affairs has faced too, because there are not enough people in gas stations who understand the aspirations of this country vis-à-vis the United Nations. This is a communications problem that the government wrestles with in its domestic affairs as well.

In any event, when we become a member of the Security Council we will have to do two or three things, and I should like to list them. We will require a much more clear identification of our policy priorities as a nation. We will require more active diplomatic pressure to implement these priorities, and we will have to be considerably more frank than we have been. I am not now gainsaying what the Minister of Justice and the Minister of State for Urban Affairs said at Habitat. I was not there. I must say, how-

ever, that the Minister of Justice has a very highly developed press section which grinds out material. Our mail boxes are full of it, and I think this is a delightful innovation in the Department of Justice.

We also will require more selective participation in United Nations debates and activities. The voting provisions, yes or no, on major issues according to our assessment seems to me to be an absolutely fundamental essential. It would be a peculiar Canadian experience, just as the patriation of our constitution would be the final sort of identification of our nationhood, if we stopped looking all the time to see what other nations did, and took the initiative on votes because we are peculiarly Canadian. I have no doubt that we are mature enough as a country to be able to do this. I do not say this in any boastful way, but today this is a positive thing for the United Nations.

Then lastly, and I guess I mentioned this in the Port Hawkesbury part of my speech, we will have to focus on improving opinion in Canada and our understanding of our opinion of the United Nations.

I suppose this is an intervention, afforded me because of the initiative of the NDP on this opposition day, which allows me to say that it is a good, plus thing that once again we are going to take up responsibility of Security Council membership. This will mean not only general support for the United Nations, but also that this is a government priority and that there can no longer be any question about that. I am sad to say that this is the case with some other countries, that is, selective withdrawal from the United Nations and its agencies.

I do not want to get in over my head on issues, but I think it is a sad sight to watch members of the United Nations trying to withdraw selectively from the ILO, for instance. Certainly the United States interests have been deeply troubled, but it does not do the United States foreign policy very much good, if I may say so candidly, for them to threaten to get out, take their marbles and go home, and not pay their dues if such a course of action should not occur. It is obvious that I would not at all favour the total giving up, but I think that is an option that could be exercised. We could give up altogether and decide that large conferences, international as they may be, with long and boring speeches and with the relentless pressure that will be on this country when we become part of the Security Council, are not in the interest of Canada. I would hope, despite the criticism by the New Democratic Party, that no one in this parliament would seriously consider that it is in the interest of Canada to withdraw altogether.

● (1750)

The United Nations, as the Charter says, has as its purpose the harmonizing of the interests of nations. It is difficult for parliament to harmonize the interests of this country; God knows it is a relentless preoccupation of all of us to try to harmonize the interests within our country. Therefore I fail to see why anyone would be surprised if the harmonizing of interests beyond the borders of this country should be equally relentless and equally demanding. I am glad to say I have no doubt that Canada will not want to withdraw. We will see that in the area of air law, sea law, housing and water—

[Mr. Fairweather.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Fairweather: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was jettisoned in the middle of flight. That is fine. What I was seeking to do before your short intervention was urgently to invite our country to participate actively. There are signs that we will do this. There are signs that the cynicism about the United Nations can be abated if people of good will realize the difficulties. There are signs too, I am sure, that despite temporary setbacks the general purpose behind this organization will be understood, accepted, and approved by the vast majority of our citizens.

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when I read again the motion of the opposition which was moved by the New Democratic Party member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), I just cannot understand what is the common denominator which inspired this motion, if not a general and fundamental attack, valid or not, against the assistance policy of the government of Canada.

As a matter of fact, why relate the conference on human settlements called Habitat in Vancouver and the sale of CANDU reactors? Why talk about the so-called cynical behaviour of the government and in addition about our supposedly conflicting and bold statements on the subject of clean water?

I frankly cannot understand why criticisms are levelled against the federal assistance program. To begin with, if I quote a short excerpt from the speech made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in Vancouver on May 31 for the opening of Habitat, it is because in my opinion he clearly states the intention of Canada. He said:

> The globalization process is speeding up and already a new world is developing. The world-wide responsibilities which our wealth leads us to assume constantly remind us of the fact. No country can remain aloof and conscious of what it has nor keep its possessions secret. Pressures from numbers and needs compel all of them to become more open with others and share more widely the secret of their resources. Failure to account is becoming impossible. Willingly or reluctantly, we are at the beginning of a new era of universal control.

I am quoting in the House from that speech because perhaps very few Canadians and parliamentarians read it and unfortunately could not attend the Habitat Conference since we are constantly sitting here instead of being in our constituencies.

To my mind, the Prime Minister was thus stating quite clearly that Canada intends to help. At the time, the opposition said, and today I speak of the New Democratic Party, as well as all the other parties for that matter: Why good intentions? Again, we are getting empty words: where is the money? Where are the concrete proposals? I heard, to my astonishment, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) introduce the idea of the Nairobi common fund, the fourth UNCTAD conference in the debate. In fact, from the numerous interventions, I gather there is a general attack against Canada's foreign aid policy. I shall come back to the common fund later on.

So, to my mind, the intent is clear. So, where is the money, were is the concrete help? Here, Mr. Speaker, I should like to recall what Habitat is. I am not an expert, but I am very much interested in the matter. Habitat was one conference among several United Nations manifestations. It is one conference in time, not a permanent organization, nor an institution that operates full-time.

It is one conference which attempted to give the people an awareness of one of the most acute problems of our times, a problem that is completely unknown in Canada, unless one has gone from southern Canada and some distance into the north of our provinces or the Territories. Those places are, to my mind, a source of shame to all Canadians. I am thinking here of some of the communities inhabited by the first settlers of our country, in which none of us would want to live, and of which we are ashamed. In other words, Habitat was meant to make Canadians aware of their wealth.

It was a forum in which resolutions developed and not a forum of commercial negotiations. It was a forum of the resolutions crystallizing everybody's goodwill to develop material forms for the promotion of the places where human beings must live, to determine how and with which basic elements they have to be able to survive. Many resolutions have been established, several of which are only recommendations because they are directed to national sovereignties, the others being commitments, at least moral commitments, because they are directed to the international community.

I did not understand the remarks of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) who was unable to translate into reality . . . Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock? I would like to ask permission to continue at eight o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. this evening.

At 6 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Miss Bégin: Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, when we adjourned the debate, I was saying how surprised I was that the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) had apparently failed to translate into reality what the conference on human settlements in Vancouver could bring to Canadians and I just described that kind of conference which is only a momentary event and not a permanent organization. Its goal is to make people like Canadians who live in a very wealthy country aware of the most crucial problems faced by three quarters of the world—lack of housing, lack of basic sanitary facilities in houses or cities and mainly lack of clean water with all the endemic diseases it creates.

Apart from that awareness development aspect, the Habitat conference gave us a large number of resolutions which were not submitted in advance and negotiable, according to the wishes of the international community to which we all subscribed. Three of them could be easily identified and I think important to mention them in the face of serious accusations such as those made in the socialist party motion.

The first concerns us very much as it relates to the audio-visual library received by one of our universities in Vancouver. My colleague, the parliamentary secretary for urban affairs, the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) has already mentioned it. The two others concerned us but particularly the Canadian assistance and I mention it because I am deeply disappointed by the character of that motion which condemns the whole foreign assistance policy of Canada concerning the Third World. I shall resume them rapidly and I quote the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) who, on June 1 in Vancouver, said bluntly and I quote:

> First, Canada is prepared to provide, through bilateral Assistance and cooperation programs, favourable answers to assistance proposals in the field of human settlements that will be submitted by its partners in those programs.

He goes on:

> In addition, we will use our influence within multilateral development agencies to encourage the latter to prove favourable as well.

I conclude with a second and last quotation of his text:

> Second, we consider as particularly worthy the proposal to establish regional training centres aimed at those having to plan and direct human settlements. For several years Canada has been giving its support to the Asian Institute of Technology located in Bangkok and to its program of human settlements. We think this program deserves continuous support and, in this way, might serve as a pattern for similar programs in other regions.

Finally, as a concrete recommendation, I will mention the one in which Canada had proposed that countries of the planet would all have access to drinking water by 1986. The final recommendation, as I understand it, was much more moderate than the emergency position advocated by Canada. There was agreement so that that goal might be reached by 1990, that is within 14 years. That shows fairly well the extent of the problem.

Coming back to the money issue, there can be no reference to cynicism since we already committed $210 million over the next three years on the last resolution alone. I therefore wonder whether opposition members are ready in the context of budgetary restraint, we had to impose on ourselves and every Canadian to fight domestic inflation which is the cause of specific ills—particularly in the area of employment—whether they are ready to fight in support of the suggestion that the external aid budget, now approximating $1 billion but still 5.2 per cent only of our GNP while it should be around 7 per cent, if they are ready to fight to maintain that in real terms and or increase the amount of money extended by Canada to the third world.

I wonder what kind of arithmetic the socialist opposition is following. But when we commit ourselves to increase n-fold, to give urgent priority to water purification projects to ensure drinking water to all communities in the world, mainly through our bilateral programs maybe through certain international bodies but mainly through bilateral agreements. The sums of money voted by Parliament are limited, they are already committed formally or through pre-agreements in the case of certain projects. Therefore, who is going to pay, where shall the money come from for that indisputable priority, drinking water for every human community on this planet?

Apparently, it is all very easy when in opposition to level that kind of criticism, but without coming to a single view. When time comes to vote subsidies, suddenly we hear all kinds of subtle criticism, suggesting we throw the money away on military aid which is totally inaccurate. Today we are faced with the horror of a South Africa where officially more than one hundred dead were registered, not even taking the trouble to tell before the world what is happening to 80 per cent of its citizens, who are treated as a minority in a totally shameful way.

Confronted with the deep contradictions regularly apparent among the opposition as to the suggested importance of the help effort, which is in my view an indisputable priority, and the subsidies Parliament has to vote regularly, I feel this is a very serious scandal. The New Democratic Party added in its opposition motion that we are putting our commercial interests above everything in Canada's nuclear sales. Such statement is really gratuitous and stupid. Canada—and I shall not emphasize that point—may not be the best seller since everyone knows that, being committed towards some countries, it is now dealing with foreign economies whose inflation rates exceed 200 per cent and that despite this fact, in the so-called conventional contracts, Canada is obviously not first of all a seller. First and foremost, although it was a seller, Canada is a member of the non proliferation treaty. It was one of the very first members, as soon as the treaty was put into force in 1970. At this time, about 100 countries only approved this treaty. At the same time I can say: 100 countries only and 100 countries, already, because that is a lot. By the way, I regret that some advanced countries in the nuclear field, such as France and China, have not accepted to sign the treaty. I can also say that this treaty has been greatly strengthened in 1975 when it was signed by five EURATOM member-countries, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, the German Federal Republic and Italy, and by countries such as the Korean Republic and many others which are not yet so-called nuclear states.

Why did we sign the non-proliferation treaty? Why did we systematically study this treaty? Why did we judge two years ago that it was not severe enough as far as standards for countries are concerned? Why did we take initiatives from which we heard through the London Club? We took all these measures because we are convinced that we must, according to the treaty and according to the principle of human solidarity, share, for pacific aims only, a technology which is often the only energy source which can be used in human settlements. That is why I often think of the spectacular example which is often given, that of the electricity for the town of Karachi in Pakistan. We could also find other examples. So, this is often the only energy source which can be used in human settlements and we have no right to judge that our stability, our democracy and our sufficiency are superior and to refuse to others what we judge as good for ourselves.

I shall end with a few remarks on the accusation that Canada's trading interests come before the other interests of humanity when it comes to selling nuclear reactors, and I shall underline that from now on Canada's policy, as far as its public bilateral development assistance is concerned, will be to refuse Canadian nuclear reactor to countries which are not members of the non-proliferation treaty. Mr. Speaker, before I end—I see that my time is coming to an end—let me refer to an accusation made during this debate by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche), who said that we were not involved in development assistance to the Third World, giving as an example our so-called absence or negativism towards the common fund in Nairobi, during the month of May.

The UNCTAD worked during the whole month of May, following the Manilla declaration of the group of 77, to stabilize, among other things, the basic commodities market in the world. Not only did we endorse the principle of the common fund, but we did actively participate in it. It is evident however that it was a bit utopian to try to delude the developing countries by having them believe that we thought that this was the best and only solution. Politically, we accepted the fund because it had become the very symbol, if I may say so, of the international new economic order. I see that my time has expired—

● (2010)

[*English*]

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Miss Bégin) a question for clarification? Perhaps I did not understand correctly from listening to the translation. What figures did the hon. member use—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Due to the fact that the parliamentary secretary's time has expired, the hon. member must have unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member to ask a question?

Mr. Hogan: It is just for clarification.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Hogan: I just want the figure of the percentage of the Gross National Product which is going to the underdeveloped world. It seemed to me that the translator said 5.2 per cent, and it was probably meant to be 0.52 per cent.

[*Translation*]

Miss Bégin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank my colleague from Nova Scotia for giving me the opportunity to correct a mistake I made.

[*English*]

It is true that I said 5.2 per cent instead of 0.52 per cent, and I would like to thank the hon. member. I am sure that many hon. members in this House, but unfortunately not the majority of us, wish Canada's figure were 1 per cent. I am dreaming of Utopia in this particular field.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to our colleagues in the New Democratic Party for bringing forward this motion. Frankly I am confused by some of that wording, and to this moment that confusion has not been particularly alleviated by the speakers from that party.

I wish to assure the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) that I am not one of those who wish to judge the success or failure of Habitat. I do not think that is our responsibility or, still less the responsibility of those who attended the conference and who were subjected to the

pressures, and emotions, and effort required to make a reasonable input into such a conference. My only experience which is comparable was a food conference in Rome some time ago. Since that time I have felt that I, least of all, am able to judge the success or failure of such a meeting. I think we should leave that to the future. It is much too early for a final verdict on what took place in Vancouver.

● (2020)

What concerned me very much was the attack, which had some validity, on Canada's credibility which arose from that conference. That is not the same thing as judging a conference in terms of success or failure. It would seem to me that people can say to Canadians with some justification that those who live in glass houses should not be the first to throw stones, or they may say to us, "Physician heal thyself", or we may say to them, "Do as I say and not as I do".

A very good example is the water issue. It is very difficult for me to understand how Canada can retain its credibility in terms of pure, clean, acceptable water, as a preacher of this position, when we have reports daily of the sins we have committed in terms of our own water resources.

I was very impressed with what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) said, and I believe I can quote him fairly accurately. It was to the effect that developed nations do not follow up their rhetoric with action. I am not particularly happy to be branded a hypocrite, Mr. Speaker. It would not bother the parliamentary secretary, I am sure. She has already intervened without waiting to hear what I have to say, which is fairly consistent with the conduct of members of the government in this regard.

I was not particularly impressed with the fact that our Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand)—and I rise particularly because the motion deals with environmental matters—says that our action and interaction with neighbours throughout the world will depend on the government's ability to judge its action or interaction by the votes it may get in the next election. As the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona said, that gained wide press coverage. I think that is unfortunate, though I do not object to them saying that in an election campaign. I think it is part of the fight in an election campaign.

The Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) says he did not say that. I asked the minister that very question in this House in the unavoidable absence of this minister, and he did not deny for one moment that it is what he said. I gave him every fair opportunity, and despite the intervention now of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, the Minister of the Environment did not deny that statement. I gave him every opportunity to do so. I do not think it brought any credit to our Minister of State for Urban Affairs—and I join my colleagues in congratulating him on his contribution; I was very proud of him, but I was not proud of his colleague when he made that particular reference which was so widely quoted in the Canadian and international press. I was embarrassed as a Canadian to read that our contribution would be dictated by an election result that was some time away. Despite the intervention of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, I think the low water mark was that reference by the Minister of the Environment.

The motion deals with the commercial criteria with regard to nuclear power, and I should like to deal with that matter as it affects the environment. I think we are going to be judged on our actions by the developing countries. I am afraid of being accused of hypocrisy, and I think one of the things we are going to be judged on is nuclear power and nuclear waste.

The most serious environmental impact of nuclear power in my judgment is in the field of the management of waste produced by reactors. This waste is composed of radio-actinides which have extremely long half-lives—in the case of plutonium 25,000 years. This means that a given quantity of plutonium will be half as radioactive in 25,000 years as it is today. At this rate it would take 250,000 years for a moderate sized quantity of plutonium to become safe.

There are a number of methods of disposing of the waste. We have investigated burying it in salt, and we have investigated burying it in stable geological formations—and even shooting it into the sun. At the moment Atomic Energy of Canada seems to be leaning toward the geological disposal of waste in the pre-Cambrian shield.

Aside from the obvious problems associated with even geological disposal of the waste, it is important to remember that, as of today, no waste has ever been disposed of successfully. In the United States liquid waste is stored in steel tanks which, although built to very high tolerances and with double walls, have been known to leak. Substantial leakage of waste could obviously pollute the water table of a considerable area leading perhaps to the closure of an entire community. In addition, waste in temporary storage is vulnerable to theft, which given its toxic nature could have grave security implications.

Another hazard of nuclear power as far as the environment is concerned—and here again we are going to be judged on the way we deal with our environment—is that caused by thermal pollution created by nuclear power plants. Because of the high steam temperatures at which the facilities operate, vast quantities of cooling water are needed—about 50 per cent more than the conventional plant; thus, given present technology, nuclear power stations need to be located near very substantial bodies of water.

All of these considerations may be deemed theoretical, and perhaps they were until the Port Hope incident. They are not theoretical any more but are very, very real. Human error in the past was translated into significant dangers to children who were not even born when the mistakes were made. Therefore I think, and I urge upon my colleagues, that if we are going to be dealing with the less developed countries that the environmental considerations be given a priority and consideration far beyond that given by the government to date.

The economics of nuclear power are increasingly coming into question. In the last three years capital costs, inflation, and the general cost of capital have made nuclear power decreasingly economic even though oil prices have quadrupled during that period. At present trends, oil-fired power stations will be competitive with nuclear stations in the very near future. In fact the Barber report commis-

sioned for the energy research and development administration in the United States calculates that at about $30 a ton for power station coal, nuclear stations under 600 megawatts are uneconomic. Ontario Hydro estimates that this is about its average cost of coal delivered to its power stations.

Another economic problem of nuclear power as far as less developed countries are concerned is that the current vendors of nuclear stations sell only 600 megawatt or larger units. In a less developed country with a relatively unsophisticated power grid, a 600 megawatt unit represents a tremendous proportion of the total electricity requirements. This can mean that the less developed countries in question will develop an excessive dependance on one power source. In light of the fact that most power stations only operate between 50 and 70 per cent of the time, this leads to immense distortions in the power supply.

An hon. Member: Who wrote that?

Mr. Jarvis: The parliamentary secretary shakes his head. Can he tell me where a developed country can purchase a nuclear power station under 600 megawatts on the market place today? It is impossible. A country which purchases a unit that size or greater becomes tremendously dependent on that one single unit. In terms of safety it is probably the biggest issue confronting the advocates of nuclear power. This is a most controversial question, technically, and I claim no expertise.

● (2030)

I suggest that claims for the over-all safety of nuclear power plants are usually based on United States experience. They are summarized in documents such as the Rasmusian report, which suggests that the probability of a fatality from a nuclear accident is extremely small. Apparently the chance of being killed in a nuclear power accident is about as great as that of being killed by a meteorite. Because laymen do not usually readily understand probability theory, and because these statistics may easily be distorted, there is widespread unease about the safety of nuclear power in communities located near nuclear power plants.

Another problem concerns the use of nuclear material by terrorists. Quite apart from the potential which exists for making bombs from plutonium, a potential which is very likely not as great as has been commonly stated, it must be borne in mind that plutonium is a highly toxic element.

An hon. Member: Who can understand that?

Mr. Jarvis: If the hon. member wants to participate in the debate, I invite him to take part.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Will the hon. member please address the Chair?

Mr. Jarvis: I do not know if the hon. member wishes to participate in the debate. I listened to him not long ago and could not understand one thing he said. He made a most inconsequential contribution. Perhaps we are getting even. The hon. member may not be prepared to understand; I do not know.

[Mr. Jarvis.]

One pound of plutonium can kill many times over every man, woman, and child on this planet. This worry is magnified by the exponential growth of world plutonium stocks. By 1980 200 tons will have been produced; the figure by 1985 will rise to over 700 tons.

My second point relates to the wording of the motion. The motion refers to "the government's bold statements on such environmental matters as clean water and its inability or unwillingness to enforce minimal standards in Canada, as in the case of the Syncrude plant in northern Alberta." The mover of the motion referred to the Great Canadian Oil Sands plant, instead of the Syncrude plant. I would have been happier if the motion had referred to the Great Lakes as an example, particularly as the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), the mover of the motion, is more familiar with the Great Lakes than with the Athabasca oil sands. I think the example in the motion is most unhappy. However, since the motion mentions the Syncrude plant, my remarks will relate to Syncrude as well.

I accuse the Minister of the Environment for creating a confused situation with regard to environmental matters on which other countries will inevitably judge us. For example, what is the minimal standard if we use the GCOS yardstick? Is it to be 287 long tons per stream day, which is apparently the standard being set for Syncrude? Or is it 40 long tons, a standard which many allege can be reached if sulphur scrubbing equipment is installed in the plant? Further, what is the cost of such equipment? On the one hand we have reports saying it costs $60 million; in other cases companies allege that the cost will be up to $1 billion. Is the equipment any good? On the one hand some people allege that, for a $60 million expenditure, emissions can be reduced to 40 long tons a day. On the other hand some companies say that the equipment is unproven, unsatisfactory, and will never meet that particular target. The Minister of the Environment ought to answer such questions; so far he has not done so.

Who has authority for dealing with such environmental matters? The Minister of the Environment says that certainly the federal government has no authority. Despite the legislative authority of the Clean Air Act and the Environmental Contaminants Act, the minister has said repeatedly in this House and elsewhere that this is simply a provincial matter. Although the federal government is largely involved with the Syncrude operation, the Minister of the Environment has said repeatedly in this House that the federal government has no responsibility with regard to environmental matters. If this is true—and I am speaking theoretically only because I do not agree that it is—why in heaven's name has the minister not agreed with his provincial counterparts on what the acceptable level ought to be?

Surely developing countries will judge us for our inadequacies, since we cannot determine who has authority and, even if there is joint responsibility, what the commonly acceptable standard ought to be. Really, that is the thrust of the motion. We tell developing countries how concerned we are about the environment; we brag of our environmental assessment studies. And in fact we have commissioned environmental assessment studies. One was

undertaken with regard to Syncrude. But we do not do what we say we will do.

The Environment Canada comments on Syncrude's environmental impact assessment were so extensive as to merit a further study which is now under way, financed 50-50 by the federal and Alberta provincial governments, and will cost around $40 million to complete. The study is to be completed in 1985 owing to the comprehensive scope of its investigations. Syncrude, however, will begin operations in 1978, which leaves a hiatus of seven years. The spending of $40 million of taxpayer's money will result in a study which we shall receive seven years after the start-up of plant operations. And we say to developing countries, do as we say, not as we do. We tell them how concerned we are about our environment; yet we shall not complete a major environmental impact study until seven years after the Syncrude plant is in operation.

Apparently the NDP are concerned about the Athabasca tar sands. I do not wish to enlarge on what the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) said, but I am concerned about the example to which the motion we are debating alludes. In Alberta the main thrust of the forces opposing Syncrude has been managed by Mr. Grant Notley, the sole NDP member of the legislative assembly. Mr. Notley reportedly has a highly qualified staff of three working for him full time, on a generous research budget provided to him as leader and sole member of one of the opposition parties in the legislature. On occasion Mr. Notley's researches have steered him up some blind alleys. For example, Mr. Notley claimed that the GCOS emissions were killing thousands of water fowl in the Athabasca area. The hon. member for Athabasca this afternoon, as have others at other times, completely rejected such claim as being inaccurate. It is unfortunate that the mover of the main motion did not use a better example to illustrate concern for the environment.

I come back to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs and say that I will not judge him on these matters. He and the government will be judged on these matters by others some time in the future. On the other hand, I join my colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona in complimenting the minister on his speech at Habitat. I say to him, sincerely, that I thought the Minister of the Environment made a most unhappy intervention at that conference. Second, so long as we are hypocritical about environmental matters in Canada, it will be difficult to show developing nations the leadership they expect of us in this field.

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks may I congratulate the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) for acting as chairman at the Habitat conference and for performing his duties under conditions which, as many know, were most trying.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogan: The motion the House is debating refers to the cynical attitude the government adopted at the Habitat conference on the question of pollution and the provision of clean water, as well as to what has happened pollution-wise in the Alberta tar sands development. The last point relates to the way this country has sold nuclear reactors to various countries of the world with the attendant pollution and safety problems.

● (2040)

In the debate at Habitat and again today, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) brought in the whole question of the Habitat conference as it relates to the whole new economic order and the discussions that had taken place in Nairobi. He mentioned that the Vancouver conference was a successor to several important U.N. conferences held in the past few years, notably the food crisis conference in Rome, the population crisis conference in Bucharest, the rights of women conference in Mexico City, and the environmental conference in Stockholm.

There is an old Biblical saying that is familiar to most people: There is faith, hope, and charity, but the greatest of these is charity. The line that I am going to take tonight is that there is food, clothing, and shelter, and the most important and greatest of these is food, even though I realize that the Habitat conference was supposed to be primarily directed to the problems of human settlement. In reality a great deal of the time was spent trying to allay the political by-play or inter-play between the mid-East forces that unfortunately crept into that conference, as it has into so many UN conferences in recent years. Perhaps it was unavoidable.

I listened to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona and part of the speech in reply by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Miss Bégin) who would very well have been talking about the new economic order in the same way as the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona. I realize that since the world food conference in Rome we have not moved as quickly as possible. Obviously if we are going to get into a new economic order it involves what was discussed at Nairobi, including commodity agreements, raw materials, preferential tariff agreements between the developed and underveloped world, changing trade patterns, a host of structural changes that need to take place in the underdeveloped world as well as in the developed world in order to bring about a greater redistribution of resources as between the poorer and richer nations. We all know that in the long run that has to be done. A start has to be made.

There is something, though, about which I am becoming increasingly concerned. My fears have not been allayed since the conference in Rome. I refer to the fact that we underplay too much the necessity of foreign aid in the traditional sense.

I was particularly struck by this fact last night in watching the CTV program "W5". There was a discussion by two people, one of whom was Dr. McTaggart-Cowan, a well known Canadian scientist who did a study of the oil spill disaster in Chedabucto Bay. The other was Dr. Schneider, I think his name was, a climatologist from one of the mid-western states. They predicted that we have fed into the computers too much of these historical climatic cycles without any reasonable room for random variations that can completely change the picture with regard to food supplies in the short run as it affects our country and, therefore, millions and millions of people in the underdeveloped world.

Since the world food conference in Rome, books and articles have been produced with regard to the question of the lifeboat theory, the idea that wealthy countries should help only the most promising of the poorer countries. I asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question with regard to the comparison of the GNP. The answer she gave me is correct; it is much less that 1 per cent. She did not state, and I am subject to correction on this, that the close to $1 billion figure she quoted includes $100 million to $150 million for military expenditures in these countries. I do not consider that conducive to helping these countries to obtain food or better human settlement.

An hon. Member: That should be million.

Mr. Hogan: I should have said $250 million, I think it is. Anyway, I am subject to correction. It may be $150 million. My point is that the distinction needs to be made between military expenditures as a part of the foreign aid program and the real foreign aid program relating to food, shelter, and things like that.

As I was saying, the lifeboat theory is still prevalent. There has been much written about it, probably as a consequence of the world food conference in Rome. The idea is that the wealthy countries should help only the most promising of the poorer countries, since spreading resources too thin could jeopardize chances for survival of the strong as well as the weak. There is the suggestion that wealthy nations should make distinctions between poorer nations in the spirit of "triage", the first world war medical practice of dividing the wounded into survival categories in order to concentrate medical resources on those who could truly benefit from them, and to ignore those who would die even with treatment or survive even without it. Some proponents of these theories cite projections from the Club of Rome's statistical model "The Limits to Growth" to add a seal of technological legitimacy to their modern-day malthusianism.

These apolyptic concepts are provocative, and the threads of truth they contain do have frightening implications. Moreover, momentum for this pessimism has been building, abetted by full page advertisements in major newspapers, articles in important international publications, and a marked increase in the demand for triage speakers on American campuses and television panels.

As a recent copy of the New York *Times* magazine noted, the campaign has had its impact. Many leaders who have been in the forefront of efforts to help the needy are currently mired in an uncharacteristic mood of inertia. And the lifeboat and triage theories offer a rationale for their passivity.

Yet a close look reveals that the theories are not appropriate to today's realities and need not be for tomorrow's. In fact reasonable and hard headed assessments of available figures suggest that it is well within the power of humanity to produce enough food to prevent masses from starving. The fact that it is possible to refute the current lifeboat and triage theories, however, as Barbara Ward notes, does not mean there is no food crisis. Various food crises and inadequate distribution systems have affected nutritionally the status of millions of children from low income families, and unless dramatic policy decisions are taken soon this trend, I am afraid, is likely to accelerate over the next decade, with ominous consequences. That in face is the reason why the lifeboat and triage theories must be refuted now.

● (2050)

I was happy to see that in a recent interview Mr. Hopper, Canada's head of the International Development Research Centre, had this to say about the triage concept. He said it is an unworthy concept. It assumes that there is nothing you can do, or that the resources that it is going to take to do it are just so colossal that you cannot afford to expend them. He says that this is a perfectly valid classification in the heat of battle on the battlefield. If I may quote him from an interview in the *Globe and Mail* for November 3, 1975, he says:

> But when it comes to the world food situation, "I don't think we're at anything like that limited capacity at the present time. I don't think we're out of time and I don't think we're out of resources."

He went on to point out that some nations that would be left to their fates are in fact agriculturally very productive—India, for example. He says that the concern should be not to abandon them but to transform their traditional agricultural practices into scientifically based ones that will increase their output of food.

I want to go further than that, Mr. Speaker. I think it is most important to recognize that the basic concept of squeezing the world into a single lifeboat is wrong. The aim should be to build more lifeboats. You then increase food production in needy countries in the longer run, while in the shorter run you supply them with the needed food, so that the many possible and in some cases probable famines that will be facing the world will be readily dealt with.

The view of helpless countries holding out begging bowls for a few kernels of grain is I know the last thing in the minds of all development agencies and low income nations. We all know that in many countries there is nothing politically more difficult to handle and more damaging to a nation's pride than food aid. However, realities are realities, and it does not do to have leaders such as, with all due respect to his memory, the late emperor Haile Selassie who, as we now know, tried to hide the fact of some famine in Ethiopia. Pride can only go so far.

Based on today's technologies, we know the opportunities for major growth in food production are there. Scientific breakthroughs are possible. Some research projects are already approaching fruition and others offer interesting promise. In any event, if we take the lifeboat and triage theories to their conclusion and deny aid to many hungry nations, what ultimately will happen to them? This is the reason we have to get up to the one per cent of GNP that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs mentioned is her dream. It must not be a dream, even in a period of national restraint; it must become a reality in one of the most relatively affluent countries of the world, even though our growth rate over the last few years, in GNP-per capita terms, has gone from second among the nations of the western world to sixth or seventh.

Furthermore, evidence is beginning to accumulate showing that great efforts are being made now at reducing

population growth and improving nutrition. These two factors are linked together far more closely than once thought. In many poor areas the best way to lower the birth rate is to provide a family's children with a decent chance for survival by the economic transformation of their society, as well as the provision of food aid in the short run. If half of their children die before reaching their productive years, parents will feel that they have to conceive a great many children—common belief puts the figure at eight—to ensure two surviving sons. So ironically the rate of population growth could be lowered partly by providing food to keep children alive and healthy.

It is hard for Canadians to realize, Mr. Speaker, as became clear at the Habitat conference, what it is like to be in the shoes of those who have to live on $200 a year. It is evident across the country, despite the attempts of officials to break that barrier down, that it is pretty tough for us who are used to restaurants with plenty of food, who are used to three square meals a day and a pretty good roof over our heads, to realize the suffering endured by these people.

If we try to imagine what it is like for a family to live on $200 a year, Mr. Speaker, first of all let us take out the furniture, except for a few old blankets, a kitchen table and one chair, take away the pantry, save for a few potatoes, dismantle the bathroom, take away the house and move the family to the toolshed, and take away all the other houses and set up in their place a shantytown.

My House leader has reminded me, Mr. Speaker, that I do not have much time left, so some of the things I was going to say will have to be left unsaid. I hope on another occasion I will have an opportunity to make some further points. Let me conclude by congratulating the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) on pointing out today that one of the great problems in our country in regard to housing is land speculation. Although we have developed this question before in the House, I wish he had developed it a little more today in relation to the food policy of this country and foreign food aid. Some of our best agricultural land is owned by these greedy speculators, and the provincial and federal governments are allowing them to go ahead as in the fertile Niagara Peninsula.

Let me remind us all of what John Maynard Keynes said after the first world war when he predicted what was going to happen in Germany. I suggest we remember this today. He said:

> Men will not always die quietly. For starvation, which brings to some lethargy and a helpless despair, drives other temperaments to the nervous instability of hysteria.

We are seeing that at the present time.

> These in their distress may overturn the remnants of organization, and submerge civilization itself in their attempts to satisfy desperately the overwhelming needs of the individual. This is the danger against which all our resources and courage and idealism must now co-operate.

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to engage in this debate and I thank the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) for introducing it. It gives us the opportunity to talk about matters which I think are very important and which we do not discuss all that often, even though there have been accusations of cynicism. I think we can make them both ways, though it would not be very productive.

The important thing to remember is that we had a fine delegation at Habitat, one that was truly representative. It was not only a federal delegation; it was a national delegation and included all levels of government, non-government organizations, our native people, and women, of whom I wish there were more on the delegation, who acquitted themselves admirably under the outstanding leadership of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) who led the Canadian delegation. I think they did us credit, and I include all the members of the Canadian Habitat Secretariat. I think they did us credit; the people of Canada, the Habitat Secretariat, and Commissioner General Mr. MacNeill did us credit. The arrangements, as all the delegates and all the United Nations people said time and time again, were second to none. Perhaps more important was the fact that the hospitality of the people of Vancouver was second to none. The warmth, the spirit, and the interest was noticed everywhere the delegates went, and this situation was repeated time and time again.

● (2100)

I certainly want to thank those who have paid tribute to the role I played there. It was one of considerable interest. I must say, however, that the conference did not solve the problems of the new international economic order. It could not deal with those things which the UNCTAD conference at Nairobi did not really resolve. There is still trouble in Ireland, and there is still tragedy in Lebanon. The Middle East problems have not been solved. The United Nations Habitat conference on human settlements was not able to solve those problems which neither the General Assembly nor the Security Council have been able to resolve so far. Many people ask: well, is that not a tragedy? That is not what the conference was about. These are the things that most of the people directed their attention to day after day in tough sessions. This is what the people directed themselves to in the long period of time in preparation for the Stockholm conference.

These people dealt with settlements. They reached conclusions on many of the human settlements issues. Perhaps 90 per cent or 95 per cent of the substance for which the conference was called was agreed upon by consensus. As the Minister of Justice has said, it was not such that we could vote or approve the Declaration of Principles by consensus.

We should not lose sight of the real progress that was made and for which the conference was called. There were no surprises. We were not surprised when issues which some consider extraneous or irrelevant arose. Delegates in most cases were not briefed on them. They did not have instructions from their governments on them. The conference was not really competent to deal with them, but these reflected the real world, and also something else which we Canadians had the opportunity of learning. It reflected that these things which we sometimes consider extraneous and irrelevant are very central to other people. I think that is the lesson we must learn.

There were over 140 nation states represented, plus many observer groups, liberation groups, and non-government organizations. We were getting the full spectrum of

the world and it has shifted, just as the United Nations has shifted. The conference is suffering from that democratic fault of having the majority have its way, and this was reflected very much there.

If we look back, as we will, and as we are beginning to do now at the Stockholm conference on the environment, we will remember these things. Very few people, except perhaps a few UN watchers or specialists, will remember the difficulties at the Stockholm conference with the recognition of the Chinese delegation, or of the German Democratic Republic delegation not being represented. I forget the details myself. When we look back and forget all the turmoil of the so-called extraneous political matters we remember the substance of what the Stockholm conference was all about. Many things have happened as a result of that. There are very few nations in the world without environmental programs, and at that time there were very few with such programs or even with environmental ministries. The word "ecology" was perhaps known to a few academics, specialists, and scientists, but now it is used by school children, and felt with their hearts.

There are many programs now on the environment under the auspices of the United Nations Environmental Program in Nairobi, for instance, the one begun following the conference regarding depollution of the Baltic Sea. Even the preparatory arrangements leading up to the conference have resulted in progress. Canada and the United States signed the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement as the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement as a direct result of the interest created in preparing for such a conference because it focused attention on this. Very few people know about the Barcelona agreement for the gradual depollution of the Mediterranean Sea which was signed a few months ago. It involves the nations around the Mediterranean, including those opponents in the Middle East conflict. Even they reached agreement on this fundamental issue which was of human and social concern. This is the way we will look back at the United Nations Habitat Conference on Human Settlements in Vancouver.

I am told there are some 20 territorial disputes going on in the world today. I am sure that in another 20 years there will still be 20 territorial disputes going on. They probably will be different ones, but the work started at Habitat and in the preparatory process will continue, and its impact will continue to be felt. That is what is important and that is what made Habitat worth while.

I have mentioned consensus. We must remember that there were three committees, including Committee Two which dealt with policies, strategies, planning, institutions and management. It brought in a report under Mr. Ansari of Iran which was a consensus report. Committee No. 3 under Mr. Aria of Venezuela dealt with shelter, infrastructure and services, land, and with public participation, and it brought in a report by consensus. The conference dealt with water quality.

It was Canada which led the fight for water targets. It was said here today that we made no financial commitment. No nation there made a commitment for funding in respect of water quality, but we fought for targets in order that there would be piped pottable water to every community by 1990. Canada would have preferred the 1986 date, but perhaps we are a little too progressive and there was a consensus reached in respect of 1990. For Canada this is important because we forget sometimes that in our own communities we do not have clean, piped water, but we hope to in all Canadian communities by the 1980's.

We are prepared to make commitments through our external programs. This is not cynicism. It would have been the height of cynicism or self-righteousness for us to tell the developing nations what their targets should be, because there were also programs of national action. This was a critical part of the whole Habitat Conference which was made up of sovereign states which must set their own targets, their own goals, and their own priorities. If their priorities reflect that which was reflected by the conference, that is, a high priority on water, Canada is very much ready to respond.

Certainly it took the magic of Barbara Ward to dramatize this for the whole world, but that consistently throughout was Canada's position. In addition, the University of British Columbia, as was mentioned, will be the scene for the unique and innovative audio-visual program which will be for the transfer of information. Not only the audio-visual program itself, but all the other documents and upgrading and enriching it as time goes on, will be of advantage to Canadians and also to other people throughout the world.

There were plans for international co-operation and institutional arrangements, and this came of Committee One under Father Muhoho of Kenya. It is true that a consensus was not reached on a statement of principles, but it is rather striking that but for perhaps ten or 15 words there would have been a consensus. It was with sadness that I noted this was all that prevented us from reaching a total consensus.

It is this planning for international action which should go to the setting of priorities and the preparation of programs to which Canada will respond as we do already through our CIDA people. In this way we exchange internationally technology, know-how, and resources. Many things are still to come as a result of the conference.

The level of consciousness throughout the world was raised immeasurably in this whole area of human settlements. Country after country had programs which were going on before Habitat. Some made them a national effort. Through the activities of many, many people in the forum under Mr. Van Puttan of The Hague, and perhaps fortunately with the help of people like Barbara Ward, Margaret Mead, Buckminster Fuller and Mother Theresa, there was a consciousness that permeated every facet of Habitat, and those people who were interested became fully aware of what the basic problems are in the world, where our priorities and commitments should lie. So it was hardly a waste.

● (2110)

Many steps forward were taken. We did not solve the problem of human settlements, I might say also. We just started the process. This was the second stage of a process. There was a long preparatory process. Habitat was the time when we made our commitments, and now is the time of implementation. There will be a time of monitoring too. There will be monitoring at a national level which we will do here in Canada, I hope in the fall when there will be

meetings involving our delegation and the non-governmental organizations, and there will be international monitoring through the United Nations both on a global and on a regional basis.

In so far as our own concerns about human settlements are concerned we face some issues very squarely. There is the question of land which really reflected the Canadian reality. It exposed us. That is fair enough because it was a national delegation. I must say I take exception to the reference to particular names. The name was raised of Mr. Teron, the secretary to the ministry. He really fought very hard for a very liberal position in those committees.

There were others present there who represented Canadian reality, the mixed economy and the federal nature of our country. That I consider a great assist because now it has exposed the problems for Canadians to see, for governments to see. I now am making contact with the ministers responsible in the various provinces across the country so that we can face that problem squarely together for the very first time.

There are jurisdictional problems, and there have been problems presented before. However, there has been a reluctance to sit down together to do something about it. I do not care if we sit down together or work in parallel, if the municipalities sit with the provinces or if we all sit together, or whether or not the private sector is there, the fact is that it has to be approached with urgency because obviously the problem is there and it will not go away. We have come to realize that certainly land is not a commodity but is a resource. This is the way in which we have to face it. Regrettably the debate today and elsewhere focused on the windfall profits in land, which are a problem. We have ways to deal with them through taxation. The provincial governments have ways to deal with this matter through taxation, and I guess also the municipalities.

We have to examine the matter much more thoroughly. However, that is only one element in the high cost of land and housing. There are many other factors. It is an important element, but it is not the most important. We have to sit down and look at it in the totality. Our job is not just to recapture profits for the community, which we do in many of our programs now; we also have to reduce the problems in respect of serviced land so that we can get housing at a lower price.

We have made our commitments in respect of water. We have to work very hard to meet them. We are making progress through our municipal infrastructure programs, and even this morning we had further meetings on how we could move into the area of remote communities where the greatest problems are.

There is the whole question of energy conservation, the design of our communities, and the need for proper urban transportation. This problem certainly has developed, and is one to which we certainly will have to give much greater priority as a result of this conference. This is something to which we are addressing ourselves now.

Then there were the problems of the Third World. We have problems in Canada. All developed nations have problems, or perhaps the industrialized nations, because some of those less industrialized are perhaps more developed as societies. But we can hope. We have the resources and the skills, and all we need are the political will and the priority to make them work. But in the Third World they do not have that luxury. When you are dealing with the squatter settlements of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and even in some North American areas to some extent, we see problems of immense proportions.

We talk about children and families living in refugee camps in Palestine and elsewhere. In this regard we have immense problems to which we must address ourselves as a world community. When we look at the villages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America which have never known clean water, where the women perhaps spend five hours a day hauling water, never really clean water, when the same water is used for cooking, drinking, washing, laundry and for defecating, end where virtually 100 per cent of the people suffer from water-borne disease, our problems fade into insignificance.

I do not believe our answer is to be able to provide housing for all the people of the world. If we can get that one first priority of clean water in each community then we have made immense progress. Then we need some decent sewage disposal, health services, and education, and then people will start building their own homes and their own communities. Then they can have a piece of land which they can call their own. Then they can have tenure of land, some pride and some stake in the community. Then things will happen. Then the problem of population, and not until then, will start to fade because then, as one of the hon. members opposite said, the families who have eight children, two of whom survive, will realize that maybe if they have two or three the two or three will live, and they will have the education and the will to do the proper family planning.

Those are the things which also come home to us as Canadians and as members of a world community. Organizations like CIDA and others have now focused in on the problems of water, sewage, and of human settlements, as has the World Bank and as have other international institutions. We must really face these issues squarely. We must realize that Habitat was not to cure all the problems of the world. It made immense progress in those areas it was intended to address.

I believe I have responded to many of the questions raised by the hon. member for Broadview, or certainly my colleagues have in the area of nuclear waste and in the area of the environment. I did want to deal particularly as I have with the question of land where the incremental gain being recaptured is only one element in the whole land picture, as I am sure he realizes quite well. I am sure that because it was a federal delegation, and because the provincial ministers were present, there was a disposition to meet on this subject. There is no commitment, but I will be in touch with my provincial colleagues to address this issue together as quickly as we possibly can.

The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) indicated that the Minister of Justice, the leader of the Canadian delegation, reserved Canada's position on these important issues. I think he will agree in all fairness that he made it perfectly clear that there was a lot of area for compromise and for agreement and consensus. There was only one area which prevented us and all other nations from supporting it, and that indeed was unfortunate.

Other members have zeroed in on other points of concern. I note that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) mentioned the question of rhetoric as opposed to action. Of course none of us can afford this kind of self-righteousness. Conferences are made up of words, and politicians use words. So do non-governmental organizations which sometimes do not have the responsibility for implementation, so I do not think this is a case of the kettle calling the pot black. It is a matter of realizing our responsibility in this respect and making commitments, as nations did.

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) of course mentioned the question of press attention. This was raised. It was rather a disappointement because I am told by UN hands and by the press people generally that the press arrangements were the finest ever made for such a conference. Yet editors thought it best simply to focus on those highly contentious issues which were not central to the conference, those about which it is easier to write perhaps, and which attract more attention.

Having said that, I think the Vancouver press and the British Columbia press generally were very responsible and covered the conference in great depth, as did radio and television. Many journalists took a serious interest in the whole issue of human settlements and reported it very well and in depth. Indeed I am rather pleased to see the press reaction now, a week or so later, which did not take an interest in the conference before but in doing an assessment now is doing it wisely.

● (2120)

The hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Jarvis) spoke about the danger of self-righteousness. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan) was cynical about our commitments with regard to water. I think that a healthy degree of cynicism is good, but so is a healthy degree of naïveté. I would not like to be out of balance either way.

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal spoke about politicization. I should like to repeat that this was not surprising. We hoped it would not happen, but this is the real world and it did happen. As a matter of fact it might be unproductive because the Third World is not monolithic, and because sometimes it detracts from the substance of these conferences, and more and more people are coming to realize that it is best to keep the specialized conferences as much to the point as possible.

We cannot believe for a moment that other problems will go away or that they are indeed extraneous. They are not extraneous to us as a world community, they are problems with which we must deal very seriously because if we forget the little children in the Methari Valley in Kenya, the children in the refugee camps in Palestine, or those children who have not survived the Warsaw ghetto, then indeed as a world community we are in great difficulty. I ask hon. members to assess this conference properly, to see what happened at Habitat, to look at the accomplishments, the plusses, and to hope for more of them in the future, but also to see what the alternatives are so that nations can get together and air their problems.

Even if we do not like the real world, we must be exposed to it. It is much better to have those differences on the table with the cards face up so that we can deal with them rationally and reach solutions. We in Canada cannot isolate ourselves from the world and its problems, and this was another benefit of Habitat because it brought them home more closely to us, more closely to the people of British Columbia and especially of Vancouver who really had a close-up view of the entire conference.

I respect the cynicism of the hon. member for Broadview, but I do not share it. I think that we accomplished a great deal at Habitat, and I think the world made a great step forward there. We will look back, not in 20 years but in two or three years, and see major action taking place as the result of this conference, as we have seen major action taking place as the result of the conference on the environment at Stockholm.

As I said, Habitat reflected the reality and the despair of the world, but also the hope and the highest ideals of mankind. I appreciate the fact that having a big heart and good-will is not enough—there must be commitment, there must be action to follow. But I am proud of Canada's role as host of Habitat and as a delegation at Habitat. I think all facets of the Canadian presence contributed well and did Canada proud.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to ask the minister a question, if you will allow it. Can the minister tell us what specific plans he has for a follow up to Habitat. He just touched lightly in his address on the subject. The non-government organizations which attended Habitat are most anxious to have follow up meetings across the country, and I wonder if the minister would tell us now what plans he has to promote the national program of action which came out of Habitat in a series of seminars on a regional basis across the country, perhaps culminating in a national meeting in the winter of 1977.

Mr. Danson: It is not only the non-government organizations but the non-organized governments that must get together now. I think we must leave sufficient room for assessment so that non-government organizations will be encouraged, as they are being encouraged, to meet, assess and monitor us, politicians. I do not want to give specific dates but I hope that not too late in the fall there can be a national meeting of non-government organizations. We have to decide if that is not too early, if perhaps we should not allow a longer time range to give more time for assessment. Certainly action in this direction has been started. I do not expect miracle answers overnight, but the process has to start quickly and we need the co-operation of the provinces and municipalities, which I am sure will be happy to participate.

In so far as external programs are concerned, I am aware of the fact that CIDA is looking at these new programs to respond to them. I think we will look at our energy conservation programs, and urban transport will get greater priority, all of this within the context of what are real economic restraints. I think this puts a different complexion on them, but I believe that this follow up and monitoring must start very quickly even on an international plane. The secretary general will be reporting to EcoSoc in Geneva this August, and then he and I will be reporting to the General Assembly in New York in the fall. We hope we can reach agreement on the institutional arrangements so

that international action can start. The UBC project is now under way and going to work immediately so that the very valuable information which was collected from many countries will not be dissipated immediately after the conference.

I can assure the hon. member that we will not let grass grow under our feet. This will not be fast enough to satisfy him or me, but we will certainly try as best we can.

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that only 30 minutes are left in the debate I have no way of forcing my preference over other members who want to speak, but what I have to say will only take seven minutes in order to allow equal time to the remaining four speakers who want to speak.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: I agree with the minister. I find that I myself am not guilty enough of ethnocentricity. I find that I am not guilty of measuring the standards and values of other nations based on the values I hold in this country to be right, good and equal for Canadians. I think that if more of us were guilty of ethnocentricity in reverse, we would perhaps be a little more concerned about some of the conditions we discussed, that were discussed at Habitat, and that were mentioned by the minister tonight.

● (2130)

Even though there are problems abroad, that does not in any way wipe out the real problems facing Canadians with respect to housing. There are people in this country who have a great hope, and they hope that one day they will be in a position to be able to own their own homes. That hope exists among young people in spite of the failures of the minister and the government. These are the days when old men dream dreams of how things used to be, and young men have visions of despair. Why has this hope turned to despair? Why are young people having to give up the right or the possibility of owning their own homes?

Just in passing, I was disappointed with the answer the minister gave me this afternoon in the question period. I was disappointed that he did not level with me and this House with reference to the one year mortgages which are a rip off to first time home owners in this country. The minister chose to evade the question.

I hope that there is still time for repentance, that the minister will read his answer, come to his senses, and tomorrow with tears streaming down his face stand in his place and right the wrong, and tell the people of this country what he intends to do with reference to the situation which has arisen with the bait and switch of one year mortgages.

In the time left to me I would like to bring to the attention of the minister the situation in the United States where, primarily in the area of housing, they make use of tax incentives, housing credit assistance, and cash subsidies, with the emphasis on tax incentives. I am wondering if the minister has given consideration to this and whether he would give thought to moving in this direction and providing tax incentives on interest paid on mortages—perhaps over 8 per cent or 9 per cent, but that could be decided upon—and perhaps to avoid double taxation, tax credits for taxes paid on municipal property to be deducted from revenue, primarily personal income tax.

I think that the advantages of this would be numerous. It would ease the burden of interest rate fluctuation, particularly high interest rates, on the taxpayer in a visible fashion; stimulate demand for home ownership; assist new families purchasing homes by allowing higher interest costs to be deducted from the generally lower incomes of younger families in the early years of family formation; and assist in building long range stability within the housing field. This scheme avoids tax upon tax, which I have already mentioned, and which has been part of past schemes. Home ownership ought to become a reality.

Just 50 years ago in this country education was considered to be a privilege, and now we consider that to be a basic right. I want to say categorically that I believe it is a basic right of expectation of every Canadian to own his own home or to have the option to own his own home. However, the option to own one's own home applies only in a certain context. We want to come to grips with that. It is not good enough, day after day, to give us the kind of verbiage that the minister gives us so well. It is not good enough to articulate the problems and then wring your hands in despair and say it is not possible.

Sir, Canadians from one end of this country to the other cannot understand why it is, with our vast resources in land and natural resources and with our hundreds of thousands of acres of land and timber, that our economic system does not allow people to own their own homes. It is not good enough that we cannot put our interest rates in order and that you, sir, cannot put your House in order to bring this about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I hope the hon. member is not blaming the Chair for all these weaknesses.

Mr. Whiteway: With those words I will conclude by saying that I challenge the minister tomorrow, sometime during the question period or perhaps in a statement on motions, to put right the wrong he made during the question period today, and the wrong which was stated by his parliamentary secretary in his absence last week.

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the debate on Habitat, 1976, which I believe was the largest United Nations conference ever held. It is certainly a credit to the UN, to the great city of Vancouver, to the Government of Canada and its delegation, and especially to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) for his devoted leadership.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Philbrook: As we have heard, some praise Habitat for its results and some criticize, but I believe that the most important thing about it is that it happened. I do not think any reasonable person can deny that a new initiative had to be taken on such a high priority subject as human settlements. Human settlements, of course, mean much more than housing. They mean such things as land and space, water and disposal, a stable climate and an agreeable environment.

I also congratulate my friend, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), for raising this subject, although I am afraid I cannot agree with his skepticism about it.

I would like to speak for a little while about one particular subject, as did the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), who is also the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and that is the subject of Canadian policy with regard to nuclear sales. Human settlements depend not just on structures and resources, but also to a very large extent on that basic commodity, energy. There is no question that, as a result of the recent changes in the world energy situation, many countries must turn to sources other than oil to meet their increased requirements. It is the obligation of the world community, including Canada, to help them to do so. There are a number of sources which must be adequately explored and developed, including indigenous energy resources such as coal and hydro, which in many cases were not considered at all seriously in the days of cheap oil. That has only come about recently.

New technologies, also largely ignored until recently, will have to be examined urgently and carefully. Nuclear energy, especially nuclear fission, however, is the major technological option available today. It is by no means applicable in all cases because of the scale of power requirements and power grids, and because of the massive investments in capital required. Nuclear technology is highly complex and sensitive, and only a relatively small number of countries have the technological resources to manage it adequately.

The government recognizes these limitations in deciding on export sales. It is, however, the responsibility of Canada as a member of the international community to make energy resources available to other countries, and in those cases where nuclear energy is the most appropriate, to share that technology.

Such sales, however, are only authorized under the most stringent international safeguards against the diversion of Canadian assistance to non peaceful uses. Canada is prepared to forgo sales where these guarantees are not available, and is acting vigorously in all international forums to raise the world standard of guarantees to levels which give the greatest protection against diversion to explosive use.

In general, Canadian export sales decisions are not, as charged by the opposition, based on an overriding commercial motivation. The government welcomes Canada gaining national benefits through world acceptance of CANDU, but this is not the central element in reaching decisions on nuclear exports. Nuclear transfers are motivated by the responsibility to help with the world energy situation on a number of fronts, including, but by no means restricted to, nuclear. Sales are made only on the basis that the facilities Canada supplies are built to the best and safest standard and are operated with the best protection for the environment. They are only authorized when there is a high degree of assurance that the facilities will be used for agreed and purely peaceful uses. Having said that in generality, there are a number of questions posed recently on the specifics of this particular subject. I should like to quote a few of those questions, and some of the answers which are widely appreciated.

[Mr. Philbrook.]

● (2140)

I can think of about ten different questions that arise: the diversion of spent fuel; the return of spent fuel to Canada; Canadian nuclear export policy in general; the non-proliferation treaty as a pre-condition of sale; justification of Canada's reactor sales to non-NPT countries; a moratorium on nuclear exports; CANDU licensing safeguards; bilateral inspections on nuclear safeguards; CANDU licensing negotiations, with Italy in particular; safeguards in uranium sales, and finally, environmental considerations.

We should look at one or two of those questions, Mr. Speaker. First is the question about diversion of spent fuel or misuse of spent fuel. It has been alleged that the CANDU reactor is particularly suited for the purpose of diversion if a country desired to do so. Regardless of verification techniques, how can the government be supporting the sale of such a potential bomb maker to countries like Argentina and the Republic of Korea? The answer is that both Argentina and the Republic of Korea have a nuclear power plant from other sources. Canada is not supplying reprocessing equipment and technology. All nuclear reactors produce plutonium and there is no essential difference in this respect between CANDU and light water reactors exported by other suppliers.

The quantities of spent fuel available in Argentina and the Republic of Korea will be considerable, quite independent of the CANDU reactor to be constructed in these countries. The CANDU facilities will be under stringent safeguards, including a Canadian veto on reprocessing. This may hopefully lead to an upgrading of safeguards on reactors sold by other suppliers.

Let us look at another question. Why is it that Canada does not insist on what appears to be the ultimate measure of safeguards in terms of restricting the use of plutonium by the Republic of Korea by having all the spent fuel from the reactor returned to Canada? The answer is that this option was carefully considered by Canada and it has been decided, as we have noted in the House previously, that on balance such a requirement would not be the best to serve the interests of Canada.

Apart from the serious environmental problems that such a course would create, it would not prevent a country, intent on violating an agreement, from retaining the fuel either by directly abrogating the agreement or by non-compliance. In the event of abrogation of the agreement, that country would be left with a significant stock of spent fuel stored for cooling which is essential before shipment, as well as fuel in the reactor and fuel about to be inserted in the reactor. Since this quantity of material would be more than ample for any immediate production of plutonium, the margin of protection against diversion would not be nearly as significant as the question indicates, at best it would mean a reduction in available stocks over a very few months.

Canada does have the clear right to prohibit reprocessing of fuel from the reactor and has given clear notice that it is not willing at this time to agree to it being carried out. In the government's view this stipulation, together with the inspection mechanisms in place, provide an adequate level of protection against diversion.

Perhaps I should raise one final question, the third out of those ten, and that is on the general Canadian nuclear export policy. The following question has been posed: in light of the criticism by such a well-informed critic as Ralph Nader that nuclear exports to Third World countries are an example of "criminal responsibility", how can the government continue to maintain that it is pursuing moral objectives in selling CANDU reactors to Third World countries? In particular, how does the government respond to criticism that less developed countries do not have the technological capability to manage such complex technology safely?

The answer is we believe that in speaking in the very extensive debate in this House on March 23, we outlined the government's policy very clearly. The government does not maintain that nuclear power is, in all cases and at all times, the only or even the most desirable energy alternative for all developing countries. It is recognized that likely only some Third World countries at any particular time need or are fully able to operate such a sophisticated energy source. What we are saying is that in the cases where the need and the ability exist, this energy should not be denied.

The moral problem is a complex one and should be examined in all its dimensions. I cannot accept the suggestion that Canada should fail to observe its international obligations to help developing nations achieve economic progress. Surely the way to meet the concerns raised is not to cut off access to nuclear technology but to provide the means and techniques to ensure its use, with safety, and under safeguards.

I might note in this connection that Canada's approach in marketing the CANDU system is to ensure that the reactors are not only built to Canada's high standards, but are handed over to operators of high technical competence and run under international safeguards earlier outlined in this House.

The other seven questions can certainly be answered with an equal amount of thoughtfulness.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the world must continue to address itself to all basic human and social concerns such as settlements and all means to that end, no matter how challenging those means may be. A fortunate people, like Canadians especially, cannot afford to shirk that responsibility.

Some approaches, such as nuclear energy, will themselves give rise to new concerns and new questions such as the questions which I have just reviewed. We are answering today's questions and we must answer tomorrow's, but answer them we will.

Canada is in the forefront of such progress of benefit to all mankind. A great deal of the credit for this goes to our federal government and especially to our Minister of State for Urban Affairs. I for one shall be pleased to continue supporting him and all the efforts of our government both at home and abroad to take care of the needs of people. Habitat was an important step toward that goal.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in the brief time that I have to devote to the subject of debate tonight there are some areas I should like to discuss, though possibly not in the context of the motion.

Habitat Conference

I should like to start with the question of a pure water policy and the environmental concerns that were expressed. While I have some very serious reservations about the Habitat conference they really do not lie upon the shoulders of the government for I honestly believe that the minister set out in a very forthright fashion to produce something that nations around the world could be proud of, and set out to do a job that the United Nations and Canadians would be proud of. I think he was frustrated in that.

Some of the Third World countries set political priorities; that was the way they viewed it, and in my view it was unfortunate. The minister made reference to a developing situation at the United Nations some years ago which concerned the German Republic and China, but those are not the countries that are creating problems today at the United Nations; instead it is the countries that need our help. In my view those countries are going to have to be dragged through the doorway to that help, and they are going to resist every inch of the way. They used Habitat as a political forum, and I think that unquestionably they are the ones which are going to suffer rather than the countries devoted to human settlements.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move to the question of pure water. This is an area of great concern, and perhaps the classic example of this concern is demonstrated by the series of questions I placed on the order paper in 1974. On December 11, 1974, I placed on the order paper the following question:

● (2150)

What is the estimated tonnage for the next five years of human waste that will be dumped from vessels plying the Great Lakes?

The Department of the Environment replied:

The estimated quantity of human sewage, including the usual 32 gallons flush water per person per day, is 7 million tons for the next five years.

I put the question on the order paper because the then minister of the environment had indicated that, in her view, it was not necessary to take action with regard to the amount of human sewage being dumped in the Great Lakes from Great Lakes vessels. She felt that the five-year moratorium provision was fine.

My second question of that date reads as follows:

What is the estimated average cost per commercial vessel for the installation of holding tanks for human waste?

The department's response reads as follows:

The estimated average cost per commercial vessel for the installation of holding tanks for human waste ranges between $23,000 for new tugs to $74,000 for new lakers and between $28,000 for existing tugs to $81,500 for existing lakers.

If the federal government had wanted to clear up a serious difficulty, it could have provided subsidies. For smaller vessels the subsidy, amortized over five years, would work out at between $5,000 and $10,000, an insignificant sum to pay for something which would help to clean up the Great Lakes. I use the word insignificant because, in terms of total pollution of the Great Lakes, the quantity of human sewage dumped from vessels is relatively insignificant.

Habitat Conference

The third part of my order paper question reads:

What improvements for the holding or disposal of human waste in Great Lakes ships are anticipated in five years time and at what cost?

In 1974 the then minister had said she was not prepared to do anything for five years. In part, the answer of the department informed me that in five years time I could anticipate:

... Construction of approximately 12 shore-based reception facilities, strategically located, and designed to receive commercial ships' sewage for subsequent discharge in a manner which ensures adequate treatment. The anticipated total cost of these facilities... is $2,500,000 assuming that, existing wharf space will be made available at no charge.

I wonder how far $2.5 million would go, even if paid as a partial subsidy, toward the installation of sewage holding tanks in Great Lakes steamers.

Lastly, I asked in my order paper question:

To what estimated percentage degree does the dumping of human waste from such vessels contribute to the pollution of the Great Lakes?

According to the department's answer, approximately .3 per cent is attributable to ships' crews.

When you consider that .3 per cent of pollution is attribuable to ships' crews, but that in five years Great Lakes ships discharge seven million tons altogether into the Great Lakes, it is clear that the total volume of human sewage dumped into the Great Lakes in five years is in the order two and one third billion tons. That is shocking.

The minister indicated that we have a clean water policy. Let me say that the people of Kootenay West are most interested in that policy. I hope the Department of Regional Economic Expansion will agree with British Columbia to provide in the valley a pipeline to carry pure, potable water for all communities along the Columbia River or, assist the province and municipalities concerned by providing for pumping stations to pump water from the Columbia River into holding areas where the water can be purified for human consumption and industrial and agricultural uses. At present the area cannot expect to develop unless it has available considerable additional volumes of clean water.

The water is available. Unfortunately in the Columbia River below the High Arrow Dam one sees the pollution effects of a pulp mill and also of a lead smelter. Would that not be an excellent program for DREE? What an excellent contribution the department would make to providing the pure water advocated by the government. The government could help us in two areas; one is in my riding; the other is the Great Lakes.

I am concerned about the question of nuclear reactors. I suggest that anyone wishing to debate that subject will open up a can of worms on my side of the House. We have heard many statements on the subject from the government benches. Perhaps the most flowery and inconsequential statements are made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen). There is beautiful rhetoric, adding up to nothing, except pending disaster. In my view CANDU sales are an example of fiscal irresponsibility. The government is ignoring its responsibility in the nuclear field to all countries of the world. Expert after expert has offered testimony showing that CANDU is a financial calamity, a nuclear catastrophe and should not be considered. I contend that if the government were concerned more about pure water and less about heavy water, it would have accomplished a great deal more.

We have seen the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) beating his breast and expressing concern because people in the poorer countries of the world must drink lousy water. Heaven knows, I have seen it myself and could not agree more. I suggest it is time the government wound down its CANDU policy and wound up its pure water policy.

I now come to the tar sands. I am greatly concerned because Alberta has claimed sole responsibility for evironmental controls with respect to the tar sands. I saw the same attitude displayed two years ago in British Columbia. I saw evidence of pollution connected with a DREE project in my riding. When I wrote to the provincial government, asking what they were prepared to do, they said, in so many words, "You are a federal member; keep your nose out of this." I say that since federal funds are used in DREE projects of that kind, the province's attitude was irresponsible. I could say much more; unfortunately I see my time has expired. May I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being ten o'clock p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 58, the proceedings on the motion have now expired.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since there has been no public announcement of the business for tomorrow morning, is there someone here who is an acting House leader, who can tell us what the business will be tomorrow morning, or can confirm that it will be Bill C-88?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, yes, it is to be Bill C-88.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): At eleven o'clock in the morning?

Mr. Drury: Yes.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under the provisions of Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

LABOUR CONDITIONS—LOCKOUT OF AIR CANADA FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES—POSSIBLE RESUMPTION OF MEDIATION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, for the last three or four weeks I have been calling on the government to direct the Auditor General to conduct a complete audit into the financial fiasco, or complete financial breakdown, of the Air Canada finance branch in Winnipeg. I was hoping, after what happened last week, that the minister would take action. Unfortunately the government had sluffed me off and referred the entire matter to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. In no way can the committee conduct an audit into the financial fiasco at the finance branch of Air Canada in Winnipeg. Nevertheless, I shall welcome seeing Air Canada representatives appear before the standing committee as I wish to discuss several matters with them, and will be glad to hear their comments.

May I allude to a statement made to the Winnipeg *Free Press* on June 17 by Michael H. Cochrane, vice president of the Air Canada finance branch. He denied union allegations that mismanagement had contributed to the airline's record $12.5 million deficit last year. He said two major audits by private firms in the last year had thoroughly studied Air Canada accounting procedures and found them satisfactory. That statement is completely false. There was no detailed accounting whatsoever by any accounting firm in the finance branch.

● (2200)

He went on to say that the audits were conducted by Clarkson and Gordon Ltd. for the Estey inquiry into the airline last year, and by Coopers and Lybrand for the airline itself for 1975. The deficit, he said, was caused by a major decline in passenger traffic, rising fuel bills and other escalating prices.

In the Coopers and Lybrand report in the 1975 financial statement of Air Canada they state:

Our examination included a general review of the accounting procedures—

The general review did not consist of a detailed study into the airline billing at the finance branch, Winnipeg.

Also, under the terms of reference from the Estey report, Clarkson and Gordon were required primarily to review the Winnipeg centralized payment system, the Montreal payment system, the Dorval purchasing system, certain local branch purchases and the system of authorization for expenditure. The review did not include payrolls and did not examine, except in a very summary fashion, the subroutines related to specific disbursements.

As a result of this review Clarkson, Gordon & Co. prepared a description of the disbursement systems and submitted this description to the commission, a brief summary of which is included in Chapter 5 of the Estey report. They did not go into detailed billing whatsoever.

I discussed this with the employees of the finance branch in Winnipeg. They told me that no outside auditors came into the finance branch to do a detailed study. Some employees recalled outside auditors dropping by in 1972. However, there have been no outside auditors doing any review since 1972.

Also in the Estey report it is recognized that, under the Financial Administration Act, the Auditor General is eligible to be appointed as auditor or joint auditor of the corporation, but such has not been the case in the past. It is certainly time that it was done, especially in view of the charges by the CALEA union in Winnipeg. Also, in the Estey report it states, and I quote:

There is no doubt that the final fiscal responsibility for Air Canada resides in Parliament when all other resources fail and therefore Parliament is entitled to the fullest and clearest financial reporting.

That is all I ask for, a clear, precise report from the Auditor General. The government has a responsibility to send the Auditor General there in light of the serious charges by the CALEA union in Winnipeg.

I have cited many cases of mismanagement over the past two weeks. One was that there are no longer any enforced controls for travel agents reporting ticket sales. As of October, 1975 there was in excess of $96,000 worth of unreported travel agent ticket sales, which represents a minimum of $2,208,000 unpaid for transportation. There is no mention of this in the Coopers and Lybrand report or in the Clarkson, Gordon report. They did not touch on any of these matters at all, so that Mr. Cochrane's statement that they have had a real in depth audit made is absolute nonsense.

I have also pointed out that Air Canada's own internal auditors endeavoured to audit the refund bank drafts account in 1975. This account is not less than $2.5 million per month, about $30 million a year. They finally gave up, and this account remains unaudited since 1972. Therefore over the past four years a $120 million account has been in question. The Clarkson, Gordon statement in the Estey report makes no mention of that whatsoever.

I have also been pointing out that Air Canada has been writing off debts from corporations as large as $186,000. How can it allow a debt for air travel to accumulate to the amount of $186,000? It is rather obvious that these two firms have not been doing any detailed study whatsoever in the finance branch in Winnipeg. There is no mention of that in the Estey report or in the Coopers and Lybrand statement in the Air Canada report for 1975.

I have also pointed out in the past that Air Canada has been breaking IATA rules and regulations. They have issued bar vouchers for Tours Mount Royal to the tune of $27,384. All that Air Canada collected from this travel agent was $9,445; they wrote off $17,938. This is illegal under IATA rules and regulations and is another matter that the Auditor General should look at.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret that the time allotted to the hon. member has now expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke had labour conditions, the lockout of Air Canada finance branch employees put on the orders of the day. Well, he discussed only the auditing of Air Canada accounting books. If that was the matter he wanted discussed tonight we would certainly have had someone from the Department of Transport come down to answer the very important matter he raised.

But the matter he raised for the late show was labour conditions, the lockout of Air Canada finance branch employees and the possible resumption of mediation. Well, I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member who personally asks to debate a specific issue should debate an entirely different matter. I do not understand his attitude at all. I understand that he is interested in what is happening in Winnipeg since he is the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (M. McKenzie) but when one wants to raise a point and receive an adequate answer I think one must stick to the point one wants to have discussed and not raise another in a debate like tonight.

So, with respect to the problems of the Air Canada lockout I think it can be said—and the hon. member knows it; if he does not, he should—that a—

[*English*]

A senior departmental mediator has held several meetings with the parties in an effort to resolve the dispute which led to rotating strike action by the union members and more recently a temporary shutdown and readjustment of the work in the finance branch operation at Winnipeg. Over this past weekend, officials of the department have been monitoring the situation, and the mediator was in contact with the parties and arranged to commence further mediation sessions in Ottawa on Tuesday, June 22, 1976. Because of the difficulty in arranging transportation between Winnipeg and Ottawa, it is now necessary to reschedule the meetings for Wednesday, June 23, 1976, provided transportation can be arranged.

Departmental officials are keeping in close contact with this situation and every effort is being made to assist the parties in the resolution of this protracted and very involved dispute. Recently, on June 18, the minister sent a telegram to the President of the Canadian Airline Employees Association which reads as follows:

● (2210)

This is in reply to your telegram advising that you find Air Canada's action of June 16 inexcusable although you recognize the company has exercised its legal rights under the Canada Labour Code. You are aware the union acquired the right to strike and the employer the right to lockout on October 22, 1975.

Apparently my time is up, Mr. Speaker, but I still want to mention that it is not fair to raise a question and then call another question at ten o'clock.

Mr. Paproski: You have to be pretty sharp and know what is going on over there.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary knows that the adjournment motion is a very special procedure. There are no points of order, and if he wants to raise the matter I suggest he do so tomorrow afternoon after the question period.

[Mr. Leblanc (Laurier).]

[*English*]

ENERGY—PROPOSAL FOR LOCATION OF URANIUM PROCESSING PLANT IN SAKSATCHEWAN—PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN SITE DECISION

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I undertake to stick directly to the topic I raised in the House on June 17. You will recall that on that date I asked for an assurance from the minister through the parliamentary secretary, who was standing in the place of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), that before a final decision is made on the establishment of an uranium processing plant there would in fact be a full public inquiry. The parliamentary secretary said in reply at that time that Eldorado Limited "when it does make a final decision as to the location of the refinery will have a full public information program". Today in the House the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources again argued for public education on the question of nuclear power. It is all important that those who might be most directly affected have the right to know the full circumstances of the proposal and to make their concerns known as well.

What I was trying to elicit from the parliamentary secretary was an assurance that before the decision is made there will in fact be a full opportunity for representation and a full opportunity for education.

I have had the opportunity of travelling in my constituency in the area which is now under consideration by Eldorado and the provincial government, and I have heard repeated expressions of concern that the decision will be made before an opportunity is given to the public for input, and also before a full explanation of some of the safety factors is given.

If nuclear power refining is as safe as the government maintains, we should have a full public inquiry so that the concerns of the citizens in the area can be laid to rest. As I said, there is to be substantial investment, as this is a capital intensive process. It is anticipated that something in the area of $50 million will be invested. This will be of great economic benefit to the area but, notwithstanding that fact, it is only fair to point out to the parliamentary secretary some of the concerns that are being expressed, and possibly he will take these under advisement and relate them to the minister and Eldorado.

First, before the decision is made hearings should take place. Secondly, only after the environmental impact assessment, which is undertaken by the federal Department of the Environment, is completed and has been made public should a decision be made. The hearings should not simply consider the site of the proposed plant, but whether the refinery plant should in fact be established in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some concerns have been expressed and I would hope that Eldorado, before making its final decision in respect of the location, would in fact deal with these concerns. The public education process should take place before the decision is made and not after.

In regard to the matter of safety, I think the people in the area should be satisfied before a decision is made whether they are getting involved in a situation that has been determined in advance over which there is some concern about safety considerations. These concerns have

been expressed to me as first being in respect of radiation. Any level of radiation is known to cause biological damage. Therefore setting "soft standards" can be somewhat arbitrary. Simply because radioactive material is emitted from an industrial source at a level that is safe does not mean that it cannot cause some harm. Apparently no solution has been found to the problem of long-term storage or disposal of the highly radioactive fission products from nuclear reactors. Then there is the question of possibility of theft of the product from the refining plant.

An explanation should be given to the public in respect of the whole area of possible accidents. The arguments of the industry about safety are predicated on a level of fail-safe technology, in the absence of human error, which has not been demonstrated in any other similar venture. The next question is in respect of opposition abroad. We have the example of the recent referendum in California. One third of the people there voted for a moratorium on the development of nuclear power. The people of California have had substantial experience with nuclear power, and I believe the number of people who expressed some concern is significant.

As I say these are the concerns which have been expressed. I simply bring this to the attention of the parliamentary secretary. With the experience of the Port Hope situation I want to know whether this is perceived as being a problem or whether this is a completely different situation. This should be made quite clear to the people in the proposed site area. I bring this to the attention of the parliamentary secretary so that these matters can be dealt with in advance of a decision rather than afterward.

There is also the question of health hazards to workers. I think this is an area which also should be fully explained by Eldorado so that people who might be employed in such a plant would be aware of the situation. Another very important consideration, I think, is the benefit to the province. I think this is an area of public information which should be entertained by the government. I realize this is a capital intensive project. Since there will be something in the area of between 150 and 200 employees it is not a labour intensive project.

These are my remarks and I simply ask for elucidation. What I am hoping to obtain from the parliamentary secretary is assurance that he will in fact undertake that there will be a public inquiry before the final decision is made in respect of the location. I hope he will be able to give an affirmative answer to that.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Ressources): Mr. Speaker, in responding to the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) I want to assure him that there is considerable economic benefit to the province of Saskatchewan from the establishment of a uranium refinery and conversion facilities in that province. Indeed I do not believe the provincial government would allow this uranium, which is being mined in increasing quantities, to be refined outside the province if it were at all possible to prevent it. In that connection there has been full consultation between the Saskatchewan government and Eldorado Nuclear Limited. As a matter of fact there has been a great deal of consultation with Sedco and the Saskatchewan Scientific Council as well as the government Department of the Environment and other federal government agencies on this subject. At this stage they are evaluating several sites in the province to determine the best possible site from an economic point of view. That is one priority. A second priority is the environmental impact of the plant.

I should caution the hon. member that we are talking about a plant which I believe is to come on stream in the next four to six years. In fact the exact capacity of the plant is not known at this time because firm commitments for production from the new mines coming on stream in Saskatchewan have not been determined. In any event, when this has been decided, the plant will be the most modern possible. The company has indicated that when they get closer to a decision on the actual site preferred, they will have public consultation.

● (2220)

I believe that the environmental impact studies will also require public consultation. Surely it is desirable from every point of view to have as much information available to the people, expecially in the immediate area where the plant will be located. I will make representations to Eldorado to ask that there be good public consultation before a final decision is reached on the question of the location of the uranium refinery in Saskatchewan.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—AREA IN WHICH JOBS WILL BE CREATED THIS YEAR

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the question that I am dealing with tonight is one which I put to the minister on May 26, the day following his non-budget. At that time I asked the minister if he could identify where the 250,000 jobs would be created in the current year, and lo and behold the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) helped out the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) by saying "In Canada", and then the Minister of Finance added that he thought there would be an opportunity during the course of the budget debate to get into this point more fully.

I pressed the matter, stating that there had been a suggestion of auxilliary work being created through such studies as the one carried out by the Economic Council of Canada and I asked whether the minister could be more specific, where exactly do they see the 250,000 jobs being created, is it mainly in the private sector, the government sector, or a bit of both; in short, have they make-work programs in mind?

In his second response the Minister of Finance passed it off to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) and said he thought that that minister would deal with the question, again during the budgetary debate. Unfortunately no minister has dealt properly with this very vital question in Canada today. I think the most basic tragedy in the nation is the fact that we have some 700,000 people out of work. When you read the budget you find that the minister's own figures indicate that that may be aggravated this year in that it is likely that 300,000 jobs will be needed this year, and yet the budget contemplates the creation of only 250,000 jobs to satisfy those who will be looking for work.

Essentially the government's fundamental problem is that it cannot make up its mind if it intends to count on the private sector to produce the jobs that are needed in the country, or whether it must have public participation to create these jobs. Certainly our belief is that the private sector can produce if the government would renew the confidence that is essential in the private sector to get on with creating the jobs that are needed. This is something that we have emphasized time and time again, but unfortunately we find that the present administration's response is really in response to the problems that it itself creates, and it comes up with the solution that it must participate still further in creating the problem by, according to it, creating the solution.

This minister is very fond of referring us to the United States and of stating, as he did on May 26, that we must wait for world markets to upturn in order that, somehow or other, we can get up to a higher level of prosperity in this country. I would point out to the minister and his parliamentary secretary that the U.S. has in fact turned its economy around in a much more imaginative way than we have in Canada. It has done it essentially by counting on the private sector to produce the type of real growth to which I am referring tonight.

In short, I hope the parliamentary secretary will give us a further explanation as to what the government plans, not just for the immediate future, not just for between now and March 31 next, but what it plans for 1977 and 1978, to ensure that there will be a lower level of unemployment in this country than we see at the present time.

Having talked with some backbenchers on the government side, I believe that the hard fact is that they have no plans. They are drifting, and they are hoping, but that is not good enough. Other nations have shown, through imagination and through proper industrial strategy, that there are ways to create job opportunities and to relieve unemployment.

With the resources we have there is no reason to believe that we cannot do likewise, and certainly for the minister, in response to my question on May 26 and also in response to the questions of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), to indicate that it is the export trade turn up upon which we are counting, and nothing else, is not satisfactory.

I would like to conclude now, and I hope that the parliamentary secretary will shed a light as to where in fact these 250,000 jobs are going to be created. If he cannot, we must assume that the minister himself had no idea of what he spoke on May 25.

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) stated when he began his speech he did ask questions. I looked at the questions he raised on May 26, and he is quite correct, he did ask questions, but I think he stopped short in looking at page 13845 because on the next page there were questions raised and answers given.

At the risk of being repetitious I should say that the hon. member should have paid attention to the speech which was given in this House by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) which regard to job creation, a subject with which he is very much concerned. I will try to be very brief, but I will be going over the same answers which were given, with possibly a little more detail.

In the section of the budget speech dealing with the international economy the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) pointed out that, and I quote:

> The international economy is launched on recovery from the depths of the worst recession since the great depression of the 1930's. The output of the industrial nations making up the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development stagnated during 1974 and declined sharply at an over all annual rate of 5 per cent during the first half of last year. This decline, fortunately, was arrested by mid-year, and with the United States in the lead, the prospect for strengthening recovery seems well-assured.

As a result, one of the main sources of strength in the Canadian economy in 1976 will be our growth in exports. This growth will influence the gains in employment on an industrial and regional basis.

In terms of particular industries, we expect that the recovery in our exports will have a major impact on the goods-producing industries including manufacturing, mining and forestry. Both output and employment declined in these industries in 1975 as our exports feel sharply. Manufacturing employment should lead the way, followed by mining and forestry. However, the major portion of employment growth during the year will emanate, as usual, from the services industries. Personal, business and community services industries will create the largest number of new jobs followed by wholesale and retail trade and transportation, communication and storage. Little growth is expected in the various levels of government employment during 1976.

In terms of the regional aspects, we expect all regions to benefit from the recovery. However, given the expected demand for our exports, strong output and employment growth should be registered in those areas which send goods to foreign markets. These include areas that export manufactured goods including automobiles and other durable goods, mining products including coal, and non-ferrous metals and forestry products including lumber, newsprint, pulp and paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to special order adopted by this House on June 7.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.31 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 22, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-88, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2), as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw) moved:

That Bill C-88, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2), be amended in Clause 1 by

(a) striking out lines 10 to 12 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"bers who shall be actual producers having the qualifications prescribed by any regulations made pursuant to section 10.5".

(b) striking out the words "members of the Advisory Committee and of" in lines 20 and 21 at page 3.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my remarks on the amendment will be brief, but in spite of that fact I think they are very important.

Bill C-88 provides in section 10.5 (3): as follows

The Governor in Council may make regulations respecting the conduct of an election of members of the Advisory Committee and in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations

(c) prescribing the qualifications of members of the Advisory Committee and of actual producers for the purposes of section 10;

The purpose of my amendment is to spell out in the Act that members of the Advisory Committee shall be actual producers. It is important that this be spelled out in the Act in order that producers in the Wheat Board area will know what the ground rules are. If it is not spelled out in the Act but is left to the Governor in Council to make regulations, these regulations can be changed from time to time without the knowledge of the producers, so they could suddenly find themselves faced with a change in qualifications. On the other hand, if it is enshrined in legislation, it would be necessary before any change is made that a bill be brought into this House and passed through the usual stages of first and second readings, the report stage and third reading. When a bill is presented to the House a debate takes place and members of the public, in this case the producers in particular, would know what was happening and would have plenty of opportunity to make representations to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board as well as to their individual MP's who in turn could make their wishes known.

The Canadian Wheat Board is charged with the sale of grain primarily for export purposes. Its function is of prime importance to the producer. The purpose of the Advisory Committee is to ensure that the producer has input into the decisions of the Board. I am sure officials of the grain trade have plenty of opportunity to have input from time to time. Therefore, in my opinion, it is very important that members of this Advisory Committee be actual producers.

We held some agriculture committee hearings in connection with this bill, and on May 12 last Mr. Vogel, chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, appeared before the committee. In giving evidence he said this, and I quote from page 87.6 of issue No. 87 of the evidence before the committee:

One of the hardest jobs for the Board is two-way communication, communicating back to the 160,000-odd farmers whom we represent, and in turn receiving their views back. There has as yet been no perfect way discovered to do this, and it is a very hard thing. I think we have made progress generally as a board in our information work that we are doing and I think the election of an advisory committee was a step in that direction.

Later on at the same meeting, and I quote from page 87.10, the minister in charge of the Wheat Board had this to say:

It is a question really of having people that are farmers and, I think, clear sight of the Wheat Board being in touch directly with some farmers about problems that concern them. We all know how easy it is to forget the obvious if you are not dealing with the problem daily as the farmer is.

Later on he said:

I am sure the Wheat Board consults with many others as well as the Advisory Committee.

I think the key words are in the first sentence I quoted, namely, "having people that are farmers". The intent of my motion is that the members of the advisory committee be actual producers or, in other words, farmers. Since presenting this amendment I have spoken to members of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association as well as individual farmers who have no connection with any particular agricultural organization. Without exception these farmers told me that they support the tenor of my motion, namely that members of the advisory committee shall be actual producers. As a matter of fact, the minister in commenting upon my motion before the committee on Tuesday May 18 as recorded at page 89:31 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Agriculture said:

● (1110)

Mr. Chairman, I had indicated at the last meeting that I could not argue in substance with Mr. Neil's basic proposition, that I would only make a general argument about leaving it flexible for possible inclusions of people that desire to be included by the producers themselves. I would not stick on that because if there were any great movement requiring that there be a change in that, I am sure we could quickly put

an amendment through the House to do that. And so I would be inclined, in the spirit of the day, to go along with that particular change.

Unfortunately, on that date 12 government members attended the committee meeting. Not one of those 12 members from the government side represented a constituency in the Canadian Wheat Board area. With all due respect, I suggest that the members who were there and who do not represent a constituency in the Canadian Wheat Board area do not understand the function and the purpose of the Canadian Wheat Board. In fact the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Marchand) in speaking on my amendment, as recorded at page 89:33 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of Tuesday May 18 had this to say:

> Another concern that I have is that on a number of these gc vernment boards, producer boards and so on, I think there is a real place for consumers.

Then, he went on to say:

> I think that on these government boards, producer boards, there should be a consumer interest in there or a consumer point of view, and I feel very strongly about that.

As I mentioned earlier the sole function of the Canadian Wheat Board is to sell grain on the export market. There is no place on the advisory committee for consumer representation. The consumers of Canada have been taken care of by a bill passed about a year or two ago which had to do with the two-price system for wheat. That was a government bill which now is law. It is separate and apart from any of the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. It is interesting to note that in committee, notwithstanding the comments of the minister to the effect that he would accept the amendment, the 12 government members chose to vote against the amendment. As I said not one of those 12 government members represented a constituency in the Canadian Wheat Board area.

It is interesting to note, on the other hand, that there were 10 members of the Conservative Party present as members of the committee. Of those 10 members eight represented the Canadian Wheat Board area. They represented constituencies within the area. Two others who were outside the Canadian Wheat Board area were farmers. Of the eight members who represented constituencies in the Canadian Wheat Board area every one was the holder of a permit book from the Canadian Wheat Board, either under suffix A or suffix B.

A few minutes ago I quoted the minister as saying in committee that he would accept the amendment. I think it is unfortunate there was a misunderstanding on the part of the government members who were sitting on that committee and who voted against the wishes of the minister. This is an important amendment. It is important to the producers in western Canada. I would ask, under the circumstances, that the members on the other side of the House reconsider their position and vote in favour of this amendment today.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to support the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) in respect of his amendment. I think he put forward excellent arguments concerning why we should support this amendment and why we should consider that only actual farmers be allowed to represent their constituencies in western Canada on the Canadian Wheat Board.

To start with, I think there is no better way to find support for the amendment than to read the words of the minister who in a sense totally supported this amendment when he stated in the committee as recorded at page 87:10 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence:

> It is a question really of having people that are farmers and, I think, clear sight of the Wheat Board being in touch directly with some farmers about problems that concern them. We all know how easy it is to forget the obvious if you are not dealing with the problem daily as the farmer is. In that sense, having practical men and women who are chosen by the farmers to be there and to draw their attention to how the farmers will be affected by something the Wheat Board is doing, I think, is just very, very useful.

I agree entirely with that statement. I think it is necessary that only producers of actual grains in the Canadian Wheat Board area be allowed to sit on this board. There are some problems at present because men or women who are members of farm organizations, and who spend their entire time as leaders of these organizations, now are eligible for election to this board. In the last election some of them were elected. While these people do an excellent job in their positions—I have no doubt of this—it would seem to me that they also are very busy in their principal occupation of being the leader of a farm organization. Although at the present time the advisory board meets 3, 4 or 5 times a year, or perhaps more often, I think in the future the Wheat Board intends to ask for its advice more often.

The Canadian Wheat Board and the Governor in Council are prepared to give these people some money in order that they may go to the areas from which they were elected and set up meetings at which they can ask the farmers, their constituents, how they feel and what advice they can give which might be passed on to the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Vogel of the Canadian Wheat Board stated his intention to have this advisory board meet more often. He mentioned 10 or 12 times a year. It seems to me it would be a very good idea if these people were not leaders of farm organizations but rather actual producers who are involved in the day-to-day workings of the farm in the production of grains. We could take the example of a member of parliament who really is not a professional in certain fields but when elected is asked by his constituents to become knowledgeable in a number of areas. We sit on committees and the experts in the various departments come forward to give us various examples of how legislation should be changed and why it should be changed. We as laymen, sit on the committees and attempt to pick out from this mass of information the logical things that we think would be of use to our constituents and should be in the legislation. Therefore, it seems to me that a producer would be able to do the same for his constituents or for the farmers in his area if he sat on the advisory board advising the Wheat Board commissioners on how they should sell grain or give advice to farmers in the production areas.

● (1120)

An example was brought forward to me recently which I think points out the necessity of having producers on the advisory board. The Wheat Board has encouraged the farmers in western Canada to produce hard spring wheat year after year, yet it is well known by the farmers that there is a market for some of the soft wheats and that our hard spring wheats are bought by other countries and mixed with lesser quality wheats to produce a form of

flour. Researchers in Canada are working with their limited budgets and limited time on the advice of some of the Wheat Board staff to produce some soft, white wheats; they spend a great deal of time on this. The producers are encouraged by this because these varieties of wheat have a larger yield than the hard spring wheats. They are easier to produce and if allowed to be grown, the result may be an increased income for these farmers.

It seems to me that this is an ideal example of a situation in which the advisory board, if it were composed of producers, could advise the Wheat Board that the farmers in their area would like to produce this type of wheat. Of course, farmers are always interested in maximizing their incomes, and it would be to their advantage to have as their advisor a producer in the area who can go to the Wheat Board and recommend that they encourage the research staff in our country to continue research into these extra varieties and encourage the Department of Agriculture to give researchers the necessary funds to continue this research.

These are just a few examples which explain why I feel the hon. member for Moose Jaw has brought forward an excellent amendment which I feel the minister himself has agreed on a number of occasions would improve this bill. I think, as a member representing a great number of grain farmers in the Wheat Board area, that these farmers would support this amendment wholeheartedly. Therefore, I commend it to all members of the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Bussières (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, my remarks on the comments that have been made will be very brief. First of all, I want to say that all hon. members who sit on the agriculture committee, even if they are not from a region affected by the act, are still very much interested by the proceedings of the committee and try to keep informed as well as possible of the work that is being done there and to make the most objective contribution possible.

Concerning the amendment proposed and discussed in committee, the comments made both by the members of the committee and by the minister during his appearances before the committee were in favour of not limiting the eligibility for membership. That was the basic argument put forward and I think it did not create any opposition or misunderstanding among the Liberal members of the committee. The answer given by witnesses and the purpose of the amendment were well understood. However, it was thought that by limiting the range of candidates, the advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board would be deprived of candidates who would have been very useful because of their experience and their knowledge in the field. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, those were the only comments I had to make.

[*English*]

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the amendment of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil). On the surface, it looks like an excellent amendment, almost like motherhood. I know the hon. member for Moose Jaw is moving this amendment with the best of motives and intentions, and I accept that. However, I want to suggest that this kind of amendment suits very well the people who support and believe in the private grain trade, the so-called open market. The amendment will allow them to accomplish what they could not do in a democratic election, that is to get rid of people like Mr. E. K. Turner, the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and Mr. Roy Atkins, the president of the Farmers' National Union, who were elected by the producers in their respective districts in a democratic vote. So, I am a little suspicious of what this amendment is trying to accomplish.

Another objection I have is that this amendment would prevent a retired farmer from running for the advisory commission and it would prevent farmers' wives from running for the advisory commission. If a group of farmers in any district decided to pick a lawyer in the local town and nominate him as their candidate, it would prevent them from doing so.

If farmers want nothing but producers on the advisory board, they can vote only for producers. It is for them to decide, not for the hon. member for Moose Jaw, for me or the government. I think the qualifications for candidates who may be elected to the advisory committee should be broad enough so that the grain producers can nominate and vote for whomever they darn well wish; I see no point in trying to restrict the eligibility of people for election to the board. I think the producers themselves will make the decision regarding who they want to nominate and for whom they want to vote. I do not think we should prohibit anyone from running. Why prevent farmers from nominating a prominent, respected retired farmer in whom they all have great confidence? He is retired, he no longer holds a class A permit book. He might have a special delivery book to clean out a number of bills after he has retired, and that is it. If he happens to be the one whom they want to elect, it seems to me that grain producers in a region should have the right to do so.

So I think the hon. member's amendment does not really accomplish what he wants. In fact, it places more restrictions than I think he realizes. So I urge the House to defeat the amendment.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member for Regina Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) would entertain a question. If he wishes to see qualifications broad enough to include retired farmers and others, would he be agreeable to permitting landlords who, say, are holders of suffix B permit books, to vote for these people, or would he restrict the eligibility strictly to producers?

Mr. Benjamin: I think I made that clear. I said that actual producers should have the right to nominate whom they wish to run for an election to the advisory commission, whether it is a suffix B permit holder, a retired farmer, the town lawyer or the town drunk—that is there business. It is up to them to decide for whom they are going to vote. I do not see any point in saying that only certain people can be nominated. What kind of democracy is that?

● (1130)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, just a few words to say that we are in favour of the motion before the House because, to my mind, it is the very essence of logic that farmers should be represented on their board, the Canadian Wheat Board. A while ago, the speaker who preceded me said that the producers could sit on the advisory committee. Even if all the members of that committee were farmers, they would not have enough influence or power to get their wishes implemented. The farmers must be represented above all on the board of administration.

On the Canadian Dairy Commission, for instance, we should have no one but dairy producers, not only civil servants who have never seen a cow. I think we would then have far more fairness. Today, the same problem seems to exist out west with regard to the Canadian Wheat Board. There are not enough wheat producers, real farmers, interested in the Board to guide the orientation of the government policy. We should get back to basics, give everyone his responsibilities, especially those who are interested in the industry, that is farming, whether it be in dairy production or grain farming. I feel we would then have much more fairness, and a much better agricultural policy in Canada. I suggest we rely far too much on experts. A while ago, I heard the representative of the NDP say that we need experts. When we need lawyers, we will get them—and this will surprise him—from farming circles because, yes, some farmers have sons who are lawyers. There are good lawyers, capable of sticking up for the farmers, without having to get them from the ranks of city dwellers who know nothing about farming the land.

I believe that is the idea the mover had in mind, and I can assure him that we are in favour of his motion. Indeed, we are in favour of all motions that will give back to the farmers the power in their respective fields of endeavour, and put a stop to the administration of that specific field by strangers.

[*English*]

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, when I first entered the House I was somewhat hesitant to participate in this debate because I felt that the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) would adequately represent the point of view I hold on this matter. However, after reflecting on what went on in the committee and after listening to the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), I feel that I must raise a few points.

First, let me deal with what went on in the committee. The minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board during the presentation of this particular amendment by the hon. member for Moose Jaw spoke very highly in favour of the suggestion; he thought it was a very valid suggestion. However, it seems that he instructed his supporters in the committee to vote against it. I understand why many of them would not support a motion like this; they do not know very much about the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board because many of them are not representatives from western Canada.

Perhaps the hon. members from eastern Canada should be excused, but I certainly cannot excuse the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre, who apparently represents a western constituency. I can understand why he would not want to have a producer advising the Canadian Wheat Board because he himself is not a producer. He does not know what it is like to be represented by some so-called expert from out of town. It seems that once you are from out of town, you become an expert, and you can tell everyone how to run his business. Personally, I have experience in operating a farm. I also know what it is like to be away from the operation. There is no better way to obtain knowledge than by practical on-the-spot experience.

The hon. member argues in favour of people like Mr. Turner, capable as he may be, but he already has a forum. There is the wheat pool. There is already a paper in which producers can put forward their points of view. Mr. Atkinson, the head of the farm union, already has a forum in which to speak. Why do we want someone who we know holds a particular point of view to become a member of a board and advise the Canadian Wheat Board?

I was very much surprised by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre. I can remember the time when the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board made an appointment to that board, and that person was from Ottawa. Without mentioning the name, I think anyone who knows the operation of the Wheat Board knows whom I am talking about. However, I know the criticism the hon. member levelled at that time. He said that was a political appointment and that it was not an appointment which was in the best interests of farmers.

Remembering all those things and having just listened to the hon. member, I was somewhat provoked into participating in this debate, in order to point out the hypocrisy of some of the comments which come from that quarter, for no other reason than it seems they may have somebody in mind themselves.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Korchinski: I can understand that they may want a particular point of view expressed. I know that the hon. member has had leanings toward the farm union, and in many instances the farm union does represent a particular point of view. It has divorced itself from the operation of, say, the agrabusiness. There we have two farm organizations taking opposing points of view.

I know that many times in politics we find ourselves in a position where we are perhaps not strongly in favour of a proposal, but because it is a caucus decision, we go along with it. It is obvious that anyone who belongs to any organization and anyone who is not a practical farmer is going to hold the view of that organization unless and until such a time as his organization points out to him that he can take a different point of view.

There is great merit in the recommendation put forward by the hon. member for Moose Jaw, and I rose only because I know what happened in committee. The minister wanted to be on both sides. He argued on one side of the question, that is, in favour of the suggestion, but then he turned around and instructed his supporters to vote in opposition. Here we have an hon. member who in the past strongly advocated proper representation. Now, he has an opportunity to demonstrate his feelings and put his money where his mouth is, and he talks against this measure.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a motherhood type of amendment. I am sure that everyone agrees that those who are involved directly should be represented. I think that is a fair position and one which everyone supports. However, there are other boards, for instance the board which was mentioned in another context by one of my colleagues from the province of Quebec. He indicated that producers have to be represented on these boards. I remember some of the representatives who were on the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, for example, who were retired farmers or retired milk producers. They sat on that board for a number of years with great distinction, and it seems to me that it is not really necessary for a representative to be an A class permit holder, but he must be someone who has the subject as his primary interest. I think even the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) would agree that most farmers would not vote for someone just because the government wants him or just because some other entity, such as the Caghill Grain Company, wants him, but that person is going to be elected because he will be able to do a good job.

It is a fact that there were elections for the advisory board, but those elections did not turn out exactly as planned. In fact, there were a number of people elected who were not anticipated to be members of the advisory board, and it may be that the Palliser grain growers did not really get the kind of representation they wanted. However, farmers are going to elect to that board those whom they think will do the best job for them. It may be some woman and she may be very involved and have a special knowledge of farming, although she may not hold the permit. Her husband could hold the permit, but I think if everyone in the community agreed that they wanted her to represent them it should be possible for her to do so. Many farmers are smart enough to know that the day comes when the farm should be turned over to the children. I think that will happen to the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski). He has been a farmer for a long time and is familiar with all the problems. If he decides one of these days to turn all the A class permits of his operation over to his sons, then there really would not be much more for him to do and he might make an excellent representative on the advisory committee. He might make that representation in a better way as a retired farmer than he would as a farmer in the actual production.

● (1140)

An hon. Member: Or as a member of parliament!

Mr. Peters: My colleague says, maybe more than as a member of parliament. That may be true, but I think he would then have time to devote to the operation.

While this a motherhood motion and I am inclined to support it on that basis, I do believe that we are really talking about allowing the largest number of competent people to be on the list from which the farmers will make their choice. I have faith in the farmers to choose those representatives for the advisory committee who are going to make representation on their behalf in the best way possible. In my opinion, it may be that retired farmers are suitable.

Let us not kid ourselves, Mr. Speaker; there are honest people and partly dishonest people. It is a matter of degree. But there is no question that most of the people we would like to get rid of turned over their A class permits when they could have held them on one section, and have met the requirements of a bona fide farmer or bona fide permit holder. That they saw fit, because they are in effect out of the operation, to surrender their permits does not mean they have given up their expertise, their ability or their knowledge of the subject and that they might not be the best representatives of the farmers on the advisory committee. I think there is considerable merit in letting the farmer make the choice himself.

Mr. Neil: It is the cabinet that makes the decision.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, it is said that the cabinet makes the decision. The cabinet always did make the decision. There were party hacks on the advisory committee, there is no doubt about that but I do not think that was true in the last election. I think the cabinet was as surprised as anybody else at some of those who were chosen.

If the farmers have faith in the ability of the advisory committee to advise the Wheat Board, then they will choose people who are going to represent them. It is a fact that they will be representing regions and representing various points of view. I am sure the Palliser Wheat Growers, who are very close to the minister, may not be a very good representative for many of the wheat producers in other areas, but in those areas representatives will be chosen to represent their point of view. That is the purpose of the advisory committee.

While I agree with the idea that producers must be involved, this amendment limits it to producers today, to people who have an A class permit. There are many producers who have retired and who have not lost their ability to provide representation. Indeed, in some cases they may have gained a much wider experience which could be of use to the producers. This could be so if we increase the number of people who can seek election.

So far as the House of Commons is concerned, anyone who meets the very basic requirement of age and certain moral standing can run for election. The public makes the decision in its own interests when it elects people to this House. I think that is the principle that could be extended to the advisory committee. The farmer is a very sophisticated voter and will make the selection in his own interests.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak for a few moments in support of the amendment I have to poke a few holes in the statements made by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). As usual, he does not seem to have his facts straight.

He stated that a farmer's wife could not have a permit book. Mr. Speaker, that is not true. A farmer's wife can have a permit book and many of them do. It is a matter of whether they wish to have one or not and whether they own the land, whether they are renting it or leasing it or owning and operating it and making the decisions on it. There is, therefore, nothing to limit the individual who wishes to become a grain producer. All he needs are three basic fundamentals—either land which is leased, property which he owns or property which he operates. It is as simple as that, and certainly has nothing to do with the

size of the property and nothing to do with the amount of produce delivered.

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre said that Roy Atkinson, president of the National Farmers' Union, would not be allowed to operate in this capacity. We all know that Roy Atkinson is a farmer so he probably has a permit book and would be eligible for election as a producer. Many of those who are interested in becoming a member of the advisory committee could just as well be producers.

There are a few things that I think we should consider. One is the fact that the stabilization bill, as brought in by this government, is open only to actual producers. We have to consider that therefore there is an intermingling of ideas, suggestions and words of wisdom for the benefit of the grain industry of Canada.

The hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand) suggested that consumers should be considered for this committee. This is one of the things that I think we must be careful about and see that there is no misconception whatever that benefits the grain producers in western Canada receive will create a hardship for the consumer. Such is not the case. In the Agriculture Committee on May 18, the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo said:

> I think that on these government boards, producer boards, there should be a consumer interest in there or a consumer point of view, and I feel very strongly about that.

Mr. Speaker, the consumer is protected under the two-price wheat legislation whereby grain is purchased for home consumption at $3.25 per bushel and that cannot be changed until that Act expires in another three or four years. Therefore, this bill is not going to create any problem whatsoever for the consumer.

We have to consider that the grain industry in Canada is of fundamental importance to our economic well-being because it contributes between $3 billion and $4 billion to our balance of trade. This should not be overlooked. Just imagine what our deficit would be if that amount were not included. Instead of being $5 billion it would be up toward $9 billion. In view of the fact that producers are seeking whatever they can get on the world market for their product, they should have the opportunity of making an input into the marketing and saying how it should be handled.

● (1150)

The present minister in charge of the Wheat Board is creating more difficulties for western grain producers who come under the Canadian Wheat Board than he is solving. Lack of adequate transportation hinders the movement of grain. Boxcars are vitally important to move other kinds of grain besides wheat. Clearly, the proposed advisory group will need to have greater input, greater say with regard to Canadian Wheat Board policies, than has been the case in the past.

As the new advisory group, if the amendment passes, is to be elected, it is clear that people well known to producers and farm organizations stand a better chance of election than those who are unknown. We have heard the names of several politicians mentioned as possible candidates for the proposed advisory group. These politicians, as I say, stand a better chance of running successfully, because they are well known. At present there is no mechanism whereby the names of people unknown but willing to run can be put before producers. As well, we must consider that it takes a great deal of money to cover the Wheat Board country comprising Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Peace River district of British Columbia. No matter how well qualified an individual may be to advise the Canadian Wheat Board, he, or she, probably cannot afford to travel around the area and become known. Therefore the unknown candidate is at a disadvantage, whereas people like Roy Atkinson, for instance, or Mr. Turner, the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, enjoy a great advantage, in that they are relatively well known and can advise the Canadian Wheat Board. As the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) suggested, we should broaden the base and enable more people to become involved in the advisory process.

We are considering a question of fundamental importance. I think that producers and consumers in future will want to rely less on bureaucrats for guidance. I hope the House will accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), and enable more producers to be involved in the governing and advisory process.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the amendment the House is considering is simple, but an important principle is at stake. During the last 40 years almost every democratic country has turned even more decision-making power over to experts. In the case of wheat, in 1935, over 40 years ago, the farmers of the west turned certain decision-making powers over to a board appointed by the federal government, known as the Canadian Wheat Board. The Canadian Wheat Board has been an unique and useful institution for stabilizing the price to farmers and helping Canada to expand wheat sales on world markets. But no board set up by man is perfect. In the past the power to decide with regard to the sale of certain farm products was handled by the group of experts who represented some 200,000-odd producers. The amendment seeks to set up an advisory board or committee, which would wield some of the power formerly wielded dictatorially by the group of experts; and, what is more, the proposed group is to be established on an elected basis.

From my experience as a minister I can say, confidently, that the views I was given by the Wheat Board and the advisory committee of my day did not necessarily reflect the views of producers. It soon became clear to me, as I said in the second reading debate, that the advisory committee I had appointed consisted of representatives of giant corporations whose interest was to maximize the profits and efficiency of their corporations. Therefore their advice was largely the advice of vested interests. Those reprentatives were concerned about how best to serve those interests. They could represent either private companies or co-operatives. But the result was the same: they wanted to do the best job they could for their particular organizations. Therefore, no matter how well intentioned such people may be in giving advice, they do not represent the voice of farmers. The farmer has become suspicious; he thinks that perhaps his views do not always get first consideration.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) is simple and shows how we can turn the

clock back a little. In the past we took the power of decision-making away from the owner of the product and gave that power to a board of experts. We could allow the owner of the product some little say in the decision-making process; therefore, I support any decision for making the advisory board an elected one. The recommendation of the hon. member for Moose Jaw, namely, that members of the proposed advisory group should be elected from producers, is sound.

Let me make one thing clear. The minister in charge of the Wheat Board said in committee that the proposed amendment is good; but something strange happened on the way to the forum, so to speak. All the Liberal members on the committee who knew nothing about wheat and nothing about western Canada decided to vote against the amendment; that is why the matter has been raised in the House today. We are attempting to correct the injustice which occurred in that committee. Surely all members know that the Wheat Board would like to get advice from producers, that the bulk of farmers want some say in the decision-making process and that the Palliser group, which has been in the news for the last few years, is in favour of this move. Further, I suggest that people who love their country, who want to see the owners of a product maintain some sort of control over that product, would also support the amendment. Really, this amendment says to farmers, "You have the right to have producers on the advisory board."

As several others have mentioned in the debate, this country is run by the bureaucracy. Really, the cabinet has little power; it listens to its advisers. Our population is dissatisfied with this and expresses dissatisfaction in many ways. In the dairy industry, wheat industry and poultry industry, to name but some segments of our economy, experts are trying to run the whole show and give no say to the producer. This is happening at both the federal and provincial levels in Canada. If we continue on this road by 1990, 90 per cent of the people of this country will be working for some government institution. That is the course we have charted ourselves. I appeal to the House to support this simple amendment. Without doubt, the professional politician or bureaucrat who runs our big organizations must move over and give the producer or owner some chance to have a say in matters which affect him. That is what the amendment says.

I shall close with a well considered example. The world is hungry and needs food. In our dry farm lands of the west, by using our knowledge and expertise which has resulted in new types of grain in the last 20 years, we can produce more grain. Does this House and country know that our experts in the Canadian Wheat Board and experts in the farm corporations have opposed bringing of these new types of grain into the marketing system of our country? At least a dozen new varieties have passed every scientific test there is, yet are suppressed from farm use.

● (1200)

There are new types of grain which produce many more bushels per acre, at the same cost. They would feed many more million people. However, the experts say they cannot accept these new grains because there would be trouble in the grading system. One particular grain, has 3 per cent or 4 per cent of small kernels. Even though this grain would produce 30 or 40 more bushels per acre, it is turned down because the experts say it would be hard to market, with 3 per cent or 4 per cent of small kernels. I am not the one to judge that. However, with a hungry world on one side, and farmers who want more income on the other, I think the farmers should have this brought to their attention so they can study it with the producers with regard to any problems of growing. The farmers should decide on the types of grain we have to sell.

I know that the Canadian Wheat Board are well intentioned. They have an efficient-running system with the present grades. They do not want to change that efficient system. It is the very nature of bureaucracy that once you get it running, you do not change it. The farm organizations which make money out of storage do not want it changed. It would mean having new grades to handle in their elevators. The vested interests who own the elevators, and the people who are bureaucrats by profession, oppose this type of question being brought to public attention. This matter has been before those of us who have been responsible for decisions for the past 20 years. It has not come to public debate because no one who advises the Wheat Board or sits on the Wheat Board wants to bring it to public debate. I believe there are eight or ten producers on that advisory board who would be able to enter a public debate on this issue, and they who have the right to decide would make the decision.

This question has moral issues as well as economic ones. The curse of this and other countries today is that we have turned the responsibility of governing the nation at the national, provincial and corporate levels over to experts. I was not surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). He knows, as well as I do, that in the management of our companies and unions we have turned over their running to the experts. Experts keep the fight going as long as they can between labour and management, because that is the only way they can get paid.

Mr. Benjamin: Let the farmer decide.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): That is right: let the farmer also decide whether he wants bureaucrats to represent him, or his own people. I simply say that if you put a weasel in a hen-house, the weasel represents the weasel.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): If you put in a man that represents a corporation which makes its money out of storage, all he will think about is storage.

Mr. Benjamin: What if the hens elect the weasel?

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): If the hens elect the weasel, you know what will happen to the hens. I think I have made my point. Let me give one little warning to the government side. The farmers know the significance of this amendment. By the eastern members on that committee voting down what the minister recommended was a good idea, they have put the Liberal members in the farm areas in jeopardy because farmers have had it up to the neck with regard to being run by bureau-

crats. I do not necessarily want to see all Liberals eliminated from Saskatchewan.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): I do not even want to see the NDP eliminated. However, if ever they want to commit suicide, this is the way to do it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ross Milne (Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I will take just a very few minutes of the time of the House to speak to some points that have been raised on the other side about members from non-wheat growing areas on the committee not knowing what they are doing. I take some exception to that. I think other members from eastern Canada do, as well.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Milne: Members from all parties on this committee were concerned enough to agree that the committee should travel to western Canada in order to have a better insight into the wheat and grain growing problems of this country. I think that all members share the view that, when they came here, the committee process was one of the most important things. They take their responsibilities seriously and do not automatically vote amendments pro or con as might be indicated. We have our own caucus meetings on this. We have discussions, good arguments and come to some agreement as to the best disposition. We follow that principle.

I take some exception to members opposite saying we do not take our responsibilities seriously and, just because we do not come from a wheat-growing area, we do not have any right to sit on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and discuss wheat matters. That is a wrong impression and it is one that members opposite might want to take off the record.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to respond to the discussion on the proposed amendment to Bill C-88. We have had an interesting and worth-while discussion on the idea proposed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) and the arguments on both sides of this particular issue. Although I do not agree with the substance of the amendment proposed in the House this morning, I want to thank the hon. member for presenting this idea to the House for consideration.

We have had a rather interesting and useful analysis of the issues that are involved here in what may appear, on the surface, to be a very simple, straightforward and thoroughly desirable change. However, that is not entirely without complication. It is important to bear in mind what those complications and considerations could be. As the minister indicated during the committee hearings on Bill C-88, there are arguments pro and con on the substance of this amendment. On the one hand, as many members have pointed out, it is fundamentally important that this advisory committee should have the choice and be representative of prairie grain producers. There is no disagreement on that point. That is the reason why, a year or more ago, the minister initiated the experiment of seeing whether, in fact, it would be desirable to devise an electoral procedure for the selection of the advisory committee members. That experiment was conducted last year and members were elected.

According to the legislation as it is written, the minister specifically appointed the successful candidates in that election to the advisory committee. Following that experiment of a year ago, the minister made the commitment that we would come back to the House of Commons to formalize that electoral procedure in legislation. That, of course, is what Bill C-88, among other things, is designed to do.

The point, clearly, is that there can be no disagreement on the fundamental issue about the desirability of this advisory committee being the choice of farmers and being representative of farmers. I do not believe anyone, on either side of the House, is arguing that point. The ultimate safeguard in this respect is to be found in the fact that the electoral process itself is squarely in the hands of producers. They are the ones who will exercise their franchise and will make the ultimate decision as to their choice of who should represent them on the advisory committee.

● (1210)

On the other side of the question, the argument in opposition to the amendment is based simply upon the desirability of maintaining flexibility and allowing producers a broad spectrum of possible candidates for election. As I say, the franchise rests with the producers. Bearing this in mind, should we, by legislation, restrict the opportunity of some to come forward? Should we limit the range of options? Ought we to restrict the class of persons eligible to sit on the advisory committee? For the time being, at least, my response would be "No." That is my view, at least until we have had further experience with this electoral process.

I remind hon. members that it is a very new one. It has been tried once and, of course, the next election a few years down the road it will be the first to be held under the terms of the legislation. Until we see some evidence that there is a problem which must be dealt with—and, surely, such evidence would have to indicate clearly that there was an impairment of the interests of producers because of the broad range of choice—the amendment ought not, in my opinion, to be accepted. Instead, I believe we should opt for flexibility and for maintaining a broad range of choice. Again, I emphasize that the choice will remain in the hands of producers. All we are talking about in the amendment is limiting the number of options. Surely it is advisable at the outset to make the choice as broad as possible. I have a great deal of personal confidence in the capacity of producers to make their decision in their own best interests. I do not believe they need the kind of artificial protection which is being proposed. Nevertheless, if safeguards are required in future, changes can be implemented either by statute or by regulation.

I should like to turn now to some of the remarks which were made in the House today having to do with what took place in the standing committee when this amendment was presented—the argument that government members of the committee that day happened to number 12 from regions outside the Canadian Wheat Board area, and that, somehow, the fact that they did not come from constituencies in

the west impaired their ability to listen to the arguments being made, to assess the evidence and to form a reasonable judgment on the basis of what was before them. Like another member who spoke earlier in the debate, I take exception to this argument. It is one which does no credit to the House of Commons, to the standing committee or to the individuals putting it forward. I do not believe it carries any weight at all.

It is an extremely divisive position for a member to take. As a westerner, I initially came forward for election from a constituency in Saskatchewan with a fundamental belief in the basic reasonableness of Canadians in all parts of this country. We in the west have had what is called, in some circles—perhaps too grandly—a feeling of alienation, a feeling that somehow our interests are not taken fully into consideration; that somehow we are left out of the decision-making process. It was my belief, when I stood for election, that this feeling of western alienation, real as it might be, was not completely justified in the sense that there were a great many initiatives being taken by the present government to relieve the concerns of westerners. I believed great progress was being made to identify and eliminate the root causes of the malaise we call western alienation.

At the root of my confidence, that we could overcome this feeling of alienation was my belief that all Canadians are basically fair-minded people whether they are asked to deal, for example, with a simple amendment to the Wheat Board Act, or the question of amending the freight rate structure as a whole. I was convinced that Canadians from other parts of the country would be prepared to listen to argument and hear the evidence, and that once they did so they would be willing and anxious to respond in a positive manner to the arguments we were making.

Surely this is a more positive approach to confederation and to the legislative process—an optimistic approach as we look forward, in a realistic way, to making the kind of changes which will work to the proper advantage of western Canada. I have confidence in Canadians and believe that through them this goal can be achieved. I have confidence in members on both sides of the House and, again, I believe that with their help our objectives can be reached. In the particular context of my remarks today, I have confidence that those who were present when this matter was being discussed before the standing committee listened to the arguments that were put foward and made a good judgment on the evidence before them, not in a biased or hasty fashion which could work to the detriment of the farmers of western Canada. I take exception to the point which was made, attacking the credibility and integrity of members on this side who serve on the committee and who do a tremendous job for all farmers both from the east and from the west.

To sum up, in the circumstances before us I think it is desirable to opt for flexibility and maintain a broad range of choice. As I say, if we determine that there is a problem, and that the interests of producers are being impaired, we could take corrective action either by legislation or by regulation. The first advisory board chosen on the basis of election is now established, and I have no evidence that there has been any impairment of the interests of the farmers as a result of the system used. The farmers themselves are the electors; they have the franchise in their own hands, and I am satisfied they will make the ultimate decision in their own best interests.

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few words to the amendment in the name of my hon. friend from Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) with respect to the selection of the advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board.

● (1220)

I listened to the last speaker during this debate, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale). I must say that I have always respected his ability to research a matter, but I am disturbed that he should be concerned that there is something wrong with insisting that producing farmers should provide the nucleus of this advisory committee. We are not talking about the Wheat Board, of course; we are talking about the advisory committee to the Wheat Board. Surely, that in itself should suggest that producers should only be members of this type of board.

I have in mind a man from my own area. He has tremendous responsibility in that he represents that area consisting of over half of the southern part of Alberta. He is a very aggressive producer in that area and is a member of the advisory committee. His name is Orville Reber, of Burdett, southern Alberta. This is the type of producing farmer who can tell the story, on behalf of the farmers he represents, in a very convincing way. I am sure he has made some members of the Wheat Board and of the grain trades a little annoyed because of his persistence. But he gets the story across and the message is there.

For the hon. member for Assiniboia to suggest it is premature to call for total farmer representation on this advisory committee is unfair and unjust. He suggested that perhaps, when the need becomes apparent, we should consider this question. I say the need is now, because the government, in its wisdom, has already agreed there should be an advisory committee; and that advisory committee, in its wisdom, must advise about grain producers' problems. For that reason there is great need to support this motion all the way down the line.

There is another reason for supporting the amendment. The producer who represents the grain growers, or the farmers, is much more knowledgeable about another pressing matter in western Canada, and that is the conflict of interest between producers of domestic feed grain and the customers, the feeders of hogs and cattle. For far too long we have only had one side of the argument presented at the Wheat Board level. Surely, with producers on the advisory committee, all of them farmers, they will be much more knowledgeable in that two-sided argument as to how we should use domestic feed grain in western Canada in order that the feeding industry will survive. Let me leave it at that for now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make one point, and it seems that perhaps it can only be done by repetition. Those who are to be electing the members of the advisory committee are all going to be producers. Surely the election should be left to them. If you look at Bill C-88, you will find that the regulations which have been stipu-

lated or set down relating to the conduct of elections are clear in this respect, and surely it is a breach of faith in the producers for hon. members opposite to suggest they cannot choose the best members of that advisory committee.

Those regulations specify that the list of producers is to be prepared prior to any election, and only those producers will be voting. Surely, the producers or farmers of whom the hon. members have such a high opinion and of whom I have such a high opinion, will be able to select and elect the members of that particular committee based on the criteria that the members have enumerated, and I suggest that the amendment ought not—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I would very much like the hon. member who has the floor to speak more slowly, not only for himself so that it will be possible to hear the simultaneous interpretation. Actually, he speaks for the gallery. I do not know why, but there is no interpretation at this time.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, all I said was that the opposition members who moved the amendment have stated that indeed only farmers and producers, necessarily western producers, should sit on the committee. All I say is that the only ones who will be able to vote for the election of council members will be farmers and producers. If they are unable to judge by themselves the quality of the people who should advise the Canadian Wheat Board, I would not know who could chose them. That is the purpose of my intervention.

● (1230)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

[Mr. Blais.]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions among House leaders to the effect that it would be undesirable to have another vote at this time, since we are scheduled to have a vote on Bill C-84 in a minute or so. I suggest, therefore, that the timing of the vote should be left to consultations among the House leaders. Probably the vote would take place tomorrow.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is agreeable to us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Beaudoin: D'accord.

Mr. Speaker: Having heard the suggestion of the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), the debate having been concluded and the yeas and nays having been called, the recorded division as required by the Standing Orders will be deferred to a time to be agreed upon by the House leaders and to be announced perhaps later this day.

It being 12.30 p.m., pursuant to an agreement of Thursday, June 17, 1976, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings in order that the House may proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 17, 1976, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

● (1240)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Having regard to the special nature of this vote, I have examined precedents on similar votes in the past and have consulted the House leaders. There is agreement that I should establish the procedure, without discussion, and in an effort to ensure accuracy and reflect the departure from the usual party voting, I will proceed as follows.

[*Translation*]

Having regard to the special nature of this vote, I have examined precedents on similar votes in the past and have consulted the House leaders. There is agreement that I should establish the procedure without discussion, and in an effort to ensure accuracy and reflect the departure from the usual party voting, I will proceed as follows.

As is customary, hon. members in favour of the motion will be asked to indicate their position first, followed by hon. members who are opposed. I will ask all members in the first row to my right who are in favour of the motion to rise together, whereupon their names will be called by the

Clerk Assistant beginning with the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) who is seated closest to the Chair. When the name of a member in the row has been called and recorded, that member will resume his seat.

When the taking of names of hon. members in the first row to my right has been completed, I will ask members in the second, third, fourth and fifth rows on my right to proceed in a similar manner. I will then ask members in the first row to my left who are in favour of the motion to rise and remain standing until their names have been called and will carry on similarly with the other rows on my left.

Once the votes of hon. members supporting the motion have been completed in this manner, I will then invite hon. members in the first row to my right who are opposed to the motion to rise. I will proceed similarly through the remaining rows on my right, and then follow the same procedure for hon. members to my left.

It bears repetition that the taking of names of hon. members in every row will begin with the hon. member seated closest to the Chair and continue consecutively along to the far end of the row. This will be so to my right regardless of rank and it will so to my left regardless of rank or party affiliation.

[*English*]

As is customary, hon. members in favour of the motion will be asked to indicate their position, first, followed by hon. members who are opposed.

I will ask all members in the first row to my right who are in favour of the motion to rise together, whereupon their names will be called by the Clerk Assistant beginning with the hon. member seated closest to the Chair. When the name of a member in the row has been called and recorded, that member will resume his seat.

When the taking of names of hon. members in the first row to my right has been completed, I will ask members in the second, third, fourth and fifth rows on my right to proceed in a similar manner.

I will then ask members in the first row to my left who are in favour of the motion to rise and remain standing until their names have been called, and will carry on similarly with the other rows on my left.

Once the votes of hon. members supporting the motion have been completed in this manner, I will then invite hon. members in the first row to my right who are opposed to the motion to rise. I will proceed similarly through the remaining rows on my right, and then follow the same procedure for hon. members to my left.

It bears repetition that the taking of names of hon. members in every row will begin with the hon. member seated closest to the Chair and will continue consecutively along to the far end of the row. This will be so to my right, regardless of rank and it will so to my left, regardless of rank or party affiliation.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Allmand) which was agreed to on the following division:

● (1250)

(*Division No. 139*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Abbott
Alexander
Allmand
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baldwin
Basford
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Collenette
Corbin
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Ethier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Gray
Guilbault
Haidasz
Halliday
Harquail
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Lalonde
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McGrath
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Symes
Trudeau
Whelan
Yanakis—133

NAYS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack
Allard
Anderson
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beaudoin
Blouin
Brisco
Cadieu
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Caron
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Clermont
Coates
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Demers
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fortin
Francis
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Isabelle
Jarvis

Transport

Messrs.

Jelinek	Masniuk	Roy (Laval)
Jones	Matte	Rynard
Kempling	Mazankowski	Schellenberger
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	McCain	Schumacher
Korchinski	McCleave	Scott
Lajoie	McKenzie	Skoreyko
Lambert	McKinley	Smith
(Bellechasse)	McKinnon	(Churchill)
Lambert	Mitges	Smith
(Edmonton West)	Muir	(Saint-Jean)
Landers	Munro	Stevens
Langlois	(Esquimalt-Saanich)	Stewart
Laprise	Murta	(Marquette)
La Salle	Neil	Tessier
Lavoie	Nowlan	Towers
Lawrence	Oberle	Trudel
Leblanc	O'Sullivan	Turner
(Laurier)	Paproski	Wagner
Lee	Parent	Watson
Loiselle	Patterson	Wenman
(Saint-Henri)	Pearsall	Whiteway
MacKay	Portelance	Whittaker
MacLean	Reynolds	Wise
Maine	Ritchie	Woolliams
Malone	Roche	Yewchuk
Marshall	Rondeau	Young—125

● (1300)

Bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1.03 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED HEARING BY TRANSPORT COMMISSION ON RAIL BARGE SERVICE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): In view of the fact that in August of 1975, the Canadian Pacific Railway abandoned the rail barge service on Kootenay Lake, in view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has ignored a three year contract with the owners of the tugboat *Melinda Jane* after only one year of operation and occasioned them great financial difficulty, and in view of the fact that to date, despite the submission of briefs by myself, the provinces of British Columbia and Quebec, as well as several local chambers of commerce, the Canadian Transport Commission has yet to conduct a hearing into its jurisdiction over rail barge service as well as address itself to the constitutional issues it creates, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker):

That the Minister of Transport urge the Hon. Mr. Benson, president of the Canadian Transport Commission, to provide greater locomotion to his gluteus maximus and minimus muscles and address himself to this long overdue and urgent matter.

[Mr. Speaker.]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST THAT PRESIDENT OF SENEGAL TRANSMIT MESSAGE OF FRIENDSHIP TO ALL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, and as a Canadian M.P., member of the parliamentary group Canada-Senegal Friendship, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move an important motion.

In view of the visit today in Ottawa of His Excellency Léopold Sédar Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal, who is in Canada as the honorary president of the World Federation of Twinned Cities, an international non governmental organization endeavouring to draw together the various nations of the world; since tomorrow, at the official opening of the Olympic village in Montreal, His Excellency, who is a keen champion and promoter of a universal brotherly civilization, will proceed with the symbolic twinning of the Olympic village with the cities of the world, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Caron):

That the House convey to His Excellency Léopold Sédar Senghor the pleasure caused by his visit and say to him that Canadian government members join with him in his intense desire to see real bonds of friendship and cooperation develop between the peoples of the world and finally, on the occasion of the symbolic twinning of the Olympic village with the cities of the world, that the House earnestly press His Excellency to transmit to all nations the message of friendship of Canada, which really demonstrated in the past a sincere desire to establish friendly international cooperation and which endorses the various positive ways of bringing people together, including the creation of bonds between municipalities.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

● (1410)

[*English*]

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF MEASURES TO INCREASE LEVEL OF INCOME OF FISHERMEN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to raise a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the announcement that the prices for freshwater fish are to be at the same depressed level as in 1973, in view of the minister's failure to comply with a request for representation on the board in line with production in certain areas, in view of the failure of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to provide adequate markets—to the point at which very low and in some cases no prices are quoted for certain species—resulting in many lifelong fishermen having to resort to welfare, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

That the Minister of State (Fisheries) be immediately seized with this problem, to propose effective measures to maintain levels of disposable income for freshwater fishermen at an increased level which would take into account increased costs of production.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Such a motion can be presented to the House only by unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: No!

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR DECENTRALIZATION PROGRAM TO BENEFIT UNDERDEVELOPED REGIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier):

That the House recognize and support the merits of the principle of decentralizing the public service towards underdeveloped areas in the country facing a historically high and chronic unemployment rate due mainly to the lack of jobs, and that the House recognize the emergency of speeding up the process in an orderly and balanced way so that all Canadians wherever they may live be provided with equal opportunity to have access to the Canadian public service, in order to reduce the inequalities and distortions already existing within these areas.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: As there is unanimous consent of the House, I shall move the motion. Seconded by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier), the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) moved:

That the House recognize and support the merits of the principle of decentralizing the public service towards underdevelopped areas in the country facing a historically high and chronic unemployment rate due mainly to the lack of jobs, and the the House . . .

Order, please. Is the hon. member for Abitibi rising on a point of order?

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, there was not unanimous consent on this last motion moved pursuant to Standing Order 43.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS WORKING—ASSURANCE TO PILOTS OF SAFE FLYING CONDITIONS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transport to whom we extend sincere condolences. At 5.30 yesterday afternoon an official in the hon. gentleman's ministry stated that air traffic control operations were back to normal at all airports across the country. I am advised that this is the situation which prevails as of now. Can the minister confirm that this is the case and, in the light of the position taken by CALPA can he tell us what assurances, if any, have been given to the airline pilots so that the services can be normalized?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Again today we have indications that the air traffic controllers are working throughout the country. Conditions, therefore, are normal for the flight of aircraft. There seems to be no reason whatever for pilots not to fly. International flights are, indeed, flying through Canadian airspace and using Canadian airports. It is my hope that other pilots in Canada will do the same and that the inconvenience to the travelling public will end.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF TERMS OF REFERENCE OF INQUIRY INTO SAFETY OF BILINGUAL TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): In view of the misgivings felt, apparently, by many pilots about what the commissioner, or commissioners, once appointed, will be asked to do, may I inquire whether the terms of the reference to the commission have been drawn up and, if so, whether the minister would be prepared to table them?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I will certainly be glad to table them as soon as they are put in place. We drew up certain terms of reference which were later worked upon. We are now at the final stages of selecting the commissioners, and at that point we will

appoint them with terms of reference. I will certainly make them available to the House at the first opportunity.

SUGGESTED EMPHASIS ON SAFETY OF BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL—DISCUSSION WITH CONTROLLERS ON TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSIONER

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary question. In light of the minister's answers, I was wondering whether there were discussions with CALPA and the controllers as to the terms of reference, and in particular that the commissioner or commissioners be directed to place priority on the question of safety? In addition, when can the minister receive the views of this House and its members and the representations of the public of Canada on a question in respect of which the public of Canada is very interested as well?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the very purpose of the commission is to assure the Canadian public that safety has been put foremost. That has been consistently our position. I believe it to be fair to say that it is the likely position of all parties in this House to put safety first, but also be prepared to proceed with some bilingual air traffic control in the province of Quebec where that can be done consistent with safety, and where this has been demontrated at certain airports where it has taken place. I say I believe that to be the position of all parties in the House, and I would appreciate specific approval in that regard from all parties so it can be known by the public in this country that this is a very limited course of action we have taken, and that the suggestion which seems to be carried abroad from time to time that somehow there is a threat to safety because French is flying fast and free over Winnipeg and Calgary is simply not the case, and that those who are concerned about making it sound as though that is the case are in fact engaging in some unfortunate blackmail.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

CONSULTATIONS WITH CONTROLLERS ON APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER TO INVESTIGATE SAFETY OF BILINGUAL TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, may I simply remind the minister that we on this side of the House have directed our questions to the question of safety and safety alone. Arising out of an answer the parliamentary secretary gave the House yesterday to the effect that there had been rather regular communication with all parties interested in the decision which is to be taken regarding the naming of a commissioner, I would ask the Minister of Transport whether he can clarify this statement, in light of the fact that the President of CATCA, Mr. Livingston, stated that his only contact with the Ministry of Transport occurred on June 8 in respect of naming a replacement for Mr. Keenan, and again last Friday, at which time he had informal discussions with the deputy minister of personnel, and during which there were no references to the appointment of a new commissioner?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the discussions between the officials of the Ministry of Transport and the various groups involved, the pilots and controllers, are going on from time to time, and practically continuously. Obviously the question of commissioners is very much foremost, so I do not understand if there is supposed to be some hesitancy on the part of the controllers and pilots to bring forward comments on the question of the commission and commissioners. We did in fact ask them for suggestions, but we have received very limited help in that regard. Indeed, the latest word I have is that there is some lack of interest in the commission because they seem to be taking the position that the only thing they will be satisfied with is a move away from the position which we have taken, when we have always said that safety comes first with bilingualism in certain areas within the province of Quebec when possible. Notwithstanding that, I have to take the position with them that backing down from this reasonable position is something we cannot do. As I say, I believe we have the support of reasonable members of all parties in this House in that regard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the appointment of a new commissioner seems to be the central issue involved in this dispute, and in view of the fact there have not been any formalized meetings with officials of the Department of Transport and CATCA, I would ask the minister whether he would undertake to convene a meeting with Mr. Livingston and his officials in order that their advice might be sought so that a suitable replacement might be named to head the commission of inquiry which would hopefully avert continued disruption of air traffic in this country?

● (1420)

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, needless to say if I felt there was anything to be gained from a particular form of meeting I would see that it was held immediately. I am indeed always available, my door is always open.

The hon. member is quite wrong in repeating his statement that there had not been any formal consultations. There have been. I have indicated to the hon. member that we asked for lists. We ended up with a list containing one name which is a strange form of helpfulness in the way of suggestions. We asked for further names. We then got an expression of now perhaps some lack of interest in the commission because of a lack of interest in anything which may allow the policy we have set forth to progress. I say to hon. members, and I say it most earnestly, I wish they would take the opportunity of their supplementaries to indicate that they do in fact support the basic policy I have enunciated here.

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO EXTENSION OF BILINGUAL TRAFFIC CONTROL IF SAFETY JEOPARDIZED

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Transport. Since neither his statements in the House today in respect of questions—and I was listening with care—nor his statement of May 12 on the question of bilingualism being introduced to air traffic control procedures in Quebec, nor

indeed the Order in Council that was passed on May 13, in the first preamble paragraph, make clear where the government stands on this issue, I should like to ask the minister, in order to remove all uncertainty on the issue, whether he will assure the House that safety on this issue will remain paramount and that if it is found that safety would be jeopardized by any extension of bilingualism in respect of air traffic control in Quebec it will not be undertaken.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to express my appreciation to the hon. member for inviting me to again state most definitely what is the case, which is that safety is foremost. If safety were in any way jeopardized by any procedures suggested in the use of bilingualism in air traffic control in Canada we would not implement those procedures because safety is foremost and that is a fact.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

REASON FOR SPEEDY PROSECUTION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely thank the minister for that unequivocal and clear answer. I should like now to turn to the President of the Treasury Board. Since one of the basic principles of effective labour relations is to maintain civil relations between the two groups in conflict, and since the Prime Minister in the House yesterday expressed a desire that both parties to the current air dispute "cool it", I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board to tell us why the government's immediate response to the Winnipeg walkout was to apply the full and literal force of the law to the people involved, instead of sending an emissary to negotiate a speedy resolution of the conflict?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we had no choice at all because the law of the land has to be respected. In fact Mr. Justice Addy, if the hon. member would read the judgment, made it a condition that he would render a judgment in injunctions if the government were ready to take its responsibility to make sure that the injunction would be respected and this is exactly what we have done.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the minister knows full well—certainly his colleague the Minister of Labour knows—that the full and vigorous application of the letter of the law can cause more harm than good if the hope is to get a settlement. I should like to ask the minister whether it is the government's position on this particular dispute that it should remain with a hands-off attitude and simply let the situation be resolved in terms of the law as it now exists.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we have a contract with the air traffic controllers and we have asked them to respect it. We went in front of the court. The court said we had a contract and ordered the air traffic controllers to go back to work. It is the policy of the government to make sure that no one in this land is above the law.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE IN DAIRY POLICY

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

Following the last subsidy received by the Quebec milk producers, many of these have lost considerable revenue because of the new government dairy policy which penalizes those who have worked. Also, the President of the Treasury Board was visited last weekend by some milk producers and according to newspaper reports the minister assured them he would discuss this question with his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. In view of these facts, could the minister tell the House whether discussions did take place with the Minister of Agriculture in this respect, and whether this policy can be changed in the near future to prevent many Quebec dairy farms from going under?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to talk briefly with the Minister of Agriculture about this, and I believe that meetings are now taking place between representatives of the union of Quebec milk producers and spokesmen from the Department of Agriculture to try and find a solution. The Minister of Agriculture has already announced that in the case of those who have farm mortgages granted by the Farm Credit Corporation, the latter will not demand payments as a measure to help farmers.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

As the solution proposed by the Minister of Agriculture—and endorsed, I suppose, by the President of the Treasury Board, whereby payments due by the farmers would be postponed—is not in fact a solution since the debts will remain and income will be lost, could the minister recommend to his cabinet colleague a solution that could really solve the acute problem that now exists and threatens the very existence of many dairy farms in Quebec?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the government is aware of some difficulties. However, we hope to find administrative solutions to those problems. The hon. member should recognize that the problem faced today by the farmers is the result of overproduction last year, and they in turn should also recognize that they must reduce their production.

As for administrative steps, I know the Minister of Agriculture is trying to find a solution in consultation with the interested parties. In addition, if my information is correct, some time this week he will be meeting some of

the provincial ministers of agriculture to discuss this subject.

SUGGESTED REDUCTION IN IMPORTATION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Considering that this matter is very important and that it has been alleged that there are surpluses and the dairy producers ought to be penalized, could the minister assure the House that the import policy of dairy products which could be produced at home will involve a reduction of these products, thus helping solve this problem so that in the coming months we will not run the risk of having, as it happened two years ago, to import tremendous amounts to the detriment of Canadian farmers and, in particular, of Quebec dairy producers.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the hon. member that the government has decided this year to limit cheese imports to 50 million pounds while we had made commitments to import much more, and that we take a close look at the situation to try to reduce imports, as the Minister of Agriculture has often pointed out in this House.

● (1430)

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE TO DAIRY FARMERS

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question relates to the problem of dairy farmers in Ontario, and it is also for the President of the Treasury Board. In the light of the fact that dairy farmers across Ontario have now received their subsidy cheques for May and that these cheques have been cut substantially—one of my constituents who not only did not receive payment for the $3,100 worth of milk he shipped but also received a bill for $170—what assistance is the government prepared to make available to dairy farmers to save them from imminent bankruptcy? They have to pay their bills.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the government is aware of that situation. In fact, I received a certain number of farmers in my office on Saturday who explained the problem to me. We are looking into that, and I think the Minister of Agriculture is supposed to meet with some provincial ministers of agriculture to try to find a way out. However, I am not the Minister of Agriculture; I am just doing my best to answer the hon. member.

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE IN FORMULA FOR ALLOCATING QUOTAS FOR INDUSTRIAL MILK

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture perhaps I could address the following question to the Acting Prime Minister. In the light of the fact that the President of the Treasury Board pointed out that the present formula for allocating quotas between the provinces actually encourages over production, what recommendations, if any, is the federal government making to reform this formula to remove the disincentives from producing within the provincial quota?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when he was answering similar questions the other day the Minister of Agriculture explained in the House that the most important problem relates to the internal allocation of quotas. He stated, for example, that in Manitoba there is no problem of this kind.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp: Oh yes there is.

Mr. Clark: Send Jim Richardson home.

Mr. Sharp: The problem is one which involves co-operation between the provinces and the federal government. The Minister of Agriculture will be making some proposals which will fulfill our part of the bargain, and I hope the provinces will act with similar goodwill.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

ALLEGED PROVISION OF UNITED STATES COMPANY WITH LIST OF THOSE IN RECEIPT OF OLD AGE PENSIONS

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has the minister completed his inquiries into the question raised on June 7 about the alleged supplying by his department to a United States mailing list company, the names of people in receipt of old age pensions?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is Mr. Diefenbaker's question.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You don't seem interested; don't you want the answer?

Mr. Lalonde: This allegation was promptly investigated. I checked with the officials of my department, who checked with all government sources. There is no indication that the list provided to a United States company came from any government. As a matter of fact, on the basis of the content of the list with which I was provided, it appears that it could not have come from government sources for a number of technical reasons, such as zip codes and so on.

We have checked with the United States company, and the president of the company has clearly stated that the information came from public records. Moreover, the president of the company has volunteered to put in future a disclaimer on all such forms to the effect that they are not

coming from social security, medicare or other government sources.

LENGTH OF TIME MINISTER HAD INFORMATION CONCERNING LISTS OF OLD AGE PENSIONERS USED BY UNITED STATES COMPANY

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the same minister a supplementary question. How long has he had that information? My understanding was that he gave an undertaking in the House that as soon as the information was available, without any prompting from his own backbenchers, he would make it available to the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton will confirm, I have had that information for several days, but I was waiting for the hon. member for Prince Albert to raise the question. I had a discussion with the hon. member for Prince Albert on the telephone yesterday morning and told him that I would be in the House yesterday, but the hon. member chose not to ask the question. He chose to ask another question, so I am not surprised—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lalonde: —that if the hon. member's colleagues do not do their homework, our members have to do it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, arising out of the statement just made by the minister, who is famous for his contributions and dialling judges—

Some hon. Members: Ask your question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I very much appreciate that he held up the answer until my return. I was absent because of my wife.

Yesterday the minister telephoned me and said that he was going to bring this matter up. I waited; he was silent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not here to correct the hon. gentleman, but I point out that his continual reference to me as "the hon. member"—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, I do not know that we can solve this disagreement in the question period. I know the right hon. member for Prince Albert was seeking the floor. Perhaps he has a question on another matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I think it is right for me to bring up the fact that the hon. gentleman invariably refers to me as "the hon. member". I am the only right hon. member who is a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES ON ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL LOTTERY

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my question to the Minister of Justice. It has to do with widespread opposition across the country to the establishment of a Crown corporation lottery. In view of the fact that lotteries come within the jurisdiction of the provinces, have the provinces been consulted, and have they accepted something they strongly objected to in the past, namely, a national lottery which will take income from the provinces which should remain in the provinces?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I hope the right hon. gentleman's previous interjection did not indicate that he needed an adjective to show that he is honourable.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: You are just a dirty Basford. You will be growing hair when he gets finished with you.

Mr. Basford: With regard to the question, it is clearly established under the Criminal Code that lotteries may be permitted by the governor in council or by lieutenant governors in council. With regard to the second part of the question as to the degree of consultation, I will ask my friend the President of the Treasury Board to answer that.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the right hon. member for Prince Albert that there were extensive consultations among all the provinces on that subject.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Did they accept?

Mr. Chrétien: There was no agreement between the provinces, and that is why we have decided to step in. I would like to inform the right hon. member that we had a vote in committee, and the count was eleven to one; all the members of his party supported Loto Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REJECTION OF WAGE AWARD TO AIRCRAFT SAFETY INSPECTORS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In the light of the fact that the aircraft safety inspectors group of the Ministry of Transport, who review and renew airplane pilots's licences, will be going on strike this coming Friday, what action does the minister propose to take with regard to the decision of the Anti-Inflation Board to reject the binding award of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall in the recent aircraft operations group dispute? The reason for the strike

is the Anti-Inflation Board's rejection of Mr. Justice Hall's wage proposal to the group.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the House passed a law which gives the board the authority to make decisions of that kind, and I intend to respect that law.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

THREATENED STRIKE OF AIRCRAFT SAFETY INSPECTORS—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO ENSURE ADHERENCE TO SAFETY REGULATIONS

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Transport. In the light of the fact that the aircraft safety inspectors group will be going on strike this coming Friday, what action does the minister intend to take to guarantee that no pilots will fly with invalid licences after Friday?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows from a specific experience Wednesday, there is a limited amount we can do, in the end, to assure that reviewing of pilots' licences, but other testing goes on satisfactorily in a strike or slowdown situation. We try to take what steps we can, and we try to assure safety, of course, but we cannot avoid inconvenience to many individuals.

* * *

● (1440)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ALLEGED NEW PROPOSAL FROM LOCKHEED FOR PURCHASE OF AIRCRAFT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Acting Prime Minister. I think it concerns more than one department. The *Wall Street Journal* of last Friday—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: I am trying to keep abreast of the facts from wherever they may come. The article quotes the chairman of Lockheed Aircraft Corporation as saying that a final proposal was submitted Tuesday to the Canadian government for the $1 billion sale of 18 PC-3 Orion aircraft and that negotiators are discussing fine tuning—whatever that may mean—and that Lockheed would need a definite answer by the end of June when the Canadian parliament recesses. I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister if the government received such an offer? Will it make an announcement of any decision to the House before parliament recesses?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Fine-tuned or otherwise.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I really do admire the catholicity of the hon. member's reading. I never expected to hear him quote the *Wall Street Journal*. To answer the question, we have received an offer which is being evaluated. I am not quite certain when a decision will be made. If a decision is made before we recess of course it will be announced here.

An hon. Member: Is it in writing?

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question. Has the government satisfied itself that the Lockheed Corporation indeed is in a financial position that would make it reasonable to anticipate that the contract as entered into with Lockheed would be carried out?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, if we had any doubts on that score we would not enter into such a contract.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EVALUATION OF PIPELINE PROPOSALS BY UNITED STATES—DISCUSSIONS WITH CANADIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. As the minister probably knows a bill has been introduced in the United States Senate calling for the evaluation of various pipeline proposals by the FBA to be done by February 1; it would then allow for the President of the United States to respond within 90 days. There is the implication that this timing has been undertaken by the United States government because of discussions with the Canadian government as to when Canada may arrive at a decision with respect to pipelines. Can the minister confirm whether such discussions have taken place and if there is an understanding that a decision would be made about a pipeline in Canada—I am talking about moving northern gas—within this time frame?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm to the hon. member the harmony that he suggests may exist between Canadian policy and United States policy. I do know that there have been discussions between the two governments on a continuing basis about this question. I will investigate whether this question of synchronization of activities has been brought up and report later.

* * *

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON OUTCOME OF ICNAF TALKS—POSSIBILITY SOME COUNTRIES REFUSED NEW QUOTAS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I would direct my question to the Minister of State (Fisheries). The three-week annual meeting of the 18 member countries belonging to ICNAF is scheduled to end tomorrow without agreement reached on quotas for some stocks or on the future role of ICNAF. The United States government has announced their intention to withdraw from

ICNAF. In the light of the extended fisheries jurisdiction of Canada and the United States early next year and the ownership problems surrounding Georges Bank as well as St. Pierre and Miquelon, is it the minister's intention to inform the House of the outcome of the ICNAF talks and whether any of the foreign countries presently fishing on our continental shelf have refused to accept the new reduced quotas?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, the conference still has a full 24 hours to run. I contacted the delegation this morning, and we have attained most of the objectives with which we entered the conference. Some issues remain and possibly one or two have been delayed but there is a further meeting later this year. It really is too early to assess the general outcome of the conference. I would suggest that, generally, we are very satisfied with the progress that has been indicated and the allocation to Canada as a coastal state of a good share of the quota which we feel we needed with the advisers involved in these discussions.

EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES FROM ICNAF

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister inform the House what will be the effect of the withdrawal of the United States from ICNAF and is Canada assessing her own position in light of our announced intention to control the fisheries some 200 miles off our coast?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, the United States delegation gave notice at the beginning of the conference, as we did, that they would consider withdrawing. They felt that those quotas and regulations adopted for 1977 were not acceptable. We have said very clearly that if they were not consistent with coastal state jurisdiction we would withdraw. This is a legal matter and you have to give notice before June 30. We made it clear that we might not exercise that option to withdraw if the conference moved sufficiently in the direction we thought it should move. I should point out to the hon. member that when the full results of this meeting are known he will see that some stocks outside the 200-mile limit zone have been considered and in fact Canada did obtain quite a number of concessions for stocks beyond the 200-mile zone.

* * *

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION

POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN PRICE OF WHITEFISH

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): While I am on my feet and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the hon. member for McKenzie in respect of a request that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation may increase the price of one type of fish, the cutter or whitefish. This matter has been referred by the corporation to the Prices Support Board and a recommendation will be coming through in a matter of days.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBILITY OF PURCHASING LOCKHEED PC-3 AND EQUIPPING WITH ELECTRONIC GEAR MADE IN CANADA

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. It has been reported that Lockheed has put a new LRPA proposal to the Department of National Defence which would extend the delivery date of the planes by one year to 1981, and which deletes some of the more sophisticated electronic gear. As this proposal seems to have retained the most serious disadvantage of the previous Lockheed plan, large payments before any plane is produced, would the minister inform the House if he is still considering the option of purchasing an off-the-shelf PC-3 and equipping it with a largely "made in Canada" avionics package?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we are at the present time studying the proposal that has been made by Lockheed. Until the cabinet has made a decision on that proposal we will not be studying seriously other possibilities.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY IF APRIL PAYMENTS MADE AND HOW MUCH

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to ask if it is a verbal offer or not. May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Supply and Services? Could the minister advise the House if any payments called for in April in the signed contract tabled in the House have been made to Lockheed? If the answer is yes, how much and if not, why are we not paying up and are we liable to interest charges on these now overdue accounts?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, at the end of April we had paid $10 million and $808,000 on May 7. We have paid those amounts in time, which means that we did not have to pay interest on amounts owing.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED DELAY IN MOVING AIRBORNE REGIMENT FROM EDMONTON

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence and it is in the interest of the taxpayer by saving money through not moving the Canadian Airborne Division out of Edmonton. Would the minister at least wait until after the 1978 election so that we may deal with this problem?

Oral Questions

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF DISCUSSIONS WITH FRANCE ON EXTENSION OF FISHING ZONE AND RELATIONSHIP TO ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and I should like to welcome him back from his visit to France. Could he report to the House if any discussions took place while he was in France with regard to St. Pierre and Miquelon as related to the extension by France of its 200 mile limit and the difficulties that could be experienced?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I did not raise the question of St. Pierre and Miquelon. We had consultations on this subject in the past with the French and as the hon. member knows we will have to have further discussions. I made extended reference to this point when we announced our extended jurisdiction on June 4. I assure the hon. member that this matter is of great importance to Canada and we intend to protect Canadian interests.

● (1450)

POSSIBLE RENEGOTIATION OF TREATY CEDING ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON TO FRANCE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs? Is the Treaty of Utrecht which ceded St. Pierre to France and gave France certain fishing rights within Canadian jurisdiction off the coast of Newfoundland, to be renegotiated in the context of our intention to declare a 200 mile economic zone?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not raised that in the negotiations. I will check to see whether it is involved in the resolution of these difficulties or problems which arise as a result of our extended jurisdiction and the jurisdiction claimed by France.

* * *

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

INVOLVEMENT OF MR. PERRIER IN LEASING FACILITIES FROM CAMPEAU CORPORATION

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. Will the minister launch an immediate investigation and report on any conflict of interest which might be present in the situation of Mr. A. J. Perrier, assistant deputy minister of the Department of Public Works, who is involved in the leasing of facilities and who was, until 1973, vice president of Campeau Corporation?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Perrier was selected for the vacancy of assistant deputy minister of the Department of Public Works by the Public Service Commission, a body reporting to parliament. At the time of his appointment he severed all connections, financial and otherwise, with Campeau Corporation. He has, since then, complied completely with guidelines regarding conflicts of interest laid down for civil servants and we have every confidence in his intention and ability to avoid a conflict of interest. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it does not help much to act on the supposition, because of certain circumstances, of suspected wrongdoing, rather than the reverse.

Mr. Huntington: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the House of the extent to which Mr. Perrier was involved in the negotiations and arrangements for leases totalling almost $10 million per annum with Campeau Corporation, and the extent to which he has been involved in the negotiation of the $490 million lease package for the three towers in Hull, Quebec?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the leases to which the hon. gentleman referred were entered into with Campeau Corporation before Mr. Perrier joined the government. Since then he has not had charge of direct negotiations of any description with Campeau Corporation. These were conducted by the National Capital Region, of which Mr. McFarland is the manager.

* * *

TRANSPORT

RESPONSIBILITY FOR RAIL-BARGE SERVICE—REQUEST FOR INTERCESSION ON BEHALF OF OWNERS OF TUG "MELINDA JANE"

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Since, apparently, the Canadian Transport Commission has no jurisdiction over rail-barge service on Kootenay Lake, it follows that it has no jurisdiction over rail-barge service between Portes aux Basques, Newfoundland, and North Sydney, Nova Scotia. This authority would then revert to the cabinet. Is the minister prepared to accept this responsibility, or will he use his good offices to stimulate the Canadian Transport Commission into taking some action?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to accept as a legal conclusion that because one thing is a certain way, the other is as well. However, I will look into the matter.

Mr. Brisco: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's response, I ask, is he prepared to intercede on behalf of the owners of the rail-barge tug *Melinda Jane* whose three year contract with the CPR was unilaterally cancelled after one year and who were advised by the CPR to "sue us?"

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member suggested, other remedies are available to the complaining party. I think those remedies should be pursued first.

FINANCE

NEED FOR ECONOMIC STIMULATION IN VALUE OF ALLEGED WEAK DOMESTIC DEMAND—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance arises out of the recent release concerning first quarter gross national product information by Statistics Canada. On May 26, the day after the presentation of the budget, the leader of my party, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: —asked the Minister of Finance why he had not brought in a budget which would stimulate the economy and reduce unemployment. The reply of the minister was that final domestic demand in Canada is and has remained at a very strong level for the past 12 to 18 months; therefore the further stimulus of consumer demand in Canada will not take up the slack in current production.

In light of statistics released since the introduction of the budget by Statistics Canada and in light of their conclusion that the first quarter was characterized by very weak personal expenditure on goods, can the minister say whether he is now prepared to revise his arguments made at the time of the budget, namely, that we are in no need of more economic stimulation than was shown in his budget?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I point out to the hon. gentleman that the first quarter figures of 2.7 per cent indicate an annual rate of about 11 per cent, most of which was concentrated in the domestic sector of Canada. I think if he will read the release again, he will see that both the government sector and private spending have contributed substantially to the situation in Canada; but, as I observed in the budget speech, the export side has been the weaker.

Mr. Saltsman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since most of the increase has occurred in inventory build-up, which means that there is a danger, once inventories are built up and consumer demand remains low, of our heading for a recession, is the minister prepared to revise his estimates on the need for stimulus in the economy and bring in additional stimulus, by cutting taxes for those at the lower end of the income scale?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the inventory build-up is founded on the assumption of business that consumer demand will be high and that it will be necessary to have extra inventory.

Mr. Broadbent: That's absurd.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN STANDING ORDERS TO PREVENT FALL OF GOVERNMENT EXCEPT ON VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the President of the Privy Council. Could the minister tell the House if during the summer recess he intends to proceed with an amendment to the parliamentary procedure to be presented when we will resume work next fall and which would enable us to change the standing orders, something like this:

That the House cannot bring down the government otherwise than by a non confidence vote, which would make it possible, each time we have a free vote as we did this morning, to show to the people of Canada that this House is an example of living democracy?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon subcommittees of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization are submitting reports which will propose very substantial amendments to the rules of the House. I hope those reports will commend themselves to the House: but when the committee itself reports we have no intention, on our side, of making changes of the kind proposed by the hon. member. I think our rules with regard to confidence motions are well established and traditional, and we should continue to adhere to them.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR REPORT OF INVESTIGATIONS INTO AVIATION SAFETY CONDUCTED PRIOR TO JULY, 1974

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport with a view to eliciting as much factual information as is available with reference to the Canadian Airlines Pilots Association and CATCA? Would the minister make available to the House and country the aviation safety investigations conducted by the Ministry of Transport prior to the issuance of NOTAM 1274, in July, 1974, since I believe the minister specifically referred to this document, or to this study, in an address delivered on March 2, this year, at Ottawa, to the special international air safety symposium. Will the minister make this information available to the House and country?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I gathered from the beginning of the question that the hon. member was referring to investigations relating to incidents in the air. I will be glad to look at the relevant practices and procedures. I have no reason to think that the basic information should not be available; however, I will look into it.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POSITION OF UNITED STATES NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE ON EFFECT OF AEROSOL SPRAYS ON OZONE—SUGGESTION MINISTER CORRECT HIS ANSWERS

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Yesterday the minister, replying to my question, advised the House that the U.S. National Academy of Science concluded that there

was no proof showing that the use of aerosol sprays can cause a deterioration of the atmosphere's ozone layer and bring about an increase in the incidence of skin cancer. Can the minister say whether his information from the academy came by way of an academy report, or by way of his conversations with academy officials?

An hon. Member: By way of academy award.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, if the translation or the words I used implied that the aerosol sprays have no effect on the ozone layer, that is not what I meant because they do have an effect which is, however, not important enough to jeopardize public health at the present time. It is a report which I got from my department and I am going to check its source.

● (1500)

[*English*]

Mr. Jarvis: In fairness to that very distinguished group of scientists, will the minister correct his answer of yesterday wherein he told me that the United States Academy of Science made a study and had come to the conclusion that nothing proved that the use of aerosol sprays affected the ozone layer because as late as this morning, the academy categorically denied that they had reached any conclusion or made any reporting indicating a conclusion about the effect of aerosol sprays?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to change anything before I check with the department that gave me this information.

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of National Health and Welfare on a point of order.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, first I referred to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) as the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton. I want to make a correction to *Hansard* on that point and I would like to refer to the hon. member by his proper title.

Furthermore, I would like to make clear that during my conversation yesterday with the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), I returned his call; I never committed myself to take the initiative to answer the question. It was agreed that I would be in the House at two o'clock yesterday and that I would be pleased to use this opportunity to answer his question on that matter.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On the point of order raised by the minister, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the minister for that correction. Ottawa-Carleton is a vacancy which we on this side of the House hope to fill the next time around.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cullen: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that those opposite are whistling in the dark. It is going to be held by the Grits.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL

STATEMENT BY MINISTER ON ALLEGED CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, questions have arisen both inside and outside the House with regard to the conduct of the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. From inquiries that have been undertaken, and from information made available, I have concluded that there is no evidence to indicate that Mr. Gauthier had a pecuniary interest or was associated with anyone who had a pecuniary interest in any matter before the Anti-Dumping Tribunal.

I wish to make it clear that there is nothing in the information which has been made available to me which indicates that Mr. Gauthier has conducted himself in any manner conflicting with the due performance of his duties. I have discussed this matter extensively with Mr. Gauthier and he has given me his assurance that there was no conflict of interest involved in his activities, and I have no reason to believe the contrary.

A question has been raised as to whether, pursuant to section 21(7) of the Anti-Dumping Act, the chairman has devoted the whole of his time to the performance of his duties under this act. From the information supplied, it is clear that both before the chairman's reappointment on January 1, 1976, and since, in contemplation of retirement, he has been involved in a variety of private interests during the course of his employment as chairman. While, clearly, in the normal course, any government employee may feel compelled from time to time to deal with private interests during the working day, the number and variety of matters referred to, in my view, go beyond the normal course as contemplated by section 21(7).

In view of the situation that has now arisen, and the strong feeling of Mr. Gauthier that his position on the tribunal has been impaired, I have discussed with him the question of his continued tenure on the tribunal until the end of his term. Mr. Gauthier has submitted to me his resignation as chairman and a member of the tribunal with effect from today's date, and on behalf of the government I have accepted that resignation. Mr. Gauthier has had a long and distinguished career in the Canadian armed forces and public service and has been a strong and effective member and chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal.

Questions have also been asked concerning the involvement of Mr. A. L. Bissonnette in private business ventures while he was a member of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. I have questioned Mr. Bissonnette about his involvement, and he revealed that he had a financial interest in certain

companies. He also said that he was a director and/or officer of these companies. He assured me that the activities of the companies in no manner conflicted with the activities of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal.

I have asked Mr. Bissonnette to resign from positions in any private company which would require a positive obligation at law, such as that of director or officer. This, in itself, would avoid the risk of being required to sit as a director or officer at the same time as he was a member of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. I have asked Mr. Bissonnette to consider whether these investments are in conformity with the conflict of interest guidelines which were sent to him and acknowledged by him on June 4, 1974. I have pointed out to him that if any investments he does retain put him in conflict with any matter before the tribunal, he would be required to disqualify himself from such matter.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the minister, in the statement he just read to the House, has demonstrated once again that this administration is a most permissive one. I would point out the background on this matter. In 1964, the then prime minister, Mr. Pearson, made very clear what the obligations were with regard to public servants. I read from page 3 the submission to his cabinet colleagues of that day where the then prime minister stated:

> Equally, a staff member, like a minister, must not have a pecuniary interest that could even remotely conflict with the discharge of his public duty.

It has been assumed, certainly on this side of the House, that that was the high standard of duty that would be required of every public servant. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) says that he has now reviewed the circumstances and there does not appear to be any evidence of confict of interest—but on the other hand, considering the circumstances, he has asked the chairman to resign. Bear in mind that this is an eight-day resignation and the term runs out at the end of this month. That shows how far this government has strayed from the high principles once held by administrations in Canada.

On December 18 there were two significant references to the duties involving public servants which were laid down at that time as guidelines. Item 4 reads:

> Public servants should exercise care in the management of their private affairs so as not to benefit, or appear to benefit from the use of information acquired during the course of their official duties,—

Item 6 reads:

> All public servants are expected to disclose to their superiors, in a manner to be notified, all business, commercial or financial interests where such interests might conceivably be construed as being in actual or potential conflict with their official duties.

The Minister of Finance owes an explantion to this House. Were these involvements in fact conveyed to him? Did Mr. Gauthier at any time indicate that he did have these pecuniary interests as laid down in item 6 of the guidelines to which I have referred? Specifically, I believe the evidence the minister has referred to is sufficient to justify an inquiry into this matter. It is not enough for the minister to come here and say he has had a chat with the chairman and that he believes there was no conflict of interest, based on the chairman's statements. Surely we are entitled to an inquiry, or at least a reference to a standing committee of this House to go through the travel itinerary of Mr. Gauthier. Who did he meet? When did he meet them? We should be able to look at the dockets to decide for ourselves whether there was a possible conflict of interest involved as far as the chairman's obligations are concerned.

The minister carefully avoided any suggestion of asking for an accounting as to the travel expenses paid for by the taxpayers of Canada with regard to these extensive private dealings to which he referred. In short, I believe we certainly have prima facie evidence to justify a full investigation into exactly what did transpire in the Anti-Dumping Tribunal, not only with respect to the chairman but also to a member of the tribunal, Mr. Bissonnette.

As far as Mr. Bissonnette is concerned, it is not enough to say that he has been asked to divest himself of private company interests—and I draw the attention of hon. members to this wording, "which would require a positive obligation at law such as those of director or officer." By implication, the minister is indicating that it is quite acceptable to have a certain amount of private business dealings, to have an interest in private concerns, but "do not go too far, and do not get caught." That is not good enough for a standard to be followed by public servants in this country. We need an inquiry.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1510)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his courtesy in letting us have in advance a copy of the statement he has just made. As for the decision he has taken with respect to Mr. Gauthier and Mr. Bissonnette, that, of course, is his responsibility as Minister of Finance.

Having looked at the rules and at the guidelines in the short time available to me, I suspect the minister has done all he could. I am not sure that what is needed now is an inquiry into how Mr. Gauthier and Mr. Bissonnette have behaved. I suggest there is a much broader issue before us, and one which must not be allowed to lapse.

The real difficulty is that the guidelines applying to public servants are unclear and uncertain. The minister said today, with respect to both these gentlemen, that they have given him certain assurances: they have assured him that what they were doing was not in conflict with their duty to the public. The unfortunate thing is this: as I read the rules, that is all they are required to do. I see the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) looking at me; he had something to say on this point, and I shall come to that in a moment.

What is called for is not an after-the-fact inquiry into the activities of those two persons. What is called for is a revamping of the guidelines which affect public servants as far as conflicts of interest are concerned. I want to quote briefly from two authorities—I am one of them, and my leader is another.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Which is the more important?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am quoting myself first, simply on the basis of chronology. In December, 1973, when we had before us a statement on this matter by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), I pointed out the shortcomings in the guidelines which were put forward. I complained in particular about the onus which was placed on public servants to report to their superiors as to whether or not they were in a conflict of interest situation. I said:

I join with the Leader of the Opposition—

That is the gentleman whom we now designate as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield).

—in expressing concern over the extent to which in the Prime Minister's statement as well as in the so-called guidelines everything seems to be left to the individual public servant. I think this is unfair to the public and also unfair to the public servant. I note this sentence in the paragraph in the Prime Minister's statement having to do with disclosure: "Only those matters which the public servant believes are in actual or potential conflict of interest will require disclosure."

I ask, frankly, of what earthly use is that kind of guideline when, in the final analysis, it is left to every individual public servant to decide whether the interests he has are such that he should disclose them. As the Leader of the Opposition said, surely the poorest judge of one's own conduct is the person himself, yet that is the way this has been drawn up.

That is a quotation from *Hansard* of December 18, 1973, at page 8840. Later, in the same citation, I called for what we believed was required, namely, full public disclosure, especially by those who are involved in what could be called decision-making—by those close to the making of government policy or its administration at a high level. Subsequently, on December 10, 1974, as reported at page 2118 of *Hansard*, my leader, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), outlined in two or three very succinct paragraphs four points which are extremely important. I mention two of them because they are relevant to the situation before us.

Second, there is no requirement for public disclosure.

Third, too much discretion is vested in the public servant. The onus is on him to disclose to the minister those matters which he believes to be in actual or potential conflict.

One note on the second point. This is the situation in which we now find ourselves. Mr. Gauthier and Mr. Bissonnette were not required to disclose their other interests. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) has already read into the record one of the sentences in that connection. I believe the trouble is right there. Our former leader, Mr. David Lewis, also had something to say on this point. We have pointed out what is really required—not just voluntary disclosure by public servants of what they believe may be wrong, but full disclosure of financial and business interests by all public servants at the upper level.

Mr. Gauthier has gone, losing eight days of his term, and Mr. Bissonnette has been told to drop some of his associations. Rather than spending too much time going over the past, the point has been reached at which we should revise these rules. This should be done for the protection of the public as well as for the protection of public servants. Senior personnel should not be left in the position where they are asked to determine what is right and what is not right. The line has to be drawn somewhere. We should not make a requirement that will not hurt those on the cleaning staff, while in the process letting those at the upper levels get off scot free. Those in the lower ranks will perhaps not be called upon to make any disclosure at all, but certainly those in the middle and upper brackets should not be left free to decide whether they should report to their superiors or not. There should be full public disclosure, and in my view this is what should come out of this latest experience.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has just made important statements concerning the integrity of some government officials.

One of them concerns the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal, Mr. J. P. C. Gauthier. In his statement, the Minister admits there has been some conflict of interest, but he plays with the situation. In the first paragraph, he says:

I wish to make it clear that there is nothing in the action which has been made available to me which indicates that Mr. Gauthier has conducted himself in any manner conflicting with the due performance of his duties.

In the second paragraph, the same Minister of Finance says:

. . . the number and variety of matters referred to, in my view, go beyond the normal course as contemplated by Section 21(7).

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore an indication of two things: first there are a certain number of cases concerning the former chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal which could be a breach of Standing Order 21(7) to the extent that the Minister of Finance would have to accept the resignation of the chairman.

The second part of the minister's statement deals with another official who is a member of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. In that case, the minister himself is both judge and tried, the judge of his official and tried by the House of Commons. The minister said: "I have questioned Mr. Bissonnette and he assured me . . ."

The Minister told him: "I will send you a short letter on June 4, and will explain to you the guidelines on the conflicts of interest. If you think, my dear Mr. Bisonnette, that it could give rise to conflicts of interest, you will not be accepted for such and such a case.

In the case of Mr. Bissonnette, the minister imitates Pontius Pilate, he backs out, he simply goes to see him, talks to him, sends him a letter and says: If you ever consider you are in a situation of conflict of interest, just offer your resignation and we will settle the problem; you will get rid of all your registered capital in such and such company.

So much for Mr. Bissonnette. Everything considered, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to boast about in the statement of the Minister of Finance. As regards Mr. Bissonnette, he simply disclaims all responsibility. The minister tells Mr. Bissonnette to judge by himself whether or not he is in a conflict of interest situation. That is all.

In the case of the president of the labour court, the minister accepts his resignation, but he announces today no positive and immediate measure, in the short or intermediate run, to prevent that kind of situation. Mr. Speaker, if a similar problem had been raised five or six years ago, there would have been a general outcry in the country and the government would have been charged with corruption.

This has become usual practice nowadays. Recently the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) got rid of a problem by shifting blame on an official who in turn is counter-attacking the minister, and this gets into the headlines and prompts legal actions which have no sense and never end. Mr. Speaker, we are always on the alert. I suggest that the credibility of the Minister of Supply and Services as well as the credibility of this minister have been affected in this situation. We have therefore two victims; public opinion is still not fully satisfied because more light has not been shed on the truth and the solution is still to come.

The matter discussed today is serious. I would like the minister to go a step further, since he pretends to be an administrator. In view of the fact that for some time the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal and one of its members have had to examine, build up and administer files about dumping complaints submitted by some plaintiffs, Mr. Speaker, and since the minister is acknowledging today that in the case of the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal there has been actual conflicts of interest, I am wondering how we can trust the results of the inquiries made following the complaints raised when those conflict of interest situations arose. I would like to know who the plaintiffs were. What were the complaints raised when those conflict of interest situations arose in the case of Mr. Gauthier, since the minister himself has acknowledged the existence of such situation to the point where he had to accept the chairman's resignation. It is therefore evident that during that period complaints have been examined, files have been built up and decisions have been taken.

● (1520)

If that man was found a victim or a cause of that conflict of interest, that leads me to question the validity of either the judgements or the studies made when these complaints were lodged and when conflicts of interest were existing.

How many complaints were there? Who were the witnesses? On what issues? Was it on textile? Was it on steel, or on any other issue? Is the minister then prepared to allow the plaintiff—who might not be satisfied with the ruling since it has been admitted today that there was a conflict of interest, so much so that the resignation of that president was accepted—is the Minister of Finance, with his intellectual honesty and as an administrator of the government finances, prepared to contact the plaintiffs so they may again file their grievances, obtain common law justice and firmly believe in the validity of the review of these files and the decision-making process with respect to these files during the conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, the question is fundamental. If today we feel quite satisfied with merely congratulating the Minister of Finance, with accepting those resignations and simply turning over a new leaf, without giving any guarantee that positive steps will be taken to avoid that type of conflicts of interest in the future, to protect those who were judged at the time when those conflicts of interest were pointed out, then, Mr. Speaker, we are just playing ostrich this afternoon.

I should like to close by saying that in Canada we have need of an efficient and, above all, humane public service. As a member of the Social Credit Party of Canada, Mr. Speaker, no one need lecture us in this House on the services we render our constituents with regard to the administration in general. We need not necessarily shout out against the civil service but many incidents prove that it takes liberties with powers it does not have, that it takes decisions unilaterally that discriminate against defenceless citizens. Please allow me to express the very humble wish, this afternoon, that the public service in general will learn its lesson from what is happening to Mr. Gauthier and may happen to Mr. Bissonnette eventually, if the Minister of Finance decides to reach a decision rather than leave it to Mr. Bissonnette. The civil service must, in its decisions with the Canadian people, with the claimant in unemployment insurance matters, in matters of old age security or income tax, be as understanding, as broadminded, as humane, as welcoming in its judgment as those two officials were in dealing with their own business.

Mr. Speaker, come the day when the civil service considers the people it wants to serve with as much broadmindedness and humanity as it serves itself when its own protection and interests are involved, then, Mr. Speaker, we can trust our civil service. But, at this time, I doubt very much that we can.

[*English*]

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put some questions to the minister. Would he first of all reply to the point I raised in my reply to his statement in respect of item No. 6 of the guidelines tabled on December 18 which provided for public servants disclosing to their superiors, in a manner to be notified, of business, commercial or financial interest where such interest might conceivably be construed as being in an actual or potential conflict with their official duties? Would the minister indicate whether, in fact, the chairman, Mr. Bissonnette did at any time disclose to the minister the business dealings to which the minister is now referring in his two statements?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, after these guidelines were issued, and indeed were sent to autonomous tribunals such as the Anti-Dumping Tribunal, the question was raised—I am not sure of the source of the question—with the government and with the Privy Council office as to whether it was appropriate to apply these guidelines to members of a self-ruling body such as the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. While the question has been under consideration, for that reason my understanding is that at least most of the members of tribunals of this kind have not reported on the guidelines. I might indicate that copies of these, as was indicated in my statement, were sent to Mr. Bissonnette. I understand it has been the general policy not to press on with that inquiry until the matter is resolved.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the guideline to which I have referred was really annexed to the statement of the Prime Minister on December 18, in which he stated very clearly that Crown Corporations and agencies will be urged to develop further standards and procedures within their own organizations in respect of this general question of conflict of interest, will the minister indicate whether in fact there are any guidelines established within the tribunal at the present time and, if not, why not?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I said, Mr. Speaker, the strict application of these to tribunals has currently been a matter of some discussion between tribunals in general and the Privy Council office. My understanding is that the matter has not come to a conclusion, and it is for that reason there is no definitive position on it at this point.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is again to the minister, who has indicated he is satisfied there is no conflict of interest involved in the chairman's activities. To become satisfied, would the minister indicate whether, for example, he reviewed the possible Swedish steel dumping cases which have been before the Anti-Dumping Tribunal for some time? If he did review these, how did he satisfy himself that in fact there was no conflict of interest involved, bearing in mind the involvement the chairman appears to have had with various Swedish business concerns, or at least in one instance a connection with the steel business; and did he specifically invite the steel representatives to indicate if they were satisfied with the tribunal's decision in respect of that matter?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I have certainly reviewed some of the correspondence in this regard, and I would remind the hon. gentleman that the result of the tribunal's decision was a substantial withdrawal of Swedish steel from Canadian markets. Indeed, Atlas Steel indicated its satisfaction with the outcome of this matter. There was no indication in either the material made available, or as a result of questioning, of any connection between the persons involved and Mr. Gauthier's individual dealings or the principals or officers of the Swedish steel company.

● (1530)

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister three brief questions. Is the matter entirely closed at this point, or is the minister still making some inquiries? Second, will the hon. gentleman, make any recommendations to his cabinet colleagues for any modification or some of the existing guidelines for public servants? Third, had any previous investigation taken place in respect of any aspect of Mr. Gauthier's activities as alleged by CTV?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, with regard to Mr. Bissonnette, as the hon. member will note, I have indicated my wish that he should take further action with regard to his position as either a director or officer of certain private companies. The matter, therefore, is not closed. It is a matter which, obviously, I will have to pursue.

With regard to Mr. Gauthier it seems to me the matter is closed. I also made inquiries, in respect of the point of the hon. member for York-Simcoe, concerning whether any charges were made to the tribunal in respect of the travels of Mr. Gauthier or the use of the tribunal's facilities. I do not have a final report. The preliminary report contains no indication of abuse of funds or substantial use of facilities for these particular transactions. What was the second question?

Mr. MacKay: Previous investigation.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There apparently was an investigation at the time the dispute arose with regard to the previous chairmanship of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. There has been an investigation. I have inquired of the Mounted Police in this regard. At the moment of speaking I do not have a report in that regard. Mr. Gauthier indicated to me that the transactions at that time were the subject of investigation, but there were no further proceedings from that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, actually the question I wanted to put to the minister is the second question asked by my friend from Central Nova. Since the minister did not answer the question, I can ask it now. In light of this experience, is the minister recommending to the Prime Minister or to his cabinet colleagues a tightening up of the guidelines so that this kind of experience will not happen again? I have in mind the loopholes in the situation, because the onus is on the public servant to report only the things that he might think would be matters in conflict.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the difficulty with the position taken by the hon. gentleman is that it appears to be a position that would require the continuous surveillance of senior public servants by the government. I have some doubt concerning whether employees in whose judgment trust is placed should be treated in that way by being under continual surveillance. The question has been raised of the required time in which to declare their interest in all personal matters which could conflict with their duties.

My understanding of the matter is that public servants, strictly speaking—and in this case we are talking about an autonomous tribunal—have now been required to declare interests which might possibly conflict with their duties. So the declaration is there in that case. The matter has not been finalized in relation to the tribunals because the question of the independence of a court of record, for example, is raised by the existence of such a tribunal. Very obviously, we will have to have further discussion about this problem. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal says that is an even stronger reason to subject to scrutiny people who are in a quasi-judicial position. I think one would want to consider whether someone who has been put in a quasi-judicial position should be subject to that kind of surveillance by the administration.

Mr. Speaker: I propose to finalize the questioning by recognizing the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre for one supplementary, the hon. member for Lotbinière, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, and the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have just one more question. May I ask the minister if it would not be more fair to all public servants to require full disclosure by all those above a certain level?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it—and I sought to confirm this with the President of the Privy Council—that is indeed the case with regard to senior public servants who are in the structure of the ministries, strictly speaking. There has, however, been a question with regard to the position of members, among

others, of quasi-judicial tribunals, and this question has not yet been brought to resolution. Obviously, I can say that it would have been very much simpler in this case if it had been brought to resolution. I have an incentive to try to do this.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) stated the following this afternoon about the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal, as recorded at the last but one paragraph, at page 1 of the English version, quote:

[*English*]

While clearly in the normal course any government employee may feel compelled from time to time to deal with private interests during the working day, the number and variety of matters referred to, in my view, go beyond the normal course as contemplated by section 21(7).

● (1540)

[*Translation*]

Can the minister tell the House how many matters he is talking about and can he say when they took place? What conclusions did he draw from this period, when for example he is talking of the number and variety of the matters referred to? So, what is the number?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the precise number, but according to my estimation I think there may be six or seven transactions, distinct cases in which the chairman of the tribunal was involved. Some press reports are somewhat different. There are six or seven distinct cases.

Mr. Fortin: Since the minister knows approximately the number of cases in which he established that there was a situation of conflict of interest, will he tell the House, in such cases, what claims had been filed with the Anti-Dumping Tribunal and what were the result of these claims? Was it in favour of the plaintiffs or of companies involved, since there is a situation of conflict of interest? The minister will now conclude that—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that this is not really a situation of conflict of interest, strictly speaking.

As I stated in the first paragraph, there is no evidence of a conflict between a sub judice matter and the private interests of the chairman or other member of that tribunal. There was a second criterion, namely that the chairman devoted the whole of his time to the performance of his official duties, and in this regard there was, in my opinion, a failure to comply with the provisions of the anti-dumping legislation. There is no conflict whatsoever between his private interests and a sub judice matter, and it is because he was attending to other matters when he was chairman. That is the conclusion I came to. It is in this perspective that I referred to the number of situations. It is not a sub judice matter, but his personal activities were involved.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Finance tell us, given the conflict of interest as regards time, whether the reason why this public servant acted in this way might be that his salary was too low? Therefore, what was the public servant's salary?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I do not think so. I believe he had a high salary. I cannot answer that question, but I believe his salary was adequate.

Mr. Fortin: But that was it?

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister will reconsider his judgment that the position of a member of a board or commission might be in any way different in the sense of his having a diminished sense of responsibility in terms of conflict of interest. Having said that, may I ask the minister whether he would be prepared to put the matter before a committee of the House, not only for an examination of the facts in this particular case but also to look toward the future in these kinds of matters which I am sure cause embarrassment to the government and embarrassment to the public servant who does not have an opportunity to put his side of the case forward except through the words of the minister.

I think it would assist members of the House in understanding the purport of the guidelines, and would also assist the public servant and the public service generally in terms of their responsibilities. The hon. member for York-Simcoe raised that possibility, and I do not think anyone has asked the minister about that. I wonder if the minister would consider such an inquiry in view of the circumstances and looking to the future, as suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I did, indeed, consider that situation. I point out to the hon. gentleman that parliament has specifically provided a procedure for dealing with this kind of complaint against members of tribunals by providing for a reference in this kind of matter to the Canadian Judicial Council as a preliminary step to those that might be taken for their removal. In the case of members of this kind of quasi-judicial board—the situation is analogous to that of judges—the assumption was made by parliament at that time that parliament itself should not inquire into their conduct, but it was appropriate that the Canadian Judicial Council should do so.

The next question which I am sure is on the hon. member's mind is, why did we not do that in this case? Quite frankly, that would have been my preferred course of action. The difficulty was the time factor involved. The chairman was going to remain in his position for another ten to twelve days. The opinion which I received on the application of the law was that the Canadian Judicial Council might well refuse to hear a matter for the removal of someone who already had ceased to be a member of the tribunal by reason of the passage of time. It might be said, in that particular case, that through the accident of time it was not possible to follow the procedure which parliament had proposed. I would think it would be preferable not to submit to the scrutiny of the legislature the conduct of individual members of quasi-judicial tribunals such as this one. I would have to acknowledge that, for reasons of time, there is a lacuna in this instance, but reference to the Canadian Judicial Council is preferable.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I gather from the minister's statement that Mr. Bissonnette's time as a member of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal has not run out. We do not have a

problem with respect to him as he is continuing in his post. However, the minister did not make it clear whether he had answered the guidelines at the time he was to answer them. Having regard to the situation in which Mr. Bissonnette must find himself, and his desire, I am sure, as well as that of the government, to avoid any suspicion of wrongdoing on his part, has the minister considered putting his case to the Canadian Judicial Council? I understand his reason with respect to Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): In the case of Mr. Bissonnette, both from documentary evidence that was available, and from his personal declaration, it was clear that he had not been a participant with Mr. Gauthier in the rather extensive conferences, exchanges of telexes and other transactions which had occurred in the past eight months. The interest of Mr. Bissonnette was as an investor in one company which was involved in these transactions in which he has the position of director. His other interest dated back to the time when he was in private law practice and when he remained on the board of a number of private companies in which he retained no pecuniary interest.

It seemed to me, on the facts of that case, that there was no evidence of conflict of interest, strictly speaking, and that there was no multiplicity of transactions to indicate that he had been failing in his duties as a member of the tribunal. Evidence would indicate that there was a potential conflict because he is director or officer of a company, but there was no evidence of an actual conflict. It would seem to me to be unfair, under the circumstances, because of that relationship, to refer the situation to the Canadian Judicial Council. Naturally, if other evidence came to light I would have to consider the suggestion of the hon. member, and that would then be the appropriate course of action.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for the attempts he has made to give us as full replies as possible to our questions. I listened with a great deal of interest to the reply he gave to my colleague, the hon. member for Central Nova. I hope the minister will correct me if I am wrong, but if I understood him correctly, he said that there was no substantial use of government facilities by Mr. Gauthier for his private business purposes. Could the minister indicate to the House what he meant by "no substantial use of government facilities for personal business", and also could he detail to the House what evidence he has, if any, of Mr. Gauthier's use of government facilities for private business purposes?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It did become clear that Mr. Gauthier had had a number of meetings in his office with people who were there, not about tribunal business but in relation to transactions about which we were speaking. Indeed, some of the correspondence that was on file might well have been typed by the staff of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal.

One of the questions upon which we focused was whether, in the course of the rather extensive travels in which the chairman was involved as a member of the board, he had charged the government for what was essentially a trip on private business. We could find no evidence of that, although it was clear in one case that while he was in Sweden on business of the tribunal on a pending case he had taken some days off, part of which time was devoted to meeting the principals involved in one of these transactions. It is in that sense that I used the words "not substantial use of facilities"—in particular, not charging for any extensive travel.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

Mr. Beatty: In elaborating on the answer which the minister gave, has the minister been able to find any information which would suggest that, for example, Mr. Gauthier's travels abroad were timed deliberately to coincide with his desire to travel abroad on business purposes? Also, the minister indicated previously that Mr. Gauthier took some time off while in Sweden to conduct personal business. Could the minister indicate whether, when Mr. Gauthier was conducting private business during the time when he would customarily be employed by the government, he reimbursed the public treasury for his salary for those days? Also, could the minister indicate whether there was any reimbursement of the public purse for any transportation costs which were carried by the government if Mr. Gauthier was able to conduct his private business during a trip which was paid for by the government?

● (1550)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as I said, if the chairman in that particular case was in Sweden for the purpose of the business of the tribunal, in that sense the expense to the Crown was no greater than it would have been if that was all he had done. As to payments back, I cannot specifically respond to that. I can inquire further. I would have been inclined, from the inquiries, to have said that this is not the appropriate subject for civil action for an accounting and payment back to the government. However, I think it would be appropriate to make some inquiries in this regard to see whether further proceedings of that kind might be taken. I have not passed judgment on that question at this point.

* * *

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

AMENDMENT TO EMPOWER ATTORNEY GENERAL TO TAKE ACTION FOR PERSONS DAMAGED BY VIOLATION OF THE ACT

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-441, to amend the Combines Investigation Act (*ex relatione* class actions).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide Canadians from one end of the country to the other with the right to class actions in the Federal Court of Canada, a right which they do not presently have.

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

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, this is not the time that there can be formal introduction of the appropriation bills, but

perhaps I should inform the House that these bills are ready for distribution. I believe this will help in handling the business later in the day.

Mr. Speaker: The practice adopted by the House on recent occasions during which it has had to consider and finalize the process of supply has certainly been improved by the early introduction of supply bills, and again, although the Standing Orders do not provide for the introduction of those bills at this particular time of the day, it certainly is gratifying to know that those bills are ready for distribution. I presume hon. members would want to have them distributed in advance, even though the understanding must be that they cannot be introduced until later in the day.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the government House leader for his accommodation. I think Your Honour properly put the point, and I hope that the minister, or perhaps his parliamentary secretary, will make the appropriate arrangements to have that distribution take place. Nonetheless, we are very grateful.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, that is a good idea, and we welcome it.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 5,345, 5,432, 5,438, 5,501, 5,503, 5,508, 5,510, 5,713 and 5,737.

[*Text*]

ATLANTIC SEAL HUNT—INFORMATION LEAFLET

Question No. 5,345—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Did the Director General, Quebec Region, Department of the Environment, order on March 30, 1976, that all French texts recently issued by Information Services on the Atlantic seal hunt and accompanying 1976 policy be destroyed and, if so, for what reason?

2. How much waste is represented by such action in terms of time, money, paper, etc.?

3. Has any action been taken to ensure that this type of incident does not recur?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Fisheries)): 1. The Director-General, Quebec Region, Fisheries and Marine Service, Department of the Environment requested that all French texts of an information leaflet on the Atlantic Seal Hunt, "La Chasse aux phoques dans l'Atlantique", be destroyed because of errors in the French text. These errors were due to inadequate editing and proofreading, and the fact that the text was a translation of a preliminary draft.

2. $284 for typesetting and printing of replacement copies for the 2,500 discarded leaflets. Errors were corrected and reprinting was completed within one week.

3. Staffing of vacant editing positions within the Fisheries and Marine Information Branch has been authorized, and closer supervision of editing and printing procedures has been implemented.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD ATLANTIC REGION—SAINT JOHN

Question No. 5,432—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the total cost of the National Harbours Board Atlantic Region Office in Saint John during 1975?

2. How many staff members are employed in the NHB Atlantic Region Office?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. $125,458.74.

2. The Board member and two employees.

WELFARE GRANTS PROGRAMME

Question No. 5,438—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. By province, for each of the past five years, how much has been provided by the Department of National Health and Welfare under the Welfare Grants Programme?

2. Are all projects, in the Province of Quebec, in the social welfare field given prior approval by the Government of Quebec?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. See reply to Parliamentary Enquiry No. 5,404, tabled on June 11, 1976.

2. No. Projects are forwarded to the Department of Social Affairs for comments and reactions prior to final consideration by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD SHEDS—PORT OF MONTREAL—LEASES

Question No. 5,501—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What percentage of National Harbours Board owned sheds at the port of Montreal were leased during the years (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 on (i) an annual (ii) a monthly (iii) a weekly (iv) a daily basis?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises that permits of occupancy for shedded terminals were issued on the following basis:

	(i) Annual per cent	(ii) Monthly per cent	(iii) Weekly per cent	(iv) Daily per cent
(a) 1974	74.4	3.7	Nil	6
(b) 1975	80.9	2.6	Nil	5
(c) 1976	83.3	1	Nil	—

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—JACQUES CARTIER TERMINAL—PORT OF MONTREAL

Question No. 5.503—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How much of the total estimated cost of the Jacques Cartier Terminal at the Port of Montreal is attributable to the take-over of general cargo facilities being incorporated in the Terminal?

2. How was this amount determined?

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. $390,128.

2. Original cost of the sheds on the Jacques Cartier Terminal as they were used for break-bulk handling less accumulated depreciation.

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—MARINE TERMINAL PROGRAMME—PORT OF MONTREAL

Question No. 5,508—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How many man-years were spent by the National Harbours Board in the administration of the shed rental programme during 1974 and 1975 and how many are anticipated in 1976 at the Port of Montreal?

2. What is the estimated cost for each year?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. 0.29 man-years were spent in the administration of the marine terminal programme during 1974 and 1975, and it is anticipated that the same time will be spent during 1976.

2. Cost for 1974, $4,810; Cost for 1975, $5,290; Estimated cost for 1976, $5,690.

UIC—FISHERMEN

Question No. 5,510—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Do (a) fishermen require eight insured weeks to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits, yet only get .83 of a week's benefits for each insured week worked (b) labourers and other workers require eight insured weeks to start a claim and are they then entitled to between 18 and 44 weeks of benefits and, if so, for what reason is there discrimination?

2. Do the present UIC regulations take into consideration factors such as years when fish are not plentiful and when fishermen are subject to weather conditions not suitable for fishing, and which prevent them working?

3. Can the majority of fishermen qualify for benefits any time prior to the week in which December 1 occurs?

4. Are the Minister and Chairman of UIC aware that ice and weather conditions discriminate against fishermen in qualifying for UIC benefits?

5. Is the government considering changes to UIC regulations in an effort to overcome the problems of Canadian fishermen and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. (a) A distinction must be made between self-employed fishermen and fishermen who are regular employees working under a contract of employment. The latter group have the same rights under the unemployment insurance legislation as all other employees. Self-employed fishermen, the only self-employed workers covered by unemployment insurance generally may qualify for benefit only during the period December 1 to May 15. This is a period of approximately 24 weeks, which is usually the non-fishing period for most self-employed fishermen. Their benefit duration is .83 benefit weeks for each week of qualifying insurable employment. However, if a self-employed fisherman has at least eight weeks of regular insured employment, this can be combined with his insured weeks from fishing self-employment to establish a regular claim for benefits; (b) Labourers and other workers require eight weeks of insurable employment in the qualifying period and they may qualify for benefit at any time of the year for up to 44 weeks. Providing benefit during the usual non-fishing period only is not discriminatory in that they enjoy a benefit not available to other self-employed workers. Furthermore, they can normally resume full scale fishing after May 15.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Both the Minister and the Chairman are aware that weather conditions can and do affect the unemployment insurance benefit entitlement of fishermen. This fact has been recognized by the Department of Environment in the last few years by additional financial support programs for such fishermen.

5. Not in respect to unemployment insurance for self-employed fishermen as the Department of Environment is developing programs to replace unemployment insurance for this group.

CAR ALLOWANCE FOR MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT

Question No. 5,713—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. (a) What is the total amount of public funds paid to the present Minister of the Environment for a car allowance since he became a member of the Cabinet (b) has the Minister always used his own car during this period of time in the Ottawa area and/or has he ever made use of government owned transportation?

2. (a) Is the government officially aware if the Minister's driver's licence was under suspension during any time over the past year and, if so, was the usual car allowance paid to the Minister during this period of time (b) how much was paid (c) has the amount been refunded and (i) if so, on what date (ii) if not, will the government request such a refund?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): 1. (a) The number of years the hon. member for Langelier has been a Minister of the Crown times the amount provided for in paragraph 43(2)(a) of the Senate and House of Commons Act, Chapter S-8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970. (See also the reply to question 4,126, Hansard 321, page 14415); (b) Both.

2. (a) No, the question of permits to operate motor vehicles being a matter falling within provincial jurisdiction.

UIC—CLAIMANTS REGISTERED

Question No. 5,737—**Mr. Alexander:**

1. In each month, for the years (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 to date, how many claimants were registered for unemployment insurance benefits?

2. In each case, what was the level of unemployment by (a) percentage (b) numbers?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. (a), (b) and (c) See Statistics Canada Publication 73-001 entitled "Statistical Report on the Operation of the Unemployment Insurance Act."

2. (a) and (b) See Statistics Canada Publication 71-001 entitled "The Labour Force".

TABLE 1. Summary Data
December 1975

Item		Number Current month	Number Previous month	Number Year ago	Percentage change from Previous month	Percentage change from Year ago
Benefit payments						
Gross amount	$	281,832,666[P]	209,853,021	165,202,526	34	71
Net amount[1]	$	280,391,035[P]	209,182,954	164,448,626	34	71
Weeks of benefit	$	3,166,823	2,384,357	2,093,785	33	51
Average weekly benefit	$	89.00[P]	88.01	78.90	1	13
Claims received		334,761	258,703	332,058	29	1
Beneficiaries		703,136[P]	615,322[P]	...	14	...
Claimants at month-end[2]		1,065,509	924,628[r]	910,103	15	17

		Year-to-date Current year	Year-to-date Previous year	Year-to-date Percentage change
Benefit payments				
Gross amount	$	3,159,279,881	2,131,410,625	48
Net amount[1]	$	3,146,136,978	2,119,212,741[r]	48
Weeks of benefit	$	37,326,671	28,460,714	31
Average weekly benefit	$	84.64	74.89	13
Claims received		2,857,227	2,410,367	19
Beneficiaries		...	...	...
Claimants at month-end[3]		1,048,984	827,740	27

[1] After cancellation of warrants and collection of overpayments.

[2] These figures are overstated in terms of active files. If claimants do not report that they became re-employed, a period of five weeks is allowed to elapse before their claims are transferred to the inactive file.

[3] Monthly average.

Table 1. Summary Labour Force characteristics by Sex, Canada

	Participation rates per cent	Employed Labour force	Employed Purchases of workers Total	Employed Purchases of workers Agriculture	Employed Purchases of workers Non-agriculture	Employed Paid workers Total	Employed Paid workers Non-agriculture	(b) Unemployed	(a) Unemployment rates per cent
				thousands					
Both sexes									
Actual									
1975 December	57.6 A	9,923 A	9,226 A	420 D	8,806 A	8,237 A	8,150 A	697 D	7.0 D
November	58.0	9,972	9,332	460	8,872	8,308	8,208	640	6.4
1974 December	57.9	9,715	9,118	409	8,709	8,121	8,047	597	6.1
November	57.8	9,682	9,189	431	8,758	8,180	8,101	493	5.1
1973 December	57.0	9,298	8,786	391	8,395	7,833	7,760	512	5.5
November	57.1	9,297	8,829	416	8,413	7,875	7,795	468	5.0
Seasonally adjusted									
1975 December	58.5	10,080	9,367	493	8,878	8,327	8,213	713	7.1
November	58.8	10,122	9,388	505	8,890	8,329	8,210	734	7.3
October	58.8	10,098	9,373	481	8,899	8,532	8,235	725	7.2
September	59.1	10,127	9,395	492	8,918	8,366	8,249	732	7.2
August	58.7	10,034	9,298	482	8,838	8,301	8,182	736	7.3
July	58.7	10,040	9,316	476	8,848	8,294	8,191	724	7.2
Annual average									
1975	58.8	10,015	9,308	479	8,828	8,272	9,162	707	7.1
1974	58.3	9,662	9,137	473	8,664	8,105	8,006	525	5.4
1973	57.5	9,279	8,759	467	8,292	7,757	7,661	520	5.6
1972	56.5	8,891	8,329	481	7,848	7,310	7,211	562	6.3
Men									
Actual									
1975 December	75.4 A	6,417 A	5,921 A	360 D	5,561 A	5,127 A	5,055 A	496 D	7.7 D
November	75.9	6,450	6,041	389	5,652	5,222	5,142	409	6.3
1974 December	76.1	6,320	5,889	354	5,535	5,095	5,035	431	6.8
November	76.3	6,323	5,996	369	5,628	5,190	5,125	327	5.2
1973 December	75.6	6,100	5,726	344	5,382	4,963	4,901	374	6.1
November	75.7	6,097	5,776	364	5,412	5,007	4,943	321	5.3

Order Paper Questions

Table 1. Summary Labour Force characteristics by Sex, Canada

	Employed							(b) Paid workers	(a)	
			Purchases of workers							
	Participation rates per cent	Labour force	Total	Agriculture	Non-agriculture	Total	Non-agriculture	unemployed	unemployment rates per cent
					thousands				
Seasonally adjusted									
1975 December	76.9	6,537	6,053	407	5,660	5,234	5,142	484	7.4
November	77.2	6,559	6,075	418	5,672	5,246	5,151	484	7.4
October	77.2	6,554	6,053	402	5,668	5,247	5,152	496	7.6
September	77.1	6,545	6,044	402	5,656	5,241	5,151	501	7.7
August	76.8	6,511	6,010	398	5,629	5,209	5,123	501	7.7
July	77.1	6,512	6,022	292	5,636	5,214	5,128	490	7.5
Annual average									
1975	77.2	6,499	6,016	398	5,618	5,194	5,107	483	7.4
1974	77.3	6,338	5,976	397	5,579	5,160	5,079	361	5.7
1973	76.8	6,127	5,767	397	5,371	4,972	4,896	360	5.9
1972	76.2	5,938	5,533	406	5,127	4,730	4,650	405	6.8
Women									
Actual									
1975 December	40.3 B	3,505 B	3,305 B	60 E	3,245 B	3,110 B	3,095 B	201 D	5.7 D
November	40.5	3,522	3,291	71	3,219	3,087	3,066	232	6.6
1974 December	40.0	3,395	3,229	54	3,174	3,026	3,012	166	4.9
November	39.7	3,359	3,193	62	3,130	2,990	2,975	166	4.9
1973 December	38.8	3,198	3,060	47	3,013	2,870	2,858	138	4.3
November	38.9	3,200	3,053	52	3,001	2,867	2,852	147	4.6
Seasonally adjusted									
1975 December	40.7	3,541	3,313	86	3,220	3,092	3.071	228	6.4
November	40.9	3,558	3,313	88	3,221	3,086	3,062	245	6.9
October	40.8	3,541	3,315	81	3,238	3,109	3,086	226	6.4
September	41.3	3,567	3,338	87	3,256	3,120	3,093	229	6.4
August	41.0	3,519	3,287	82	3,208	3,081	3,057	232	6.6
July	40.8	3,524	3,293	82	3,210	3,082	3,053	231	6.6
Annual average									
1975	40.9	3,515	3,291	81	3,210	3,078	3,055	224	6.4
1974	39.7	3,324	3,161	76	3,085	2,945	2,927	163	4.9
1973	38.7	3,152	2,992	70	2,921	2,784	2,765	160	5.1
1972	37.1	2,953	2,796	75	2,721	2,580	2,561	157	5.3

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,249 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

FISH SPECIES IMPORTED BY CANADA

Question No. 5,249—**Mr. Marshall:**

What are the fish species which Canada imported, by dollar value, for the years 1970 to 1975?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Andras.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton) moved:

That this House, finding unacceptable the performance of the government, particularly its penchant for shifting blame, reaffirms its belief in the importance of the convention of ministerial responsibility and expresses its lack of confidence in the government.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, when I heard the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) shout "Agreed," I was gratified and I was looking for a similar form of acknowledgement from the other side. It would have been an acknowledgement of what has become apparent in the minds of most Canadians, that is, that as we draw to the close of the longest session in Canadian parliamentary history—and I suspect we may be close to the end of it—the government has gradually, steadfastly and inexorably lost control of affairs. While this motion is expressed in terms of a matter of confidence by this House, whether it passes or not I am

satisfied it expresses the view of the Canadian public with respect to the performance of this government.

We are drawing near the end of a session. What a session it has been, as we look back over it. The paradox which has become apparent to us day after day was first brought to light by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who, having condemned the policy of controls during an election campaign, finally marched before the television cameras and announced what can only be described as a deathbed repentance and adopted controls for himself.

In terms of agricultural policies, we have seen in the last few days the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) blame everybody. His policies have managed to do something which no minister of agriculture, as far as I am aware, in Canadian history—perhaps I will be corrected with respect to that—has been able to do, and that is to skewer both the producer and the consumer at the same time.

We sat in this House on the dramatic budget night a few days ago and heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) advance a budget which will do nothing for inflation or for unemployment, which managed to blame the Americans or somebody else for the failings of this government on the one hand, but which hitched its future to the United States on the other.

As Canadians look at this government, they see a rather sorry performance. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) recently in this House, outside the House and even outside the country, said to the people of the Atlantic provinces that they are really to blame for the high price of energy there, and he advanced an energy strategy which is no more that a pricing strategy.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) came into the House not too long ago and decided, at long last, to cast the blame on India for the results of his policy respecting nuclear proliferation. When we consider that policy, we realize that all along it has been the carpetbagging approach of this government in the important matter of nuclear proliferation to place the question of sales beyond and above the question of public morality.

Those are the failures, and as honestly and objectively as I usually look at these things, I have tried to find what this government can really show for over 300 days of parliamentary work, in terms of real accomplishments or changes for the better, for the lifestyle of Canadians and in terms of what Canadians can expect by way of leadership from the government and, quite frankly, I am hard put to come upon anything of that nature.

● (1600)

The government has blamed their failings on everyone but themselves. When it was convenient, they castigated labour. When it was convenient in another way, they blamed management. From time to time the farmer came in for a share of the blame. The workingman gathered his share of the blame for the policies of the government, and if they were stuck, as they were from time to time, for being scapegoats, so that they could sleep at nights—and I imagine it was an uneasy sleep—they blamed the provinces and the opposition, and they even came down once in a while to blaming the weather. Mr. Speaker, this is the litany of failure; it is also the litany of the denial of responsibility by the government to account to the people of Canada, through this House, which it has not done.

I do not want to sell this government short, Mr. Speaker. Even a government dedicated to making a mess can sometimes outdo itself—in the dredging affair, the Sky Shops affair, the judges' affair—and if all these were not enough, let us not forget the "Orion" crash, the $16 million disaster. This most unusual game they play in the House would have been comical had it not been a serious matter—the game of seeing the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) blame the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), on the one hand, and the next day on the volley-ball courts the Minister of Supply and Services casting the blame on the Minister of National Defence, and the Prime Minister straining himself to find some common ground between these two ministers who are the epitome and essence of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing. That showed itself to the people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, someone will deal later with the details of that matter.

The country has two answers to the Galaxy of Goofs that I have described. I should like to refer to an article by Richard Gwyn. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) asks where I found that. I found it in this article. To this Galaxy of Goofs, the latest goof is now being run out, excuses are being made, people are being blamed and answers are not being given. In his column in the Montreal *Star* of June 10, Mr. Gwyn said:

> To tabulate the price taxpayers will pay for this Galaxy of Goofs is easy: $16 million in penalties to Lockheed; several million in wasted defence department plans; a year's delay in the delivery of new anti-sub planes and anything up to $50 million in inflationary costs that will have to be added to the new contract. About $100 million in all which, if burnt as $1 bills to heat a house would, quite literally, have been better spent.
>
> Undecided is the price that will be paid by one minister... and by senior civil servants in three departments. Excepting Stopforth, who has been reassigned to spend a year on French, I will bet anyone one hundred million to one that the answer will be nothing.

Mr. Speaker, who stars in this saga? The Minister of National Defence, and the Minister of Supply and Services. One is exactly the same star who was involved in the saga of the overpriced oil not too long ago. What does he do? Does he come into the House and say he is sorry? Does he come into this House and account? Not likely. But he does have an answer for all that has gone on. He sums up his courage, rises in his place and blames it on a public servant. The public servant, Mr. Larry Stopforth—whom I do not know—denies the charge, threatens to sue the minister for libel if he does not retract, and the minister wraps himself in the swaddling clothes of parliamentary immunity and refuses to retract.

The Prime Minister, who ought to be an arbitrator in this dispute, did not even try to examine it. He did not come to the rescue of the public servant, nor did the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) who had a hand in that Lockheed deal with the handwritten memorandum and who also has some responsibility to the public service of this country. Nor, may I note, did the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), who was formerly a public servant and was president of the Professional Institute of Public Servants of Canada at one time. None of them came to the rescue.

I asked in this House that the public servant at least be given the right to come before a committee of parliament and give his side of the question. Another former public servant, the President of the Treasury Board, said "no" and cast him on the tender mercies of a grievance procedure which would take the public servant to the very person who ordered his removal; or, in the alternative, he put the public servant to the tender mercies of the courts. All of us who have practised in the courts know the delays incurred. All of us who have served in this parliament know how fruitless and futile that remedy is. Mr. Speaker, we have $16 million down the drain; that is for sure. We have no aircraft for the military; we know that. Out of it all, instead of taking his responsibilities seriously, the minister points his finger at a public servant. I think in this long session of parliament, not having been here very long, that particular action—I see the Minister for Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) is involved, and I hope he would not do that to his public servants.

The Minister of Supply and Services has really carried this matter of ministerial responsibility to a new low. It is an interesting matter to the public service of Canada. They are much the same as any other group of Canadians in wanting to do a particular job and to do it well. If a minister is prepared to encourage his public servants, protect them when necessary, take responsibility when necessary, then the public service of this country is prepared to put out for the minister and for the government.

The things I have heard on the street, the things that are relayed to me by letter and telephone, show me that public servants are shocked by what has happened. The public service of this country will not tolerate incompetence. I do not think a government ought to tolerate incompetence, but I do not think it is fair for a government to make an accusation of incompetence and shift the blame for its own irresponsible acts to a person who has no opportunity to defend himself. That is what happened in this case.

Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, if you would enter into any transaction that would cost you the amount of money that this transaction has cost the people of Canada, without putting it in writing? You would not buy a rowboat under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker. Yet this government embarked upon a defence policy with a company whose record is at least questionable in the eyes of the rest of the world, without even a jot in writing with respect to one of the important aspects thereof.

That same minister, and indeed the ministry—because the Prime Minister was drawn into this, and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp)—does not have the guts to stand up and take its responsibilities and its lumps with respect to this transaction.

● (1610)

I do not want you to think, Mr. Speaker, that the doctrine of ministerial responsibility is not important. James Eayrs, professor of international relations at the University of Toronto, in a newspaper column entitled "Minister must take blame for Lockheed" said in part:

> At stake is the charge by Jean-Pierre Goyer, Minister of Supply and Services, that L. H. Stopworth, Goyer's representative on the interdepartmental committee supervising the acquisition of 18 Orion patrol planes from the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, failed to keep him properly informed.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

> At stake is more than the careers of the two men concerned, more than the $16 million that we, the taxpayers, must cough up in cancellation charges now that the deal has fallen through.
>
> At stake is a cornerstone of our structure of parliamentary democracy—the way we run our country. At stake is the constitutional principle known as "ministerial responsibility."
>
> The doctrine of ministerial responsibility prescribes that a member of the cabinet is answerable to parliament for what goes on in his department. It is not for him to point the finger. It is not for him to pass the buck. If he speaks at all about the public servants in his charge, it should be to protect and defend them—never to accuse and attack them.
>
> Ministerial responsibility's most attractive feature is its sense of fair play. After all, it's the minister who is quick to claim the credit and grab the glory when his department does well by him. Why shouldn't the manfully shoulder the blame when there are goofs? Since he gets the praise, he should take the rap. This is what ministerial responsibility requires him to do.

Next I shall read something written by Professor McGregor Dawson. In his book he mentions changes which have occurred in the public service, but he makes the point that the minister takes the responsibility and should not place blame elsewhere. Speaking of what has happened in the public service, he said in his book:

> None of these changes, all of which helped produce a massive reorganization of the executive and the public service of Canada, altered the fundamental fact that executive and public service in Canada have always in one respect discharged a common function, the enforcement, application, and development of the national policies. But the distinction between the two is never in any doubt: the executive is a political body; the public service is non-political, and consists of the growing number of employees of the state who work in either a department of government, or a Crown corporation or other agency engaged in administering some particular law or laws.

There are those who say times have changed, that governments have grown more complex. That is true. To an ever greater extent governments, at their own instance or the instance of others, have intruded into our affairs and grown more complex. Nevertheless, at the very foundation of our system is the doctrine that the minister is ultimately responsible, that he must stand up publicly and be answerable. That duty remains, and does not in any way limit the right of the public servant to expect that the minister will be answerable for the affairs of the department. That has not changed, and it is time this House confirmed and reaffirmed its views on ministerial responsibility. That is why the House is debating this motion today. Writing in "Parliamentary Affairs," volume 26, No. 4, published in the autumn of 1973, David Butler said, at page 403:

> Consider first individual ministerial responsibility. Its central doctrine is that for every public act of a public servant, a minister has to answer to parliament. It is an assertion of democratic accountability. Honouring the ancestral cry "grievances precede supply," some member of the government has to reply for any action—or want of action—in which public money, gathered from the taxpayer, is or might be involved.
>
> Individual ministerial responsibility is easy to ridicule. How can a minister take responsibility for the innumerable acts of his civil servants, many of them involving technicians of which he could not conceivably master? In ordinary affairs we are seldom willing to carry the can for things about which we have no knowledge and no possibility of control. We can hardly feel surprised when we see ministers passing the buck: "It was before my time," "I had to rely on the expert advice I was given," "I could not have known anything about it."

The House has received replies of that kind. I continue:

> But to answer does not mean to take the blame in a personal way; still less does it mean to resign. To answer only requires a minister to say "I have ministerial responsibility for this. I am sorry that a mistake has been made. I have taken steps to see that it does not happen again."

And if it does happen again the minister will, at the least, look foolish and lose caste in the eyes of his Prime Minister, his colleagues and indeed the wider public.

Because of the factors I mentioned, the old, strict rule regarding ministerial responsibility has been diluted. But the Minister of Supply and Services, backed by every one of his colleagues and every member on his side of the House who cheered when he made his statement concerning Larry Stopforth, refused to take even a mini-step and acknowledge that he, as minister, was responsible for what was done and for what the government did. The minister and the government did not have the good grace to do that.

There is another side to ministerial responsibility. The decline is at the heart of the relationship between ministers and public servants. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, ministers take the blame; but they also take the praise. Public servants accept power without publicity. As long as they do not violate the traditional code of their profession, they are shielded from public criticism for their mistakes. That is as it should be and as it should continue to be. I have said previously that incompetence does not have to be tolerated, but that is not the case here. Incompetence has been alleged. The public servant should have the right to answer that allegation, but this government steadfastly refuses to give him that right. Why is it refusing, Mr. Speaker? Is the government worried, afraid that an examination of the case of Larry Stopforth may also lead to an examination of the blunders, foolishness, bad business practices, and so on, relating to the Orion deal? If the government is afraid of this, it ought to say so.

The present position does not do much for Larry Stopforth and every other public servant who finds himself caught in a similar situation. It is to be the lot of public servants in Canada that ministers shall attack them on the floor of the House of Commons?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Are they to be named on the floor of the House of Commons and left without redress? If that is how the government feels, it is unworthy, not only of the confidence of the people of Canada, which it does not have, but of the confidence of this House. I hope that during this debate some minister of the Crown will stand up and plead the case, publicly, of the public servant who is shunted aside and moved out of his position. Really, Mr. Speaker, that is not the important factor. What is important is this: a public servant who may have served his country in war, served it in peace in the public service of Canada, and advanced in the public service now finds himself named in the House of Commons and subject to ridicule.

● (1620)

He is in danger of losing all that he has, that is not transitory, by its nature—namely, his reputation. What the Minister of Supply and Services did by naming this civil servant was an act of cowardice. The act of the Prime Minister, in not rebuking his Minister of Supply and Services, was an act of complicity in that cowardice. In my judgment and respectful submission to this House of Commons—

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Be honest.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I do not expect the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) to know very much about ministerial responsibility. Anyway, he will never have to worry about it.

I speak strongly about this matter. I have raised it before in this House of Commons, and I will continue to raise it. If this is going to be the attitude of the government, there is a danger to the public service of this country. Whether we are dealing with Mr. Stopforth or any other public servant, there will be a danger to the integrity of the public service. It could, in fact, lead politicization of the public service—and the public service has suffered enough by the heavy, left-handed methods of this government.

I ask the support of this House of Commons with respect to the individual about whom I have spoken today who has been maligned here and left without remedy. If the hon. member for Timmins thinks that is fair, I do not know where his moral values lie. If there is anything wrong with a public inquiry or parliamentary examination at which Mr. Stopforth would be prepared to put his reputation on the line and suffer the slings and arrows of that disclosure, along with what the government would suffer, I would certainly like to hear it.

I moved this motion because the people of Canada have lost confidence in this government. This House, therefore, ought not to have any confidence in it.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, after the historic half hour that we had in this House just before lunch, anything to be raised during the rest of the day is almost bound to be anti-climactic. Yet even in that kind of atmosphere the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) in his motion has raised a very important issue. Like him, and like other members of the House, I look forward to the reply that will come from the ministerial benches. I notice that most of the ministers have left—all but the two orators, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Mackasey). I do not know which one is going to indulge in a flight of oratory this afternoon.

I suspect—in fact, I believe—that both ministers concur, in the proposition set out in the first part of this motion. I cannot expect either of those two ministers, or any other minister, to concur as I do in the proposition that the government does not have the confidence of this House or the country. However, I trust I am right in assuming that both of the orators sitting in the front ministerial benches agree with us about the importance of the convention of ministerial responsibility. I know my two friends very well. I know their capacity for getting into debate, slaughtering their opponents, and so on. If they cannot do it directly, they do it by beating around the bush and talking about other subjects. I hope they will come to grips with this issue. I see them tossing glances to see which one is going to do it.

This question of the importance of ministerial responsibility is such that whoever speaks for the government ought to affirm it today, even if in so doing he casts some doubt on what was done from a ministerial bench a few weeks ago.

When I first came here some years ago, there was a notion about Ottawa that the real government was the public service. There was the notion that it was the deputy ministers who ran things, that even if there was a change of government, some of the same policies would be carried forward. I saw that happen. I saw governments change. The departments of government continued to give the same advice, and what might have been brought forward had the previous government stayed in office was brought forward by the new government. When this present government came in in 1968 under the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), we were told that it was a new era. From here on in, the decisions were going to be made by the cabinet. There are indications that to some extent the present government has carried out that position.

Deputy ministers have been moved from one department to another. Shifts have been made so that senior public officials do not get into positions of too much power. All of this has seemed to be part of the implementation of the present government's philosophy that the government should be controlled and run by the elected ministers, not by public servants at any level.

The government has made it clear that they have a tremendously valuable and efficient public service and that their advice is very important to them, but that in the final analysis, it is the government, the cabinet, those who have been elected to office, who have the say. I submit that a government that has taken that position has even more responsibility than some earlier governments which did not take that position, to stand by the principle set out in this motion, namely, the principle of ministerial responsibility.

It is inevitable, in a debate of this kind, that reference is made to the action of the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) when he stood in his place in this House on a question of privilege or on a ministerial statement and condemned one of his senior public servants. I suggest that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton was quite justified in condemning that action outright, as he has done. Just as I do not like the way in which Mr. Stopforth was castigated and pilloried, so I do not intend to spend time castigating or pillorying the Minister of Supply and Services. Nevertheless, the principle which is brought into focus by this incident is certainly one concerning which there should be a clear statement by whichever of those ministerial orators is to reply in the debate today.

● (1630)

As I understand it, Mr. Stopforth is not the deputy minister in the department. He is not the assistant deputy minister. He is three, four or five rungs down the ladder. I do not know how much contact he had in a direct way with his minister. But, surely, for the Minister of Supply and Services, when the government has found itself in an awkward situation, to stand in the House and name him and blame him for the mess and, in effect, ruin his professional career, does not sit well with the position the government has taken with regard to its own authority and responsibility.

I am one who thinks we are served by a very efficient public service. When, on a recent occasion, it was attacked in this House, I felt I cculd not keep my seat; I had to stand up and say it as I see it. However, I realize that even the most efficient group of men and women is made up of persons who can make mistakes. We all do so from time to time. A couple of us had to get up in the House yesterday and admit we make mistakes. We admitted it and took the blame for it. A senior public servant, or a public servant a little down the ladder, can make a mistake. Maybe it happens in circumstances when something has to be done. Maybe he should be suspended, or called in on the carpet or, in an extreme case, dismissed. But for a minister to name him publicly in the House of Commons, where the minister has immunity and the public servant cannot reply is, I think, deplorable.

In doing this, the minister is trying to say, "It is not my fault. We came to power prepared to take responsibility and make decisions, but now we have goofed and I say it was not my fault; we are placing the blame on somebody else." I shall not go back to my old profession and preach a sermon, but there is a story in the Old Testament about a golden calf. When Moses came down from the mountain and found that the children of Israel had created this golden calf despite his objection to idolatry, the answer was, "We do not know how it happened. We just put in the gold and out came the calf." This is one of the classic examples of failing to take responsibility.

Yet the Minister of Supply and Services is a member of a government which said things had changed, a government whose attitude was: We are in charge now. We are not letting the public service run things; we are taking the responsibility. Thus, I think the idea the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton had when he put down this motion for discussion, anti-climactic though it may be today, was a good one and I hope that whichever of the two ministers over there is to reply will take the matter seriously.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton and I do not mind being demolished in debate. That is part of the game. But it is not hon. members who are to be demolished. It is an issue which has to be faced, and I hope that whoever replies on behalf of the government will face that issue. It seems to me the best thing that could come out of this debate would be for a minister to say, "Yes, this should not have been done. It was wrong, and as far as the government is concerned it will not happen again."

I do not see how anyone could fail to agree with the first part of the motion which calls attention to the convention of ministerial responsibility. I trust that principle will be endorsed this afternoon. Since ministers over there have faces to save, they will no doubt dislike the latter part of the motion which calls on the House to express its lack of confidence in the government. However, I can tell hon. members opposite that the House is only being asked to express a view which is widely held in this country. Indeed, I believe it is held by a very large majority of the Canadian people. It was a long and sorry list the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton brought to our attention. I might mention some of the items, though I shall not do so in any detail. There was the dredging scandal, the judges' affair, the Sky Shops situation and, finally, the Orion debacle resulting in the loss of $16 million because of fumbling which was the responsibility of the government. It may be that the Orion affair is not over even now,

because there are reports that something else is in the wind—

An hon. Member: In what newspaper?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It was in the *Wall Street Journal*—we have to keep in touch with the organs of my hon. friends.

An hon. Member: Be careful, now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I refer particularly to the statement in that newspaper that an announcement might not be made until after parliament has recessed. That is one of the favourite tricks of the government when it has something embarrassing to announce; it waits until parliament recesses before doing so.

As the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton pointed out, this session has already lasted—what is it—329 days. Before it ends it will probably have gone on for two full years from September, 1974, until September or October, 1976, and it is a session which has been characterized by messes. The present Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), when he was minister of transport, came out with that truism about transportation policy being in a mess. It still is. At the moment, transportation policy, in particular with respect to aviation, is in a mess.

Agricultural policy is in a mess. There are messes with respect to energy, messes caused by the shortcomings of the government in the field of housing and environmental control. I suppose the word "mess" applies in a double way to our lakes, rivers and air—and because we have a government which cannot even manage to get a session of parliament over in the usual year or 18 months, we should not be surprised if it compounds this messy situation. When we turn to consider the anti-inflation program, we find that an extensive bureaucracy has been set up to make sure that wage increases do not take place beyond certain levels, though price increases continue to make life difficult for our people.

● (1640)

It is a two-year mess, this first session of the thirtieth parliament. Even if I cannot persuade my ministerial friends across the way to agree with the latter part of the motion, the fact is it is true that most of the Canadian people do not have confidence in the present government.

I want to say a word or two about one or two other things that are the cause of the lack of confidence. One of my friends across the way, if he were here, would say he knows what is coming, and he would be right. I know that a little bit was done in the first part of this session in respect of the Canada Pension Plan, but in the main this has been a very disappointing session of parliament in so far as the pensioners of Canada are concerned. No increase has been provided at all in the basic pension paid under old age security, except, of course, the cost of living increase that comes along every three months, always five or seven months behind, leaving our senior citizens in worse trouble as time goes on.

The one change that was made in the Old Age Security Act created another mess, and that is the provision for spouses' allowances which are payable only to persons who are married to and living with their spouses. I am speaking now of persons between 60 and 65 years of age. The allowance is not available to persons in that age bracket if they are spinsters, widows, bachelors or widowers. The letters we all get from persons who were not aware of what was happening in the debate express amazement. They suggest that surely this was an oversight or a failure to think the thing through, and that a government of a civilized country like Canada would not provide a pension for a spouse who has another spouse, since they can somehow get along, but would not provide it for a person who is living in the single status of any of the categories I have already mentioned.

That is a mess, and the fact that it is a mess has now been demonstrated by some answers to questions I received a few days ago to the effect that now there are about 200 cases a month of spouses who started to draw the pension but who are losing them because the elder spouse in the meantime has died. So many wives of 62 with husbands of 67, for example, were receiving the spouses' allowance. Then a few months later this generous Liberal government takes that allowance away, because the other spouse has died. The word "mess" certainly applies down the line.

We had a bill earlier in this session, Bill C-52, that had to do with the pensions in the public service. There, again, the government failed to meet a number of very crucial situations. We took care of our own pensions, of course; we seemed to be able to do that. We took care of our pay a year or so ago, over my objection. But in terms of the needs of many of our people, these needs have not been met during the course of this session.

In addition to all these other things, the difficulties we are having with relations in the public service, and so on, we have a total picture that nobody on that side can look at with any sense of pride. When the vote is called on this motion, it is pretty clear how we will vote. We will vote for it because what it says is true, that there ought to be an affirmation of the importance of the convention of ministerial responsibility. It is also true when it says that this House—and, I would add, the majority of the people of Canada—no longer has confidence in that government across the way.

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, today this House is here to discuss ministerial responsibility. Rather than examining a specific policy or decision, our objective is to look at something which is less tangible but perhaps of greater import, namely, the conduct of government per se, for it is this, the conduct of government, which is at the core of ministerial responsibility. What, though, is meant by this term which is bruited about so freely?

In Canada, the basis of the term lies in the British tradition that a minister is responsible for the probity of his ministery and of its employees. We seem, however, to have modified this principle somewhat. There are now few who would extend this notion to make the minister responsible for the honesty and propriety of every action of his department. While this has reduced the range of ministerial responsibility, a new connotation has added a dimension to the term.

Ministerial Responsibility

In addition to probity in the conduct of affairs, we also demand diligence of the minister in seeing that the affairs of his department are undertaken with a basic level of competence. While it might seem more accurate to call this expectation ministerial competence rather than responsibility, this would be a mistake, for the basic principle remains that the minister is responsible for the conduct of his department's affairs. Above all, the minister is bound to ensure that his actions set an example for diligence, honesty and competence. He can scarcely excoriate a subordinate for laxness if he has been lax himself; for dishonesty, if he has been dishonest himself; or for incompetence, if he has been incompetent himself. The Canadian people should demand from their government behaviour which at the very minimum meets these criteria.

I intend to use this opportunity to examine in detail one case, namely, the financing of the LRPA project. I intend to look at it, however, not so much for the content of the decision but, rather, for what it reveals of the process and style of decision-making as practiced by the current government. In this process we will find revealed the increasing inability of the Liberals to conduct the day to day business of government.

We are not concerned here with corruption, chicanery, or even with the incoherence of the government's approach to defence policy. Rather, it is a lack of simple competence in carrying out the decisions which confront them. Because the government's blundering in this case has been both obvious and enormous, it has afforded the House a rarely equalled opportunity to catch a glimpse of the reality of decision-making as it is conducted by the Liberal cabinet.

Before I begin my analysis of the cabinet's actions, however, I wish to apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members present, and beg their indulgence, as the information which I will present is far from straightforward. As a result of the government's unwillingness to let the House or the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence have access to much of the relevant documentation or to several important witnesses, the story must be pieced together from a variety of sources and teased out of ministers' obfuscatory statements. The results are difficult to follow and not entirely unambiguous. However, the general lesson is clear. We find here a cabinet conducting the nation's business without even a minimum of competence.

Let us begin with the rather surprising statement made on Friday last by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson). In response to my question asking whether he knew by about mid-November "that the commitment by Lockheed to provide interim financing for the LRPA project was purely verbal", the minister replied:

> I did not know that in mid-November ... about the middle of December ... was also the first time I learned there was only a verbal agreement.

This is recorded in *Hansard* at page 14657. This means that the minister did not know, he now claims, about the verbal agreement. This is in direct contradiction of everything we had been led to believe up to that time. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, as I go through several statements here, to note how often we heard the word "said" and how often we hear the word "told".

[Mr. McKinnon.]

You might wonder why the minister has changed his declaration from one of easy compliance with what his officials told him to one of denying that he knew it. I suggest to you that it might be that, as the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) was well off in denying that he knew about the agreement, blaming it on a subordinate, the Minister of National Defence is now trying to do the same thing.

● (1650)

While this admission of ignorance as to the details of the financing of a billion dollar purchase is surprising for the lack of diligence it reveals on the minister's part it implicitly contradicts his earlier statements. Indeed, the minister had, until last Friday, never wavered for a second from his contention that the whole cause of the misunderstanding was that Lockheed said it could arrange financing and then later said it could not. The Minister of National Defence has consistently identified himself with his officials on this position. The full position the minister has taken can be deduced from his various statements to the House and to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. The Minister of National Defence told the first meeting of that committee which was considering the estimates:

> —it was during the final negotiation of the contract that we learned that Lockheed was not going to be able to provide the financing for the short-term production-phase payments which we had believed the company could provide.

That was what he said on March 23. At the same meeting he admitted there was a difference between the funds available in the DND budget and the funds required. He said:

> It was that difference which was to be financed. It was known then and now and Lockheed indicated they could finance that previous difference. Subsequently, they said they could not and that is the sole source of the misunderstanding.

That is what the minister said on March 23. Further, he said:

> The misunderstanding was that we believed, and my officials were told by Lockheed, they could finance the difference. They subsequently told us they could not.

These are the words of the minister who said he never knew there was a verbal agreement. Further in the minister's statement, he said:

> And we were satisfied then—

Meaning in November.

> —that they had the financial capability to complete the contracts ... we had also been talking at the same time with Boeing ... and Boeing gave us the same assurance that they could assist with the financing.

He went on to say:

> It did not seem to me there were very real difficulties in arranging the financing.

I would draw to the attention of the House the minister's use of the word "me". The minister seems to have been of the opinion that there would not be substantial problems associated with financing for a company that had had prolonged financial difficulties and was in the throes of scandals which could not but jeopardize its future hope for contracts. This despite the fact that the minister had had the problem of financing brought to him by General Allan, according to General Allan's testimony on April 13 before

the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. When I inquired on May 6 why the Minister of Supply and Services claimed he did not know about the shortfall and the verbal agreement, the deputy minister of national defence, Mr. Nixon, declined to answer directly, stating:

> We as officials certainly informed Mr. Richardson, and I can only presume that the people in Supply and Services had equally informed Mr. Goyer of the situation.

That quotation is taken from the *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence* of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence of May 6, at page 37:6; yet the minister now claims he never knew there was a verbal agreement. Mr. Nixon at that time admitted he would have preferred a written assurance that financing could be arranged. This is what Mr. Nixon said:

> —but I think General Allan and I have both made it clear to the committee that if time had permitted under the circumstances in which we had this understanding that Lockheed could provide the financing, it should have been in writing, but not being in writing it did not obligate you to something of undue proportion.

The Minister of National Defence agreed with this contention.

> The truth is that General Allan was told and believed that the shortfall could be financed by the Lockheed Company. He was told the same thing by the Boeing company.

Those are the words of the minister who said he never knew of any verbal agreement. When asked if the Minister of Supply and Services knew this, the Minister of National Defence said:

> I will not speak for another minister but I know it was in the cabinet document, as I have said, and which cabinet considered.

That is from the *Minutes and Proceedings of Evidence* of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence of May 27. The minister went on to say:

> It was certainly not, and I have said this before, the Department of National Defence that said, let us finance the shortfall, let us do it that way. Other departments of government said that in order to hold down government expenditure next year and the year afterwards we only want you to spend so much. I said, all right, we will only spend that much. The payments required are so much. I think the figures are $140 million in the first year. So that must be financed. That is what took place.
>
> As I said before, it is not really very hard to re-enact the circumstances. But when we started in to the further negotiations, Lockheed said that they could not proceed. This is the crux of the matter. I think if you have to place the blame somewhere, it was a failure of Lockheed to be able to do what they said they could do.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where in all this can one find the slightest trace that the Minister of National Defence was ignorant of the fact that this was a verbal agreement they were talking about. I would like to point out something the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is often fond of saying, that is, that Machiavelli said one who deceives will always find those who will allow themselves to be deceived. There was a lot of deception going on in this case, according to the senior members of the cabinet who claim that they were just simple people who believed everything everybody ever told them. They had no hesitation in believing this and in giving away at least $16 million of the Canadian taxpayers' money on the strength of their gullibility.

The statements that I have quoted thus far were made by the minister and his subordinates only at the end of a long and painful process stretching over a number of months in which the minister and his colleagues had sought to keep the details of their conduct from the public. The Minister of National Defence did, however, let the House know in late March that the problems revolved around the interim financing. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that before that he tried to blame it on Lockheed's bribery around the world and suggested that this was holding up the signing of the contract. In March he said it was his opinion that it was the Lockheed company's fault that the financing was not forthcoming. On March 26 he affirmed this. He said:

> There was a difference between the amount of funds available in the National Defence budget and the progress payments required by Lockheed. We explained this and were told by Lockheed that the difference could be financed by them.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the minister had claimed he did not know it was verbal. In the days up until March he said they were told by Lockheed of the difficulties in respect of financing.

> Subsequently they told us they could not do it. That is all there is to the misunderstanding. It is serious, but easy to explain.

I trust that the government will not find it so easy to explain this in the years ahead. On March 30 the Minister of National Defence went on to say:

> Mr. Speaker, as recently as this morning, and on numerous earlier occasions, I talked with the officials who were negotiating with Lockheed and they were very clearly of the belief that Lockheed could provide this financing. They were so told and they so reported to us, and it was on that basis that we continued—

They had been told that it was a verbal agreement and the minister now claims he knew nothing about it. It seems logical to conclude that if the officials reported what they were told, and it was on that basis that "we" continued, then it seems to me that the Minister of National Defence and anyone else included in the term "we" must have known Lockheed gave a verbal, not a written, assurance.

● (1700)

This reasonable conclusion does, however, fly in the face of the minister's statement of Friday past. Are we then to conclude that the minister and his officials did not bother to inquire in any detail into the financing arrangements to be made by Lockheed, despite the minister's claim that the problem and its severity had been recognized by the minister and his colleagues a month before they were informed by Lockheed that they could not undertake the financing alone? Again I will quote the minister:

> The need for financing, as I have said many times, was known during November and was the subject of discussion in the cabinet, the cabinet committee and the Treasury Board.

The minister does seem to be affirming that the decision on financing was seen as vital, yet despite that perception he made no real effort to see that the interim financing was in fact being arranged. If there was no verbal agreement and no written agreement, what on earth were they going on—pipe dreams?

What are we to conclude from this examination of the statements of the minister and his staff? The overwhelming feeling which one gets from looking at the record is that the government lacked all common sense, to say nothing of business acumen. The inadequacies that have been demonstrated are not restricted to the Minister of National Defence alone for he has involved his colleagues by saying

that the fact that financing was needed was pointed out in the cabinet documents, and that it was on the basis that both companies could provide financing that negotiations continued, that cabinet decided on a particular plane, and that cabinet decided to pay for the plane by a financing rather than a direct funding route. He has also admitted that perhaps "all of them"—one assumes he means his colleagues in cabinet—should have looked more closely at this financing question.

The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) has been vague in his replies as to whether he knew how the financing was to be arranged. He did not say whether he knew or not if there was a verbal agreement. He just stated that he agrees with whatever the Prime Minister had said in his latest statement. Obviously if cabinet decided on the commercial financing route, this involved Lockheed, but the President of the Treasury Board will not say whether he knew that Lockheed had given any assurances—verbal or otherwise—that it could arrange financing.

The Minister of Supply and Services has, however, consistently maintained that he did not know until mid-December that the Lockheed commitment to provide financing was based on nothing more than a verbal agreement. Far from claiming to have been misled by Lockheed he has stated:

> In all the negotiations with Lockheed I do not have to complain at any time about the behaviour of the company nor about their ethics.

This was recorded in *Hansard* of April 5, at page 12437.

The Prime Minister seems to have changed his story in a most blatant manner. Having said on June 3 and 8 that they—the government—negotiated on the basis of a verbal agreement with Lockheed, on June 10 he said that he, like the Minister of National Defence, only knew of the verbal agreement in mid-December. This was two weeks after they had decided to go ahead with the contract, seemingly contradicting what he said on June 3 and 8. It appears inconsistent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired. If he does not have much more of his speech left, perhaps he could get the consent of the House to carry on.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the House and I will try to be brief.

The Prime Minister said, "We had been assured that Lockheed could supply it", meaning money. If there was no written assurance, and the Prime Minister says he did not know there was a verbal assurance, then what kind of assurance did they have? None at all.

Presumably the Prime Minister would say there is no inconsistency in these statements—that what these statements really mean is that they negotiated on the basis of a verbal agreement without knowing at the time that it was a verbal agreement. If this is the Prime Minister's justification then it says little for his own judgment or that of his colleagues. What it means is that no one ever thought to check into this financing question, that they simply proceeded on an assumption, and that the whole cabinet, not just the Minister of National Defence and his officials, were gullible and imprudent.

If no one, including the Minister of National Defence, heard anything about a verbal commitment from Lockheed that financing could be arranged, this means that they all assumed—totally incorrectly—that the contractor would and could provide financing. This assumption was ludicrous for two reasons: first, Lockheed's financial situation, and second, defence contracts such as this, which involve research and development, setting up new production lines, etc., are never more than 20 per cent funded by the contractor unless the circumstances are exceptional. Given Lockheed's position, it would be lucky to find that 20 per cent, let alone more.

A verbal commitment from Lockheed is at least some explanation of why the cabinet acted as it did; with no commitment of any kind from Lockheed. It means cabinet just went ahead on the basis of assumptions or wishful thinking. If they assumed there was a commitment in writing, ministers should at the very least have asked to look at it. The Prime Minister has said that they acted in good faith though perhaps imprudently. Since when have we started electing governments who feel entitled to act imprudently so long as they do so in good faith?

What are we now to conclude about ministerial responsibility and the government's conduct? Thus far there seems to be no indication whatsoever that the probity of the government is in question. Despite a sometimes rather craven willingness to blame others, there is no hint of the corruption which has tainted Lockheed contracts elsewhere. The same cannot be said of their competence in the discharge of their duties. The government, both as personified in the cabinet as a whole and in the person of several of the ministers, seems not to have taken the most elementary precautions in the financing of this contract.

The government is responsible for this fiasco. We heard the Minister of Supply and Services say today that the government made its first payment on it, amounting to $10,800,000, all for nothing. The concept of ministerial responsibility requires that those whom the Prime Minister finds to be at fault must be asked to resign.

Finally, I would remind the Prime Minister that it is he and his colleagues in the cabinet who are responsible for the actions of the members of their departments; attempts to blame them for the ministers' errors are a denial of their responsibility. In this context I would ask the Prime Minister to recall the words of Machiavelli: "One who is not wise himself cannot be well advised".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Donald C. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with those who have moved this opposition motion today because I find unacceptable the conduct of the government, and particularly its tendency to always find means to shirk its own responsibilities by putting them in most cases on the shoulders of a scapegoat or by not recognizing them.

Mr. Speaker, ministerial responsibility is at the basis of our parliamentary democracy; once eroded, we would have difficulty in restoring it. There has already been some mention of a few cases of lack of responsibility, for instance in the case of the Department of Supply and

Services, and in the case of the former Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand), who admitted in the House the mess existing in his department. And we have just witnessed a similar case of lack of responsibility on the part of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) and the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer). But my comments today concern the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), and I would like to tell him through you how he has in my opinion evaded his own responsibilities.

Among the duties of the President of the Treasury Board is the responsibility to negotiate in good faith with various organized units in the public service: typists, engineers, professional external services agents, filers, researchers, and so on. In this regard, his department, the Treasury Board, has made so many mistakes, has allowed so much injustices that today, in the public service and among the public servants, there is an attitude of frustration, fear, unstability and uncertainty for their own future and that of their children.

Mr. Speaker, because of these abuses the public service which is so devoted, loyal and qualified is now becoming a group of people who no longer know where to turn to protect their carreers. Those people, those servants of the great Canadian public, are becoming more and more disillusioned. In the past, they carried out their functions and duties with a certainty, a pride and a precision which was admired throughout the world. They were an inspiration, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, it is no longer the case. What we now see are demoralized senior public servants. I would therefore like to give a few examples.

● (1710)

[*English*]

In the House I asked questions on a number of occasions indicating the areas in which the Treasury Board had not properly fulfilled its function. I do not think I should have to go over them all, but I feel that I should at least cite them and demand some sort of reckoning. The first one I recall, since assuming the responsibilities I have been asked to assume in my party, is one affecting an arbitration award to a group of public functionaires. It was with regard to the forestry and biological sciences group of the Professional Association of the Public Service of Canada. That was a technical professional group which was highly qualified and anxious to do its work, and instead of striking, as it could have done, it opted for the arbitration route. What happened? The dates are here. It was on May 3 that I raised the question. The arbitration award came down and was accepted by the Treasury Board and by this group. If I remember correctly, the award came down just after the Anti-Inflation Board had been put into place.

An arbitration award is just exactly that. It must be recognized as one of the legitimate procedures of the bargaining process. If it is not accepted as an arbitration, we must go to some other method. However, the Treasury Board decided on its own to push aside that arbitration award and refer the matter to the Anti-Inflation Board, and there the award was set aside. I still think that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) ought to have recognized the award which was given by the arbitration tribunal, but he found a means of putting on someone else's shoulders the responsibility for setting aside an award with which he felt he would rather not agree. That was the first instance.

I brought the second instance to the minister's attention and he undertook to look into it.

Incidentally, I mentioned this arbitration award in the Miscellaneous Estimates Committee on May 17 as well. To my knowledge it has not been resolved, and I would be glad if, when the minister gets a chance to consider the procedures today, he can find out just how far this matter has come, recognized his responsibilities and put things back on the rails.

The second matter is one which stems from 18 months ago. I raised the question first in 1975 in one of the committees of which I am a member, and it referred to the disbanding of a group of highly qualified and multi disciplined public servants who had been brought together into a unit called the Defence Research Board. This group has been disbanded, and the members were told that they would be allocated to other parts of the civil service. That was 18 months or perhaps two years ago, and they are still waiting to find out just what role they play and how they fit into the public service, because their prior employment was part of a separate organization. This is an abdication of the responsibility of the Treasury Board for making sure that these devoted public servants, whose objective in life is to serve the Canadian people, are not cast aside. Their rightful awards are being completely neglected.

Another matter came to my attention earlier this month. There was a group, and this time it was the economists, sociologists, and statisticians who were getting ready for their negotiations, and just prior to submitting their demands, which were negotiable, they received from Treasury Board an indication that the whole group was to be reclassified, and that threw the whole thing into disarray. That is the sort of activity a responsible minister would not allow to happen in his department. I deplore it because of what it is doing to the public service and because the government claims it wishes to respect the principles of collective bargaining.

[*Translation*]

And finally, this government has so much speeded up the bilingualization program of the civil service that the results could have been expected because there is no doubt that this speeding up policy has compelled many officials to resign or accept a transfer to other jobs for which they are not necessarily qualified.

The speedy application of the policy and the mistakes made consequently have been strongly criticized in the recent report of the Language Commissioner. Before quoting from that report, I would like to provide some clarifications to make you understand my position and that of the Progressive Conservative Party on the application of the bilingualism legislation. I hasten to note that we support the principle on which that legislation is hased, that is the Canadian people are entitled to the services provided by federal government in the official language of their choice.

[*English*]

To be more specific, section 9 of the Official Languages Act, to which we subscribe without any hesitation, reads as follows:

[*Translation*]

Every department and agency of the Government of Canada and every judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative body or Crown Corporation, established by or pursuant to an Act of the Parliament of Canada, has the duty to ensure that members of the public can obtain available services from and can communicate with it in both official languages.

● (1720)

[*English*]

This position is clear and unequivocal. It cannot be questioned.

[*Translation*]

But we refuse to accept without protesting the actions that demoralize and destroy honest and diligent civil servants. To illustrate my point, let me first quote an excerpt from the Commissioner's report to Parliament as found on page 4. I quote:

On November 21, 1974, the President of the Treasury Board announced the creation of a research project led by recognized linguists to determine why some persons appear unable to learn a second language and whether, as a consequence, teaching methods could be improved. The study group, headed by Dr. Gilles Bibeau of the University of Montreal, set about examining all elements entering into provision of language training in the public service.

The Bibeau commission proceeded with its enquiry and I read as follows:

One of Professor Bibeau's main conclusions is that many of the roughly 53,000 bilingual positions identified in 1973-74 were chosen without regard to any detailed evaluation of each department's specific needs. Indeed, levels of second-language ability required by various occupational categories for bilingual positions had been established in 1969 by the Public Service Commission in the following manner:

In other words, the policy was a failure and that failure is acknowledged by the Commissioner of Official Languages in his report.

[*English*]

To give some idea of the problems that this is creating for good honest well-meaning public servants who find, for one reason or another, that they are unable to learn a second language, I should just like to read from two letters that have passed over my desk recently. I am not going to cite names because I do not want to get anybody into trouble, but these are authentic documents and the names are here.

A civil servant at Shirley's Bay approximately nine years away from retirement finds that his job has been declared bilingual. He has been in the security line, presumably on perimeter security to make sure that the Shirley's Bay operations are not tampered with. I look back to the Bibeau report. Is this one of the 53,000 posts that were declared bilingual for no good reason other than to have 53,000 to report? I suspect it is.

This man tried to learn French but he is tone deaf. Anyone who has tried to learn a language, particularly at a certain age, knows that you need some tonality—you have to be able to hear changes from what you normally hear. The deafness does not affect his work and he has indicated that he very rarely needs the second language and gets along very well with one. Suddenly he was sent a letter on April 1 of this year which informed him that his position had been made bilingual and telling him that he should resign by letter immediately. The letter, which grieved me, said:

As you were unsuccessful in attaining the required level of language proficiency in the other official language—

He is tone deaf and has no need to use the language in his position, Mr. Speaker.

—those aspects of your duties which resulted in your position being identified as bilingual, shall not be carried out by you.

Even before this letter was sent it had been determined that an employee of the bilingual division of the public service was phoning around to other people in his division asking if they would take on his job. Is this the way to maintain morale in a public service? I must say I find it deplorable.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Despicable.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I am surprised that the President of the Treasury Board should accept it. There is another letter I should like to quote from which came from a highly trained professional scientist. I am not going to give the name but I have the letter. The division in which he was working has given national leadership in technology, training methods, and efficient management methods. I have to avoid a little bit of this because it could be identified. They publish their works in both French and English on the development of the system, and have received national and international acclaim. A second edition of one of their works has been published, and a request has been received from Spanish-speaking countries to have it translated.

The director of this particular part of the public service has developed his unit to the point where it has full international recognition. It has been operated as a bilingual unit for a long time and has played a major role in encouraging institutions in the province of Quebec to improve their methods and training.

All of a sudden this man and his administrator were called to go to a language course. The administrator had just finished a course in organization and administrative management by objective. He had just reported back when he got another letter to go off to a French course. They were expecting to implement the management by objective procedures that he had learned when he was sent off on two weeks' notice. My friend here suspected he would have two weeks's notice or so, and was making plans accordingly. But not a bit of it; he received two days' notice. Having cancelled his engagements he reported to the Centre Asticou in Hull. Unfortunately this is not where the story ends. He reminds me that in this sort of thing he is taken out of the world to which he has been committed all his life, and he writes;

This is grossly unreasonable and shows a flagrant lack of understanding of the professional role in the public service. No employer has the right to demand such sacrifice for any person, particularly when a unit has already demonstrated its capability in fully achieving the employer's goals, which includes bilingualistic facility in this instance.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, when he got there he found people who had just joined the public service and had immediately been assigned to the Centre Asticou in Hull. One young person was sent on language training immediately on joining the public service. She had no intention of

working in the public service, and on completion of her training intended to resign with a working knowledge of French and money in the bank. This is no way to run the public service, and the President of the Treasury Board is not living up to his responsibilities. He is always asking for instances, Mr. Speaker, so I can give him instances.

The people who are called there know their careers are at stake. Failure means the end of the road for them. This is a tragic thing to impose upon a man four, five or six years before retirement who has performed his duties. When he joined the public service his contract did not contain any of this, and now he finds his career is jeopardized if he does not succeed.

● (1730)

The other thing—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time having expired, he may only continue to complete his remarks if he has the unanimous consent of the House. Has the hon. member consent to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its indulgence. I shall not be long.

The public servant of whom I am speaking is most detailed in his remarks. He says, "When the language bureau instruct one to report, one must do so." There is none of this business of telephoning and saying, "I have an appointment." Why, the service is worse than the Whips around here, although when the Whip says, "You must be in the House," you make sure you are in the House.

Then he writes, "Can nobody see what these officious incompetents are doing to the morale of public servants?" He says that he was given two days' notice to report, and alleged that this action showed gross insensitivity to his position, function, and responsibilities, thereby unnerving his management team and those with whom he worked. He said that this mindless, officious act was equivalent to hauling a man out of his bed in the middle of the night, to be taken from his family, still dressed in night attire. He went on to write, "Can nobody see what these officious incompetents are doing to the morale of public servants?" I hope the President of the Treasury Board is now aware of the situation. The public servant went on to say, "What is more important, cannot the cabinet see the damage it is doing to management in all government departments?"

A few lines later he said that one could not ask for a better public service unit; it is a great service, but is being demoralized. He mentions what happened to an administrative officer, and why, because at a crucial time he was sent off on a certain course, he was unable to attain certain management objectives. Mr. Speaker, it is sheer nonsense to send a man off to a management course and then, as soon as he returns, to send him on another course.

The writer of the letter said:

> In the meantime the indecent haste with which the language blitzkreig is being waged on a demoralized public service indicates that our political masters clearly place 'instant' bilingualism far above more efficient use of public funds . . .

Although I value bilingualism in the public service, I do not value the way it is being imposed.

The writer of the letter was true to his own character; he said:

> I believe in the coexistence of the two founding cultures . . . It requires fostering and funding. We need better and more translation services. We need to train good language graduates as highly competent specialists; we need Francophones and Anglophones side by side across Canada.

He then asked:

> Are you aware that when one is interviewed for language training the interrogator attempts to assess one's beliefs related to bilingualism?

Such an interrogation concerning one's bilingual ability is reprehensible. According to what I hear, people are being interrogated in the manner described. As the writer of the letter says:

> It is insidious interrogation, calculated to look into and manipulate private thoughts, and depending upon the outcome a Canadian's career will be affected . . .
>
> . . . Criticism from within has been scarce and muted. Many are not in a position to do so for they fear for their future. Management by fear has become uppermost in the minds of all public servants. Many Canadians fought and died to prevent such tactics becoming entrenched in the western hemisphere. It is tragic to consider that some of the survivors of that struggle should find themselves at a rather late age as victims of oppression, based on irrationality and . . . political posturings . . .

He believes that we should improve our translation and interpretation services.

He ends his letter with a forthright statement: as a result of this treatment he resigned from the public service and accepted a post in the United States. We have lost a valuable public servant who during his career made a name internationally and who, but for the treatment meted out to him, would have enhanced the reputation of the Canadian public service.

I hope the minister to whom my remarks are directed, a minister prominent for having failed to shoulder the responsibilities he assumed when taking the ministerial oath, will correct the abuses mentioned in order that we may have a good, bilingual public service, able to serve the Canadian people in the official language of their choice.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious, judging by the thrust of the debate begun by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), that he has in mind the by-election coming up in October in Ottawa-Carleton. The constituency is populated mainly by public servants. The hon. member is trying to convince them that somehow the government is anti-public service and that the opposition has a monopoly on concern for those who work day in and day out for the people of Canada. Such a position is not abnormal. I presume that if I were a member of the perpetual opposition—

Mr. Benjamin: You wouldn't know how to handle the job.

Mr. Mackasey: —I would try to change my status. The point is, the hon. member talked almost exclusively about public servants. He forgot that the present government has done more for Canada's public servants than any other government in Canada's history.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Rubbish! The public service is demoralized.

Mr. Mackasey: Unfortunately the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, whom I respect, cannot be here at present because he must attend to certain other matters. No matter what he says, he cannot suggest that any other government has done more for the public service than the present government. We have given them high wages, a good pension plan with indexation, the right to organize, the right to strike, an ample grievance procedure, and an official languages act which the opposition can either accept or not accept. I do not know what the opposition would do but, speaking for myself as part of the minority in the province in which I live, I know the government does not intend to retreat from its determination to open as many careers in Ottawa as possible to bilingual people of this country. Under our policy those who are not bilingual are given the opportunity to become bilingual.

Provisions in the act, known as grandfather clauses, say that certain people, because of their seniority in years and length of service in the public service, need not take language courses. For example, in post offices in Montreal I know there are people without the ability to learn the other language. Because of their years of service in the public service they are entitled to continue as unilingual employees and will not suffer for their inability to learn the other language.

The new person entering the public service is being asked to learn the other language. This qualification is not necessarily a prerequisite. Once the new employee has joined the public service, where it is necessary he or she is asked to take advantage of the opportunity to learn the other language. It is to the everlasting credit of many hon. members opposite and members of my party that members of parliament as well as public servants have taken advantage of this program.

When the opposition bemoan the fate of the public service and try to paint the Liberal government as the enemy of the public service, I suggest it is doing this only because of the upcoming by-election. It is trying to paint this government, as I say, as anti-public service. But it should not be forgotten that day after day in the House of Commons members of the opposition rise to complain about the wages of public servants and about their numbers. They ask, when will we reduce the bureaucracy, or the public service, by 5,000 or 50,000? The opposition raises such questions almost every day.

Mr. Benjamin: Which part of the opposition?

Mr. Mackasey: The official opposition. Day after day its members get up in the House and complain about the size of the bureaucracy. When they are talking about the bureaucracy, they are not talking about the minister, the member of parliament. They are talking about the poor public servant who, day in and day out, has to grit his teeth as somebody gets up during the question period and questions why he has got a job.

● (1740)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Mr. Mackasey: When the opposition says that this has been an unproductive parliament, I refer them to the hundred bills that have been passed in what is a record session of parliament. There was the Petro-Can Act, the Federal Business Development Act, the Citizenship Act which is already through second reading, amendments to the Canada Pension Plan Act, the Salaries Act, the CRTC changes, the amendments to the War Veterans' Allowances Act which my colleague brought in at a time of austerity. I give credit to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who had a part in that.

There was the Lieutenant Governers Superannuation Act, the Environmental Contaminants Act, amendments to the Customs Tariff Act, the Animal Disease and Protection Act, the Canada Business Corporation Act, the Petroleum Administration Act, and to the National Housing Act which latter are already resulting in record building.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: There were amendments to the Public Service Staff Relations Act coming forward from a joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate. That is a study of what can be done to improve the lot of the public servant in the field of industrial relations. Members from both sides of the House as well as of the Senate make up the committee.

There were amendments to the Supreme Court Act. I could go on and on. In fact so much progressive legislation passed this House of Commons it would take the whole half hour to read them. There was the Western Grain Stabilization Act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Why did that take so long? It was because those across the way could not understand it. It took them months and months to understand finally that it was for the benefit of their constituents. There were amendments to the Law Reform Commission Act as well as the Income Tax Act to help the less fortunate. There was the West Coast Ports Operations Act and the Appropriation Act. There was also the Anti-Inflation Act, which I want to talk about in a few moments. I have no hesitation in talking about that. If this House is not a better House, it is because this is the most inept opposition we have seen in many years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: If ministers get away with murder, as has been alleged today, it is because of the ineptitude of the people across the way in the question period and in debate. Perhaps the biggest single problem of that party is that they have no leader in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: When the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) came into the House as Leader of the Opposition, he was here day after day learning his business. The present leader who knows what he should do to weld the opposition as a team rather than divide them is never in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: There has been a lot of talk about parliament. Parliament is not only the government, the members of the majority. It is everyone in this House of Commons. The opposition in this motion suggests that this is a poor parliament. They must realize that they, more than any other single force in the last two years, have been the reason for what they call a poor parliament.

One only has to look at the treatment of the Anti-Inflation Board by the opposition. One day out on the hustings, within the first two months, they criticized the Liberals for stealing their election platform. After we allegedly stole it, they criticized us day in and day out because we put it in place and it happens to be functioning. It is bringing down inflation in this country, as we said it would. What kind of co-operation did we get from the opposition? When they thought they were going to get elected on it, it was their legislation. Now they want to disown it because they think it is unpopular. Well, it is not unpopular because this government is providing the leadership that the people of Canada want.

We have a fine Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), a leader who is in the House of Commons every possible day despite his responsibility as leader of the government, a leader who does not shirk his responsibility.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: He gets up and answers questions. Whether the answer is popular or unpopular, you have to say one thing; he provides what the Canadian people want at this crucial time in our history, leadership.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: When the Prime Minister says that controls and restraints will stay on until inflation is at a controllable level, he means it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a partisan mood today. But since this debate began a couple of hours ago, the official opposition have been portraying themselves as the friends of the public servants. However, after a union exercises its legal right to go on strike, the opposition is the first party to demand that that right be taken away from them. Every time some group goes on strike, the official opposition demands that that right be taken away from the public servants of Canada because it might upset or inconvenience a few people. They regard everything as a national emergency. If you were to poll the opposition tonight, they would say that if they had the opportunity, they would take away from the public servants of this country not only the right to strike but even the right to organize without the right to strike. That has been their position for the past 25 years.

I have in my little department 52,000 public servants. I have been a minister for 8 years. I have had one single case of discrimination brought forward to me as a minister. I came to the conclusion that the public servant had a case, ruled accordingly, and that person received the monetary compensation to which I thought he was entitled. We in this government understand that.

I might sometimes get a little angry and say that we have too many ex-public servants in cabinet. I often state that in good humour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Look at the reaction. I did that on purpose. I said that public servants did not have a chance to run for office and be cabinet ministers. Did you hear the applause? Without realizing it, the members opposite walked into the trap. What they said by their applause, and it will be on the record, is that public servants should not have the right to present themselves as candidates and, least of all, should not have the right to be members of the cabinet.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mackasey: Why were you applauding? The opposition says they should not have the right to be candidates, they should not have the right to be cabinet ministers, they should not have the right to organize, and must not have the right to go on strike. What do they stand for? It is obvious, and I will tell you in a moment what they stand for.

● (1750)

Mr. Ellis: May I ask the minister whether now, or some time before he finishes his discourse, he will accept a question?

Mr. Mackasey: Right now.

Mr. Ellis: Thank you. I ask him whether he is prepared, because of his great benevolence toward all civil servants, to prevail upon the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) to allow members of parliament to knock on the doors of members of the Armed Forces to campaign for election, something they cannot do now?

An hon. Member: Sure, they can.

Mr. Mackasey: I have to consider the hon. gentleman to be a unique Conservative, because once again he is going against the party line. He is so extreme in his left wing tendencies that he does not wish to consider the fact the army must be in a unique position because of the discipline needed and because of its special position in a democracy. When people join the army there are certain disciplines they must accept, as is the case in certain police forces, including the RCMP. These restraints are supposed to be compensated for in other ways, and this is, in fact, the case. Incidentally, the Canadian army never had a better friend than it has in the person of the present Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: When the changes in the Public Service Relations Act come before cabinet I undertake to bring forward the hon. member's representation with respect to members of the army in the hope that by then he will have succeeded in convincing his caucus that this is the official position of the Conservative party.

The motion before us, brought forward so late in the session, is really indicative of the barrenness of the thinking in the party opposite. It is two motions rolled into one, of course, and as I indicated I suspect from the trend of the debate so far that the opposition, in its sudden concern for

the public service, is looking apprehensively toward the by-election which is to take place in Ottawa-Carleton since there is now a pretty good indication that they will lose a contest which a month ago they thought, to use a vernacular expression, was in the bag. They are beginning to worry that Ottawa-Carleton will remain true to the Liberal party as it has for so long.

Because it is getting close to six o'clock, and I want to take only five or ten minutes in which to speak after the recess, let me make it clear that no government has done more for the public service than this government. We have given to certain elements the right to collective bargaining, the right to opt for strike action if that is felt necessary. We have resisted the demands of the opposition to deny that right, particularly at times when members opposite were prepared to remove that democratic privilege on the ground that a strike by public servants was inconveniencing one party or another.

When the chips are down, we live in one of the most democratic countries of the world, and the average Canadian will put up with legal strikes if the alternative is a form of government which infringes to an intolerable degree on civil liberties and freedom. If we on this side have any bias it is to see that public servants continue to enjoy the right to go on strike provided, of course, that they have met the legal requirements. That is official Liberal policy, and we shall find out whether it is official Conservative policy when the appropriate moment comes.

The motion before us is a "nothing" motion. I am suprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre should have stated very early in his address that his two-man party would support the opposition.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Three.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Four.

Mr. Mackasey: Four, then. In any event I suspect that the basic motive of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is the same as that of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. One of the things about being a New Democrat, and even more about the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, is that you become a living example of the old adage which says hope springs eternal in the human breast. The hon. gentleman really has hopes of winning that by-election in Ottawa-Carleton. Thus, when the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton sat down after his eloquent, effective, and persuasive speech, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre got up and virtually endorsed everything which had been said. Summed up in two words, his contribution to the debate was: "Me too."

It may be I am too suspicious. Maybe there has been a change in heart among the opposition. Perhaps they were concerned all these years about the plight of the public servants. Maybe they will stop demanding that we fire or lay-off tens of thousands of public servants across the country. Maybe they will cease to echo some of the editorials appearing in right wing papers in this country which say that bureaucracy is running rampant, that there are thousands on the payroll who should not be there. That is what we read day in and day out. But suddenly, the opposition is prepared to try to find out who these thousands of public servants are. They are people. They are voters. They are, many of them, residents of Ottawa. If the bureaucracy in this country grows it is because we as Canadians want more services, and if we want more services from government a larger bureaucracy is needed to supply them.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the minister permit a question?

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Maybe the question could be asked after supper.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I want to ask the minister whether, when he gets back at eight o'clock, he will deal with the motion, which concerns ministerial responsibility?

Mr. Mackasey: That will be a pleasure.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TABLING OF REPORT OF ANTI-INFLATION ACT ADMINISTRATOR

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please the hon. Minister of National Revenue rises on a point of order.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I might seek the unanimous consent of the House to revert to the tabling of documents in order that I might table the report of the office of the Administrator under the Anti-Inflation Act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Does the hon. minister have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their generous and vocal support of my request to revert to the tabling of documents. Pursuant to Standing Order 41 I should like to table, in both official languages, the report of the office of the Administrator under the Anti-Inflation Act.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):

That this House, finding unacceptable the performance of the Government, particularly its penchant for shifting blame, reaffirms its belief in the importance of the convention of ministerial responsibility and expresses its lack of confidence in the Government.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, at this time—

Mr. Paproski: Let's hear the truth now, and let's hear it for Bryce.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: You have some support on this side. You are not all that bad.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, the only ones supporting me are the philatelists. They want their first cover issues.

An hon. Member: Let's keep this clean.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I am at a handicap as I forgot my glasses.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: It is very difficult.

Mr. Paproski: That's no handicap. You are better without reading it anyway, Bryce.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: As I said before six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was really very disappointed that this is the last opposition day debate before the end of the session. I happen to be a little bit of a traditionalist and I would like to be serious for a moment.

There were two events I enjoyed this session; one was discussing my estimates in the House, which took place on a Friday as I recall when there were a lot of excellent and intelligent questions asked from the local party and the odd one from the opposition. Really it was parliament as I knew it in the 1960's, when you had to defend yourself.

If I have any advice for a friend who might come into the House of Commons it would be that he must learn to defend himself without being personal. If you cannot do this then you do not belong here, because one must look at the House of Commons and come to the conclusion that there have been great speakers, great debaters in this House of Commons and in this country for over 100 years. Somehow they learned the difference between personal vindictiveness and debate. This is a very important point, and it makes all the difference between a job and working at something you enjoy.

I sit here languishing in relative obscurity most days. I must admit that I admire the hon. gentleman representing Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). He has a gift for words, but I admire him because he never gets personal, and I say that sincerely. Mind you, he is very obvious, but that is another thing. He became very obvious early today when suddenly he rediscovered the electors in the public service and the upcoming Ottawa byelection in October.

The amazing thing about that hon. gentleman's speech was that he did not make the point that should have been made when talking about parliament.

Mr. Paproski: You have no excuse now, but you were going great guns without your glasses.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, there is a gentleman out of order, but it is not unusual for the socialists. They have never been in order as long as I can recall.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Just before six o'clock I asked the minister if, when we came back at eight o'clock, he would speak to the motion, and I think his answer was "with pleasure". I wonder whether he is now going to address himself to the motion before us.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): That is what he is doing, but you do not like it.

Mr. Mackasey: My problem was that I did not have my glasses and I was not sure what the motion was.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mackasey: At quarter to ten the House of Commons will express its opinion on the motion as to whether this House has a lack of confidence in the government. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will vote with or against the government, but I am willing to concede, or risk my reputation, by stating that somehow the representatives of the people of Canada will express their confidence in the government that leads them, and in the Liberal party. If I am wrong—

● (2010)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Tell us about ministerial responsibility.

Mr. Mackasey: An hon. gentleman says, "Speak to the motion". I am doing precisely that. I am doing what the hon. gentleman for Winnipeg North Centre said, "Me too". The nice thing about the speech by the hon. gentleman from Grenville-Carleton is he said they are really the unofficial voice of the public service and that we are really bad people on this side in that we have been really hard on the public service. They say, "Look how you have treated a certain individual; we wouldn't do that". But day after day after day someone over there would get up and say, "When are you going to fire 11,000 public servants in the Ottawa district because your office is too big?"

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We never said that.

Mr. Mackasey: More or less in those terms. If you look at *Hansard*, which I did at seven o'clock, I think you will see that there are 40 odd questions which, if you follow through on the implication, will show that in every case they represent criticism, unintentional maybe, of the public service.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Or the government.

Mr. Mackasey: Or of the government, but also the public service. It is not the government which criticized Reisman and Grandy who were public servants.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Retired.

Mr. Mackasey: Who were public servants and then retired. I do not wish to become involved in personalities. However, they are the people who brought up names today, not the government. I do not want to get involved in names. I would rather get to the fact that we live in a society right here which, rightly or wrongly, and I think rightly, is demanding of our private enterprise system a certain quality of life. We are demanding a Gross National Product that can support the poor, the blind, the crippled, the alcoholics, and even the lazy people. We are saying to that private enterprise system, which I think all of us stand for, including the converts in the corner because they become converts when they form provincial governments, that rightly or wrongly it is the best thing for this country but that at the present moment it is subject to a lot of tensions.

For the first time maybe in 30 years these tensions have come in the industrial world, or in the "have" world if you like.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mackasey: I promise, Mr. Speaker, not to be too long. I just want to make a point which is important to me. Perhaps for the first time some of the industrialized nations such as our own are a little uncertain, a little afraid, a little terrified to trust the market place. They are worried because of the OPEC dispute, because of the energy crisis, and because of the environmental problems. They are worried because the poor are no longer passive. They are worried because, ironically in our quite logical dedication to democracy, for the first time all Canadians have a voice through some organization. This is not abnormal. It has penetrated, I believe, the whole western world, the whole of industrialized society. It is bound to have reflected on people. When it reflects on people it is bound to reflect on parliamentarians on both sides of the House. I am being as non-partisan as I can.

What is the problem with which we are faced? The problem is to resist panic. The problem is not to recreate the mood of the thirties when somehow leadership was tired out, and the leaders who then came forward were Hitler and Mussolini who were going to solve all the problems of the world when they were first elected. This is the problem in this country. How do we react to this world-wide situation? It is not really world-wide.

One thing about prosperity is that if you have never known it you never know when you are worse off. The industrialized world has known prosperity for 30 years. Suddenly we are faced with a challenge. We are faced with the thought that there may be no energy in 20 years, the thought that we may destroy the ecology, the thought that just possible our free enterprise system might not be able to provide the wealth that is needed to look after the less fortunate or those who somehow have to be supported, and also provide those who contribute to the quality of life whether they be doctors, dentists, lawyers, teachers or whatever. It would be surprising if the question period and the government's actions did not somehow reflect that concern of the people. Our challenge is to have the courage to resist a mod which if carried to its ultimate, will simply destroy what has taken decades to build—our concern for each other.

I look forward to a country in which we recognize everybody's right the poor and the blind, to a minimum income, but also a society where anybody in this room can have children who, if they want to work 10 or 15 hours a day, can go to it in order to have a two-car garage, a summer home, and have a level of income that is incomparable around the world. This is really why I am here and why most of us are here on both sides of this House. This is why I feel very deeply about this institution. I may be in the minority in my thinking and I do not apologize for that.

I just want to say that as a member of the Liberal party, and as a member of this parliament which has run for 300 and some days, I have no apologies for our records. As I said earlier before six o'clock, we have brought in about 100 meaningful pieces of legislation. When I say "we" I am speaking for everybody, because parliament is not just one party; it is four parties. We are dedicated; we fight; we improve, and hopefully and practically we end up with better pieces of legislation for all Canadians. It really is very unimportant whether one sits here or there so long as one is dedicated to improving society. Much of our legislation has been improved by backbenchers and by opposition members. That is why we are here. We are not here simply to be re-elected.

We must have the courage of our convictions which got us elected in the first place. Mr. Speaker, you might say what does that have to do with the public service? Simply this: if you want government to look after the lame, the poor, the crippled, the blind, and the lazy as well as all the others including, the abandoned mother and the widow, rather than have private enterprise saddled with it, then you have to expect bureaucracy to grow in the same way corporations such as General Motors grow. So it is incidental to me whether the public service is comprised of 5,000 people or 500,000 people. What is important is why we hire them and what they are doing.

I like to see our public service fulfil a useful role. It is the best public service in the world, despite the speech of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton today. The opposition has no monopoly on concern for the public service. I must be partisan to the point of repeating that this is the party, the Liberal party, which gave that public service a

voice in its own destiny, which gave it the right to bargain and the right to strike even as opposed to arbitration if it felt this necessary after it met the requirements. This is the party which gave public servants a decent income, which gave them a decent pension, and we have no apologies to make to the public service. They know it, and the opposition knows it.

I am not blaming the hon. gentleman for preparing the ground for the Ottawa by-election. I would be doing it too. I will be there at that by-election, as he will, and we will end up good friends, as we are now.

● (2020)

I want to say in conclusion that the Liberal party has nothing to apologize for, both in its relationship with the public service and in its record as a government in the last couple of years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to repeat the comments of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Mackasey). I had the privilege to act as the co-chairman of the committee considering labour relations in the public service and as such I have noted the efforts made by the members of every party within that committee to protect the rights of civil servants in Ottawa and elsewhere in Canada who are responsible under the legislation governing labour relations in the civil service.

[*English*]

I would simply like to repeat that in effect when dealing with the public service at the federal level we established, in terms of labour relations for the public servants in Canada at the federal level, a system which has not been equalled in any of the public services anywhere else in the western world. Those advantages that befall public servants in terms of labour relations at the federal level in Canada are the envy of public services throughout the world. We provided them with the right to strike, and indeed we have protected them with benefits that will continue to be provided to them.

Also we are providing for the public servants in Canada the continuation of the principle which has been espoused in parliamentary democracy, that is the principle of anonymity, the principle that public servants are responsible to the House of Commons through their minister. That principle has not been changed and it is honoured every day in the House. No one will deny that in the question period, the period which is the most interesting and followed most closely by the public, every minister in the government answers for his department in terms of policy and in terms of administration. That principle has been recognized and no one denies it.

I was really disapppointed with the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). When he introduced his motion I thought he would address himself to the question of ministerial responsibility which, in my view, has received a great deal of attention as the result of the statement made by the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer). But no, he was too interested in making some possible gain, in trying, in his particular style, to draw attention to his presence in the House by making a speech that is strictly political and partisan in nature.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blais: I had hoped that he would deal with the interesting and essential problem of parliamentary democracy in our adversary system. However, he did not deal with it. I left ten minutes before the end of his speech because I was disappointed that he had not dealt with the basic issue. On my return I inquired to see whether he had deigned to deal with the issue, but I found that he had not. He spent all his time dealing with the Orion case and with the Minister of Supply and Services, without specifying why he believed the conduct of the minister to have been in contravention of the recognized principle of ministerial responsibility.

On the other hand, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) did bring his attention, even though only glancingly, to the question of ministerial responsibility, primarily in requesting the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Mackasey) to deal with that issue. That was the contribution of the hon. member. I cannot understand it because members of the opposition have a wealth of material upon which to draw in order to deal with the doctrine of ministerial responsibility for this government has been immersed in that particular doctrine. As I understand it, there are two aspects to the doctrine, if I may be so bold as to deal with the issue at hand.

An hon. Member: Yes, dredging and Sky Shops.

Mr. Blais: The first one is the doctine of collective ministerial responsibility, namely, the responsibility of the cabinet which is the collective responsibility of the whole front bench on the government side. That particular principle has been honoured increasingly since the coming of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in 1968.

An hon. Member: The coming of the Prime Minister?

Mr. Blais: In support of my contention I draw the attention of hon. members opposite—individually perhaps they might not be able to comprehend it but perhaps collectively they might be able to bring some intelligence to bear on an article written by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp).

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blais: It is entitled "Decision-making".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The parliamentary secretary has the floor. I suggest that we should listen and we might learn something.

Mr. Blais: It is entitled "Decision-making in the Federal Cabinet". The President of the Privy Council has been a minister and a public servant. That has been stated by members of the opposition and members on this side on a number of occasions. He entered the public service when Mackenzie King was still prime minister. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will remember that epoch. It was in 1942 that the President of the Privy Council entered

the public service. He describes the situation as he found it in those days, with a great deal of accuracy. He states in that article which was published in the "Canadian Public Administration," volume 19, in the spring of 1976, that he entered the public service in 1942. Then he goes on to say:

The tradition was an oral one, and the recommendations of ministers were seldom rejected. Cabinet agenda were reasonably flexible so that matters could be raised of which notice had not been given . . .

There were few formal cabinet committees except Treasury Board, the Defence Committee and, for a time the Wheat Committee. Proposals by ministers came before cabinet in the first instance and only in the event of disagreement were they referred to ministerial committees which were more often than not ad hoc. At that time, interdepartmental committees of officials were more numerous than ministerial committees.

A great many comments were made this afternoon relating to the suspicion that the public service in Canada at one time really governed the government. There might have been some reason for that suspicion at the time when the President of the Privy Council first entered the public service. He states in the article:

When I arrived in Ottawa at the beginning of 1942, I recall Dr. Mackintosh's account of how he had been instructed to prepare a statement for Mr. King to use when announcing on the radio the over-all price ceiling which came into effect toward the end of 1941. He showed his draft to the prime minister who, after reading the opening paragraphs, looked up and said: 'This is important, isn't it, Dr. Mackintosh?' I couldn't imagine Mr. Pearson or Mr. Trudeau being so unaware of the momentous consequences of introducing over-all price controls.

● (2030)

Indeed he says in his article that in those days decisions originated much more in the public service than they did in the cabinet itself. He goes on in his article as follows:

The main characteristic of the Trudeau Cabinet in my judgment has been the application of the principle of collegiality, the practical application of the concept of joint responsibility.

Under Mr. Trudeau all proposals must be fully documented, their conclusions and recommendations based on a careful consideration of alternatives and presentation of the arguments pro and con. Lengthy documents must be accompanied by a summary in both official languages . . . Caucus consultations must be described or reasons given if these have not taken place.

I can personally attest to the fact that cabinet decisions now cannot be taken unless there has been prior caucus consultation.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is why they are so bad.

Mr. Blais: That caucus consultation has been substantial and very beneficial, if we consider the list of statutes and enactments which were enumerated by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs this afternoon. The President of the Privy Council stated further as follows:

The general rule, to which there are extremely few exceptions, is that proposals are referred in the first instance to the cabinet committees for consideration and decision or, failing decision, report to cabinet.

He goes on to say the following:

The Trudeau approach to decision-making in the cabinet has had many consequences. Perhaps one of its most significant has been to require ministers to become knowledgeable, even expert, to an extent that was not required of them in the past.

My impression is that for these reasons ministers are not as dependent upon their principal civil servant advisers for policy guidance as they were in earlier administrations and that interdepartmental committees, while they remain numerous, are not as significant in the decision-making process as they once were.

This afternoon the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre alluded to that fact. Although his particular position in this House did not permit him to commend the government for having taken these initiatives, I could read between the lines that indeed he approved of the greater political input in the government decision-making process. I do as well, because at this particular time we are facing a development of the powers of the House.

It is not a question, as has been said by hon. members of the opposition, of reinstating in the House powers which once were within this House. I disagree. It is a question of evolution. As members of parliament we are headed toward an increase in the control we can have over the operations of the government and over the administrative aspects of government and the bureaucracy. More and more, members of parliament are becoming ombudsmen vis-à-vis the bureaucracy in the public service, and members of parliament on both sides of the House are demanding more power, more time in the House, more control over the operations of the government and of the bureaucracy, and that is as it should be. I fully agree with that.

When we look at the changes which are being announced, undoubtedly the government in the next session will be introducing legislation relating to freedom of information. That is an essential piece of legislation, but I am surprised that hon. members opposite have not directed their minds to the principle of individual ministerial responsibility vis-à-vis the question of freedom of information. That is one of the major stumbling blocks.

When the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton attacks the Minister of Supply and Services for having chastised or castigated a member of the public service in the House, he is working against his own interest with regard to freedom of information because there is nothing wrong with what the minister did. That course of action has been followed in parliamentary democracies such as ours. It has been followed in Westminster, in New Zealand, and in Australia, and if I may quote from an article—

An hon. Member: You are showing your ignorance.

Mr. Blais: I am not showing ignorance at all. I am just showing more depth than the hon. member who is singing on the other side.

I would like to call the attention of the House to an article published by Hutchinson in 1961 and written by C. Marshall entitled "Some Problems of the Constitution". Under the heading "Responsibility for Civil Servants", at page 84 it is stated:

There seems to be uncertainty about the doctrine that Ministers are responsible for every act of their Civil Service subordinates. Sir Ivor Jennings in his *Cabinet Government* speaks of 'the responsibility of the Minister for every act done in his department'. In Mr. Herbert Morrison's words, 'There can be no question whatever that Ministers are responsible for everything that their officers do!' The Minister 'is responsible for every stamp stuck on an envelope'. Now it is clear in the light of earlier discussion of the term 'responsible' that such a statement might mean a number of things. It might mean that each act is legally to be considered that of the Minister. It might mean that the Minister must hold himself morally responsible for every act of his subordinates. Or it might mean that the Minister (and the Minister alone) is the constitutional mouthpiece through which departmental

actions are to be defended or repudiated and from whom information is to be sought.

That is the solution which C. Marshall feels has been accepted by parliamentary democracies. He cites no less an authority than Sir Anthony Eden as follows:

> . . . thus clearly indicating his officials and not himself as the agents of the mischief. Moreover where action is taken of which the Minister disapproves and has no prior knowledge 'there is' said the Home Secretary, 'no obligation on the part of the Minister to endorse what he believes to be wrong, or to defend what are clearly shown to be errors of his officers'.

Herbert Morrison, in his book "Government and Parliament",

> . . . that though the consequences 'may be rather hard on a Minister from time to time', he 'must accept responsibility as if the act were his own'. Yet he has 'a perfect right to reveal the facts and to assure the House that he has taken suitable action' where his specific orders have been disobeyed. On one such occasion a disobedient officer in the Home Office had been castigated in the House.

There are numerous precedents where public servants have not abided by the directives of their ministers or have acted contrary to recognized priciples of conduct and been castigated in the House. There is no doubt that Mr. Morrison's reference was to that. I suggest that to argue the contrary works against the growth of control by this House over the government and its operations. There is no doubt that if we are to say that the government and the ministers within that government are totally responsible for every act of civil servants, whether policy making or administrative, they will fight any move to liberate the flow of information, and that is as it should be. There is no doubt that no government can really act to the betterment of public interest if it sees that its public servants can be called on to account at any time without any clearance from their ministers. That is why I find it very strange that hon. members opposite have not sought to consider the aspect of freedom of information in terms of individual ministerial responsibility.

In an article entitled "Parliamentary Affairs" written by Leslie Wolf-Phillips there is a statement to the effect that in this House and in Westminster there has been a failure to deal with the question of secrecy in terms of ministerial responsibility. He states:

● (2040)

> . . . the key justification for secrecy—the whole working of the existing system with its tradition that ministers act on confidential advice from a professional cadre of civil servants.

If we are to deal with secrecy, the justification for that secrecy is that public servants act in the belief that their particular counsel to their minister is going to be kept secret. If, on the other hand, the minister feels that he can throw the public service open to public scrutiny, indeed there is no question but that there is going to be a great interplay so that the public servants themselves will refuse to divulge to the minister—

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

Some hon. Members: No.

An hon. Member: That is enough.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this motion today. We have somewhat rambled away from the meat of the motion, which reads:

> That this House, finding unacceptable the performance of the Government, particularly its penchant for shifting blame, reaffirms its belief in the importance of the convention of ministerial responsibility and expresses its lack of confidence in the Government.

I have no hesitation is supporting that motion. We got on to the subject of civil servants, and the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) said that the Conservative party was going to fire tens of thousands of civil servants. Mr. Speaker, I do not recall us making any such statement.

Mr. Mackasey: I said 50,000.

Mr. McKenzie: Even 50,000—that is not correct. There is an element of concern on the part of civil servants. In an article in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of May 15, 1976, entitled "The Big Sleep" Jacques Grenier writes:

> Because of the sheer size of the bureaucracy, a civil servant who wants to can go almost completely underground performing little or no work. A federal employee at the National Museums of Canada admitted to me he works about an hour a week. He makes over $15,000 a year. A bright young bureaucrat with the Foreign Investment Review Agency admits working about two hours a week. His salary is $28,000.
>
> An acquaintance of mine who has been in the civil service for four years, with a salary in excess of $20,000 confided, "I took this job because I wanted to make some kind of difference. Now I'm working a total of about three hours a week. It's at something I don't like, and there is no real way out of it." He is completely disillusioned.

This is what we should be concerned about in the civil service. I hope the minister has investigated the charges made in this article of federal civil servants drawing $28,000 to work two hours a week.

The minister said he is proud of his government's record. After this latest budget with about a $5 billion deficit, I do not think he has anything to be proud of. This year the Post Office will have a deficit of three-quarters of a billion dollars. That is nothing to be proud of; he should be ashamed.

Turning to ministerial responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to an article in yesterday's *Globe and Mail* regarding the air travel privileges which cabinet ministers receive, as well as the leaders of the opposition.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): And some members of parliament.

Mr. McKenzie: I said leaders of the opposition. The article quoted the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) as follows:

> Do you think it's funny for an airline to know that the Prime Minister is going to travel with them? And for the passengers. If I was a passenger I would not want to travel on the same aircraft as the Prime Minister. So many people want to kill this man.

I think the minister has a responsibility to report this to the RCMP. If he knows that so many people want to kill the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) he has a ministerial responsibility to report it. Is he getting phone calls or letters from kooks? What is he going to do about it? Maybe the list is too long to present to the RCMP.

An area of ministerial responsibility that I have covered many times is the serious financial problems being experienced by Air Canada in its finance branch in Winnipeg. They are not only experiencing financial problems with millions of dollars going astray, they are experiencing labour problems. The government has taken some initiative in regard to labour problems and has appointed a federal mediator to deal with them, but it is shirking its duty in looking into the financial problems of Air Canada. On a number of occasions I have asked that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and the Prime Minister dispatch the Auditor General to the Air Canada finance branch to find out what is going on.

The CALEA union has laid documented evidence on the table in regard to financial mismanagement and the poor billing procedures that are taking place, and the millions of dollars that are being lost. What do we get from the Prime Minister and the Minister of Transport? Just the answer that we should not be running Crown corporations from the floor of the House of Commons. This is nothing but a slough off. Then the parliamentary secretary tells me that Air Canada will be coming before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications and that we can question them. Mr. Speaker, there is no way this committee can conduct an audit. That is impossible. The government has the power to dispatch the Auditor General to the finance branch in Winnipeg to find out what is going on.

Here are some of the charges that are being made. An article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of Saturday, June 12, states:

> But CALEA says Air Canada, through its clearing house section, has paid out $40 million to other airlines without an audit and, as of September, was backlogged to October, 1973. By not auditing, the airline is simply writing off errors in billings which normally amount to $160,000 a month, or nearly $2 million over a year, the union claims.

They provided us with all documents in regard to this. It is not supposition. They go on evidence. I have the documents. The article continues:

> According to the study, the Air Canada department which bills other airlines for flight coupons accepted by the Crown corporation isn't in much better financial shape.
>
> The union estimated that $10 million in coupons were still not cashed in as of September and the backlog at one point last year hit $20 million. Even if they are eventually processed, the airline has lost millions of dollars in interest on the revenue because of the delay, CALEA says.
>
> In press reports, published in March of last year, an internal Air Canada memorandum between officials in Winnipeg and Montreal was quoted as reporting "significant delays in billing other airlines" because of the processing delay.

This is costing millions of dollars. They estimated that $1 million in interest was lost due to this poor procedure.

The vice-president of the Air Canada finance branch, Michael H. Cochrane, made some startling statements to the Winnipeg *Free Press* last Thursday. He denied union allegations that mismanagement had contributed to the airline's record $12.5 million deficit last year. He said two major audits by private firms in the last year had thoroughly studied Air Canada accounting procedures and found them satisfactory. That statement is completely false. There was no detailed accounting whatsoever by any accounting firm in the finance branch. He said that the audits were conducted by Clarkson and Gordon Ltd. for the Estey inquiry into the airline last year, and by Coopers and Lybrand for the airline itself. The deficit, he said, was caused by a major decline in passenger traffic, rising fuel bills, and other escalating prices.

In the Coopers and Lybrand report in the 1975 financial statement of Air Canada they state:

> Our examination included a general review of the accounting procedures—

I have asked Air Canada employees if Coopers and Lybrand did any examination, if they came into the finance branch in Winnipeg to conduct a proper audit. They said they have seen no one there at all. The last person they saw was in there around 1972 doing some kind of an audit.

Also, under the terms of reference from the Estey report, Clarkson and Gordon were required primarily to review the Winnipeg centralized payment system, the Montreal payment system, the Dorval purchasing system, certain local branch purchases, and the system of authorization for expenditure. The review did not include payrolls and did not examine, except in a very summary fashion, the subroutines related to specific disbursements. In other words, they did not delve into airline billing.

● (2050)

I have referred, time and again, to discrepancies involving the finance branch; but the Minister of Transport has sloughed me off. He has refused to conduct a review into the difficulties at the Air Canada finance branch in Winnipeg.

Let me cite another example of mismanagement concerning reporting of ticket sales. As of October, 1975, there was in excess of $96,000 worth of unreported travel agent ticket sales, which represents a minimum of $2,208,000 unpaid for transportation. There is no mention of this in the Coopers and Lybrand report, or in the Clarkson, Gordon report. I have also pointed out that Air Canada has allowed debts as large as $186,000 to accumulate; it wrote them off because it could not collect. I submit that such a fact alone should result in an investigation of the finance branch. After all, the Estey inquiry looked into a $100,000 item. The report cost the government about $400,000. Commissioner Estey, after looking into the matter, said that he had never seen such unethical business practices as occurred in the operation of Air Canada. Yet when we ask the Minister of Transport to conduct an inquiry, he sloughs us off. He will not respond to requests for an investigation into the financial fiasco at the finance branch in Winnipeg.

Next I wish to talk about the foundation underpinning Canada's parliamentary system as inherited from Britain, cabinet solidarity. Everyone knows that a cabinet seldom agrees unanimously on any issue, and it would be a poor sort of cabinet if it did. It would nothing but a group of smug yes-men. Yet although solidarity has always been a fiction, the system cannot work without it. Cabinets argue and disagree in private, but once a majority decision is reached all ministers must support it or honourably resign; otherwise the life of any government would be chaotic and short, parliament a war of factions, and the public business neglected and deranged by frequent, indecisive elections.

As a constiutional lawyer, the Prime Minister fully understands this historic fiction and the working facts of

the system. When he took office in 1968 the Prime Minister warned his colleagues that any of them who publicly disagreed with a cabinet decision or revealed a cabinet secret would be dismissed immediately. But in the two recent extraordinary instances of public disagreement the Prime Minister did nothing to discipline, much less dismiss, the offenders.

In statements made outside the House of Commons, the Postmaster General criticized the government's revision of the unemployment insurance scheme, while the Conservative opposition supported the obvious need to curb its abuses. Quarrelling openly in the House of Commons, the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) attacked the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) for bungling the purchase of Orion aircraft; the national defence minister replied, quite rightly, that the collapse of the Lockheed deal was the shared responsibility of all ministers. Finally, the supply and services minister, defying a basic rule of the system, named and blamed a defenceless civil servant.

But the malaise in Ottawa is not sudden, temporary or unexpected. The disorder of the government did not begin with the outbursts of those ministers. It began with the resignation of John Turner as minister of finance last fall, followed by the conviction of the then minister of consumer and corporate affairs for contempt of court, and his resignation as minister of consumer and corporate affairs. This was then followed by the proffered resignation of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) in the affair of the Quebec judges; but the Prime Minister refused to accept the resignation. Even this regrettable episode did not prevent the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) from approaching the National Parole Board to inquire about the suspended driver's licence of the Minister of the Environment who had been convicted of leaving the scene of an automobile accident.

The behaviour of the Trudeau cabinet is disturbing and unacceptable, because it weakens the whole governing system at a time when strength is most required.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): What about the hon. member's leader? He is seldom here.

Mr. McKenzie: Oh, boy, here we go again with the government Whip. A recent article in the *Globe and Mail* says that:

> ... Liberal Joseph Guay (St. Boniface) was feted for his leather-lunged performances in the Commons and described as the 'noisiest, most abrasive' MP on the Liberal benches.

Many of us hear the interjections of the government Whip. They are not constructive. If he would take lessons from the opposition whip, he would be far more constructive.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I suggest that my interjections make a lot of sense compared with the nonsense we hear coming from the other side of the House much of the time.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Don't be so modest, Joe.

Mr. McKenzie: The article went on to say:

> (It's said by some of the MPs in attendance that the comments were too close to the bone—Joe was not amused.)

Apparently I got to Joe's bone again tonight.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You don't know what you are talking about, unless you read. Keep reading.

Mr. McKenzie: Clearly, the Prime Minister cannot allow such a spectacle of confusion to last much longer.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Keep reading.

Mr. McKenzie: He indicated months ago that the cabinet would be shuffled after the current parliamentary session; but he will need more than another game of musical chairs if his credibility as the nation's leader is to be re-established. I suggest that Canadians have the right to expect something better than a cabinet in public disarray, a governing system unable to govern effectively until it is repaired, or to make any policy work.

Let me now deal with the Lockheed Orion fiasco which has cast a harsh light on the competence of two members of the Trudeau government, the Minister of Supply and Services and the Minister of National Defence.

By his shabby attempts at blame shifting, the Minister of Supply and Services has revealed that he also lacks the sense of responsibility to be a cabinet minister. Because of the financial and political troubles that had overtaken the Lockheed company, both ministers should have been especially watchful and prudent in making the deal for 18 long-range patrol aircraft at a cost of more than $1 billion. It was to be expected that a company in that position, urgently needing the contract, would put the most optimistic face on its ability to carry through.

The defence minister's chief fault was that, in emulating Lockheed's professed or real optimism, he took on trust its verbal assurance last November that it could get interim financing. I can recall, on November 27, the defence minister announcing that the big purchase would be going through and that two factories in Winnipeg would start making parts immediately for the Lockheed Orion. I questioned the minister further in the defence committee on December 1 and he assured me again that the deal was going through. He had no business making such statements.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): And what happened with regard to aircraft when the Conservatives had a majority?

An hon. Member: Water your mushrooms, Joe.

Mr. McKenzie: Because of the financial and political troubles that had overtaken the Lockheed company, both ministers should have been especially watchful and prudent in making the deal for 18 long-range patrol aircraft at a cost of more than $1 billion. It was to be expected that a company in that position, urgently needing the contract, would put the most optimistic face on its ability to carry through. The defence minister's chief fault was that, in emulating Lockheed's professed or real optimism, he took on trust its verbal assurance last November that it could get interim financing. It was even more precisely the supply and services minister's responsibility to nail down

this assurance in writing and to clear the financing of the entire deal before accepting the company's proposal, as he did in a telex message last December 2.

There was further confusion with regard to Treasury Board's authorizing this expenditure. I asked ministers in the House about their knowledge of this transaction, but neither would give me an answer. The Minister of Public Works refused to refer my request to the President of the Treasury Board. I questioned the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) who at that time was on the Treasury Board, but he would not get up to answer.

On June 8 this year I put on the order paper a starred question in which I asked what members of the cabinet were on the Treasury Board on December 2, 1975. The second part of my question reads:

Was the financing of the Lockheed (LRPA) deal discussed at the Treasury Board meeting of December 2, 1975 and, if so, what members of the cabinet were present?

The government does not want to tell the House which members of the cabinet at that time were on the Treasury Board. A starred question is supposed to be answered within a period of two weeks. However, they have chosen not to answer this one. I have severe reservations about this. I doubt whether any members of the cabinet appeared at the December 2 meeting. It was rubber stamped and sent through, and that is why they will not answer my question.

● (2100)

Further, it is now revealed that the Minister of Supply and Services received a document from his deputy minister on December 1 advising that there was some risk with Lockheed financing and warning that the Defence Department could not finance the first year of the project. This evidently demolished the minister's excuse that he did not know on December 2 that the Defence Department was not going to finance the deal by direct payment to Lockheed.

It makes even more contemptible his naming and blaming officials in Defence and his own department. Under our system of government, cabinet ministers are required to shoulder responsibility when things go wrong, not blame underlings.

The Orion mess has delayed by months, if not years, Canada's acquisition of modern patrol aircraft to replace the obsolete Argus. It will waste $16 million of the taxpayers' money—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the motion although I do it with a bit of a smile on my face because it is another example of the pot calling the kettle black. Listening to free enterprise Tories saying mean things to free enterprise Liberals is amusing, because when it comes right down to the way they operate there is fundamentally no difference between their policies, philosophy, and everything else. Of course we have always looked with amusement on the pot to my right calling the kettle across the way black. The motion reads:

[Mr. McKenzie.]

That this House, finding unacceptable the performance of the Government,—

That is a broad statement. Even I would not be brave enough to say that the entire performance of the government is unacceptable. Some parts of its performance were acceptable. On balance, however, I agree with the motion because there was more that was unacceptable than acceptable.

Before I get into the main part of my remarks I want to refer to something that was said by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey), and repeated by the parliamentary secretary, to the effect that that government and that Liberal party have done the best of any in the world with regard to the rights, support for, and so forth with regard to the public service. If the Postmaster General will check Canadian history, he will find that in typical Liberal fashion they were 20 or 25 years behind.

When the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) was premier of Saskatchewan in 1944, 1945 and 1946, the provincial public service got a union, the right to strike, and a better pension plan. They got rid of all the Liberal hacks in the public service. They had all this plus an independent public service commission 20 years before any Liberal government even came close to thinking about it. The minister can, however, feel proud because he is still 20 years ahead of the Tory party. He can take some satisfaction in that. However, I do not want to hear any nonsense from any Liberal. They had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the twentieth century with regard to the public service having the right to organize, the right to strike, an independent public service commission, and a decent pension program. The Liberal party in Saskatchewan and in every other province in Canada had to be dragged kicking and screaming into this. Finally, the federal Liberal government did it. Of course there is no Tory provincial government in the country that has got to it yet.

The minister should only take credit in terms of comparing the Liberals with the Tories. I grant him that they are 20 years ahead of the Tories, although they are 25 years behind the CCF and the NDP.

The motion further states that the House finds unacceptable the government's penchant for shifting blame and, I quote:

—reaffirms its belief in the importance of the convention of ministerial responsibility—

I imagine everyone in the House agrees with that clause. Not even the government members can argue against that. Finally it states:

—and expresses its lack of confidence in the Government.

I want to illustrate the shifting of responsibility or the failure to carry out the responsibility on the part of ministers, particularly the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) who is also in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. That minister still refuses to carry out a vote by producers of the prairie provinces with regard to feed grains being under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, even though he promised it.

The minister in charge of the wheat board has failed to carry out that commitment in spite of the fact that the producers on the Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Council carried out a plebiscite which indicated 93 per cent support for keeping the Canadian Wheat Board as the sole marketing agency for feed grains. That may be why the minister in charge of the wheat board refused to carry out his responsibility and commitment. When he saw the result of the vote of the Saskatchewan producers on that issue, he cut and ran.

The minister did carry out the results of a vote one time. That is what I call shifting, or being shifty. That vote was with regard to whether rapeseed should be under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. The minister in charge of the wheat board handled that cutely. He sent a ballot to all producers. Instead of it having the usual yes or no, it had yes, no, or no opinion. In order to ensure that the rapeseed producers would not vote to have rapeseed under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, the minister counted all "no opinion" ballots as "no". When the results were tallied, the minister was able to shift responsibility. The producers voted, he said. Is that what you call a responsible exercise of ministerial responsibility? I do not think so.

With regard to railway passenger service, particularly transcontinental service, the minister made a policy announcement which in effect said that we will have only one transcontinental passenger train. In order to take the heat off, the minister asked the railway committee of the Canadian Transport Commission to carry out hearings across Canada with regard to transcontinental railway passenger trains. However, in the terms of reference there was a little fence put around them, saying they will consider the various alternatives to a transcontinental passenger train.

The minister is neatly trying to shift responsibility for his policy announcement to the Canadian Transport Commission, and he worked it in such a way that the Commission could report back on various questions concerning one trans-continental passenger train rather than two. It work very well. It suits the minister's purpose very well. He has been able to shift political and ministerial responsibility from his own neck to the railway committee of the Canadian Transport Commission.

● (2110)

The beauty of it is he has not only done that with the CTC. He is the boy who did a lot of talking about rail line abandonment and the political heat got heavy so he appointed a commission headed by Mr. Justice Hall. He is the boy who opened the whole thing up about reviewing the Crowsnest pass rates. It was not any other political party or any farm organisation. Then he appointed the Snavely Commission. Again he shifts the heat and the responsibility, and while those organizations are meeting and carrying out their tasks the minister continues to make decisions which come under the purview of those various inquiries. The beauty of it for the Minister of Transport is that he can take credit for it if it works, and continue to shift the blame to these other commissions and boards if it does not.

This is another reason for my supporting the motion. I do not think that is a proper or responsible exercise of ministerial responsibility. If you have made a political and philosophic decision, you have made it. And then you see to it that it is implemented. You don't try to look around in ten directions at one time or shift the heat to other public bodies or to public servants.

The same thing has been occurring in the past several days in connection with the dispute between the government and the air traffic controllers. The House should remember some of the history of this matter. It was not the Government of Canada, it was not the Minister of Transport or his predecessor, or the minister before that, who said there should be bilingualism among air traffic controllers. It was the air traffic controllers themselves who were responsible for taking the initiative in 1974 because of the failure of successive ministers of transport to set out proper regulations governing air traffic control, particularly small aircraft using smaller airports.

In 1962 the ministry directed that French might be used by air traffic controllers only in emergencies and an immediate translation must be made into English.

In 1971 a transport study found no major problems about air traffic control in English, though some private flyers required additional assistance in French. For this reason the informal use of French in air traffic control proceeded without authorization. In other words, air traffic controllers themselves, when someone needed assistance in the second language, gave it.

Even though the air line pilots and the controllers repeatedly requested the ministry to put some regulation and order into this process, nothing was done. Finally, in 1974, the air traffic controllers proposed that limited bilingual air traffic control for visual flight rules, meaning lowflying planes, be allowed to apply at Quebec airports where traffic was light and there was no significant mix of high-speed jets with small craft.

I do not want to hear the Minister of Transport or any other member of the government trying to take credit for bilingualism being brought into five airports. It was the air traffic controllers themselves who initiated that move, and to their credit. It was the air traffic controllers who started using French informally. All this is in the ministry's own report if hon. members would care to check on it. In June, 1974, bilingual traffic control was used for visual flight regulation. It was authorized then by the ministry following the example of the air traffic controllers for the airports of Quebec City, St. Jean, Baie Comeau, Sept-Îles and St. Honoré.

By March of 1975 the MOT task force called Project Bilcom presented 23 recommendations related to the use of language at airports. That report was presented to the House on May 22 last year. The majority report, with only one dissenting voice, found there was no demand for wider bilingual service. It recommended that air traffic control under instrument flight rules remain English only, that visual flight rules above 9,500 feet provide for English only and that bilingual visual flight be restricted to the five airports in the province of Quebec.

Some aviation personnel in Quebec referred the findings of the report to the Commissioner of Official Languages. Mr. Spicer, in a letter to the Ministry of Transport, recommended that the minister continue to consult with all

interested parties and always give overriding priority to the safety of air travellers and air crew.

In September of last year a committee representative of CALPA, pilots, controllers, machinists, the airline industry, and the province of Quebec was set up to study bilingualism in air traffic control. It recommended that the use of French remain limited to visual flight rule operations, yet on December 31, 1975, despite all these studies, the Minister of Transport suddenly announced that bilingual air traffic control would be extended to all elements of air traffic control in Quebec. This was in spite of recommendations not only from the air traffic controllers but from the airline pilots, the machinists, the government of Quebec, and the airline companies. Disregarding this advice, the minister says bilingualism will be extended to all elements of air traffic control in Quebec, with an extension of visual flight rules to two more airports in the summer of 1976 and an eventual extension to instrument flight rules when safe procedures are developed. The minister made that announcement even though some of his own press announcements had led one to expect something different.

All parties in this House have supported bilingualism. There is no argument about that. Again we are in a situation where the minister either evades, or misuses, or abuses the responsibility which belongs to him. There can be no question about this: if it is intended to add a duty to an air traffic controller, whether that additional duty involves another language, or new instruments, or polishing his supervisor's shoes, it will increase the controller's work load, it will increase the stress upon that person, and this may be reflected in his ability to carry out his job with the maximum effectiveness and safety. This is perfectly logical. It is saying nothing against one language or another.

Surely the Minister of Transport could have met with the controllers, if necessary on a daily basis, to let them know that the resignation of Mr. Keenan was regretted not only by their organization but by himself—to let them know he would try to get another commissioner appointed as soon as possible. He might have taken them into his confidence, discussed the subject with them and reassured them that in the end the controllers, the pilots, and the companies, though the process might take somewhat longer, would have a full and definite part to play in developing an acceptable system. He might have done all this instead of making an arbitrary announcement which flies in the face of the recommendations of a committee of his own department. That is not carrying out ministerial responsibility.

● (2120)

Instead of that what did the minister do last week? He went to Paris. Why did he go to Paris? He went to check on bilingual air traffic control at the airports in Paris and in other countries in Europe. I could have saved him the trouble. There were eight members of this House who made a trip on April 13 and 14. I was privileged to be invited to the flight deck by the captain of that Air Canada aircraft, and I listened to the air traffic controller in Paris for the last two hours of the flight. I could have saved the minister the trouble. I could have told him it was working very well there. The same situation exists in Brussels. But the minister went to Paris to investigate.

The terms of reference for the commission of inquiry into bilingualism in respect of air traffic control are limited, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of Monday, June 21. The article states that the commission is vested with the power to inquire only into methods of introducing bilingualism but it cannot inquire into the policy of whether it is safe to introduce bilingualism at all.

The minister went to Paris to check on bilingualism in air traffic control, but I should have thought that would be the job of the commission of inquiry. I should have thought that the commissioner would go to Paris, London, Brussels, The Hague, Rome, Berlin, and anywhere else necessary. The minister went, and in the meantime the whole country was shut down. Is that carrying out ministerial responsibility or is that some more of the shifty, shifting operations of that minister and, I am sorry to say, some others in the government?

I fully support the motion of want of confidence because I am convinced there has been too much of this shifting of responsibility. There has been too much evasion of responsibility, with the using of public bodies and public servants to take the political heat off or to get a tough decision implemented. Whether members of this House agree or disagree with a particular policy taken by the government is not the point. The point is that the government resorts to the use of public bodies and public servants to shift political heat and political blame. It seems to me ministers are working at abdicating their own responsibility.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, the last words on the bilingualism issue in air communications show to what extent some members opposite can be hypocrites when it suits their purpose.

Indeed, unless I am mistaken the discussion today was to show our confidence in the public service. However, the case which has just been raised by the member for Regina Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) shows how principles give way to prejudices. Let us take for example bilingualism in air control.

[*English*]

Let us take the precise example of bilingualism in air traffic control if we really believe in the competence of civil servants. Every single aircraft in this country flies according to rules devised by officials of the Department of Transport headed by Mr. McLeish. These rules are considered all around the world to be the most strict and safest. Now that these experts who devise rules concerning flying say that they can devise rules to permit bilingualism in the province of Quebec, what is the reaction of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre? He does not have confidence in them any more even though their record is flawless, and even though they have a world renowned reputation concerning safety. Now hon. members attack their reputation.

Mr. Benjamin: No, I attack the minister.

Mr. De Bané: No, Sir, do not try to misconstrue the situation we are in today. Knowing that these civil servants have an absolutely perfect reputation and record in

Canada and elsewhere concerning safety, it should not be suggested that these people can play into the hands of politicians or anybody else with the suggestion that they cannot devise bilingual procedures which are safe. How can someone in his right mind say something like that? Now we say we have to check on this through an inquiry, yet all the other rules they might devise are O.K. In this particular instance we have to check to see if what they are doing is safe. When civil servants actually do what we like we have nothing to quarrel with them about, but when there is a partisan or narrow minded benefit to be gained then we attack the policy which, in this instance, is made by experts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the matter before us today deals with many concepts which hardly bear any resemblance to reality any more. As Kenneth Galbraith says in his book *The Affluent Society*:

Ideas are by nature conservative.

They do not yield under the attack of other ideas, but under the massive aspect of circumstances against which they are helpless. When Confederation was proclaimed 109 years ago, there were hardly four civil servants in the country. Today, besides the 300,000 civil servants who come under the Public Service Commission, if we add the employees of Crown corporations such as Air Canada, Canadian National and the Armed Forces, we number about 750,000 civil servants who at an increasing rate of between 2 and 3 per cent a year, will hit 1.5 million—15 years hence. And we go on saying that ministers should be responsible for the least decision taken within their department.

In this regard, I would like to quote Norman Ward, who says at page 236 of his book *The Government of Canada* the following:

[*English*]

It is obvious that the opportunity to exercise control becomes more and more unreal as functions become more varied and complex and as the number under the minister's direction increases. A carefully planned organization can do much to overcome these handicaps, yet even with the most efficient methods, the subordinates at some level under the minister will inevitably acquire more power. The constant assertion of the principle of ministerial responsibility will cover to some degree the actual delegation of authority which has taken place, but this cannot conceal the fact that no minister (or his deputy) can hope to make even the major decisions for the five or ten or twenty thousand employees who may be nominally under him.

[*Translation*]

This idea was developed again recently by one of the most competent civil servants that I know in the federal administration, Michael Pitfield, in an article entitled "The shape of government in the 1980s: techniques and instruments for policy formulation at the federal level". Talking about the principle of ministerial responsibility, he refers, in my opinion, to one of the ideas where theory and practice are getting farther and farther apart. On page 9, he writes:

[*English*]

The benefits to be gained from enhancing the relationship between theory and practice are obvious; for theory to be sound it must reflect the way the real world operates, and for practice to maintain its effectiveness while keeping up with the changing needs of society, it must be consistent with theory. I suspect that for some years in Canada the theorist and the practitioner have been getting out of touch with one another.

● (2130)

[*Translation*]

A relevant excerpt, according to me, is the one where the former conservative Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, said:

[*English*]

A Minister of the Crown is responsible, under the system in Great Britain, for the minutest details of the administration in his department; he is politically responsible, but he does not know anything at all about them. When anything goes wrong in his department, he is responsible therefore to Parliament, and if he comes to Parliament and points out that he entrusted the duty to an official in the ordinary course and in good faith, that he had been selected for his capacity, and ability, and integrity, and the moment that man has gone wrong the Minister had investigated the matter to the full and punished the man either by degradation or dismissal, he has done his duty to the public. That is the way matters are dealt with in Great Britain, and it is the way, it seems to me, that our affairs ought to be carried on in this country.

[*Translation*]

And here I quote from the debates of the House of Commons of May 15, 1909, page 6723.

I would also like to quote an article by Professor S. E. Finer on "The Individual Responsibility of Ministers" published in *Public Administration*, volume 3445, 1956, page 377, where he shows that the idea of the minister's accountability for all actions taking place within his department is getting gradually further away from reality. I quote:

[*English*]

There is a good deal of constitutional folklore on this subject, to be true, but whether it adds up to a convention is very questionable.

[*Translation*]

And here he refers to a well known case in England: the resignation of Sir Thomas. He says:

[*English*]

And as to whether such enforced resignations as Sir Thomas' can be deemed a certain and effective constitutional remedy for mismanagement, the answer is not in any doubt. They cannot.

[*Translation*]

And he recalls what the meaning of this principle is, that is only the minister can report to Parliament. I quote from page 381:

[*English*]

Although the doctrine became established that Ministers alone are answerable to Parliament in respect of every act or omission of their civil servants, there seems no evidence that it was also established that—in the words of Wade and Phillips—'no Minister can shield himself by blaming his official'. And indeed, as Sir David Maxwell Fyfe himself observed, it is not true that 'Ministers are obliged to extend total protection to their officials and endorse their acts,' or that 'well justified criticism of civil servants cannot be made on a suitable occasion.' But it is clear from the cases to be cited below . . .

● (2140)

[*Translation*]

And he provides us with several examples on page 381 . . .

[*English*]

—that Ministers do not have to defend subordinates who defy instructions or who act reprehensibly in circumstances of which the Minister

could not have become aware. It is equally clear that Ministers have defended themselves by blaming their officials and firing them. And it is also true that the House does not censure the Minister who can show that the delinquency was against his express instructions, or that he could not physically have known of it—provided he makes it clear, by speech or action, that the offender has been dealt with and that therefore the delinquency is unlikely to recur.

[*Translation*]

And on page 381, he gives numerous examples of the same situation. Obviously, on a tendency . . .

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow a question. Does he intend to deal in the course of his speech with the position of the member of the public service in Canada who has been named in the House of Commons by his minister and what remedies or what avenues or what redress for at least fair a hearing that a public servant is offered today? Does the hon. member intend to deal with that point?

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: The hon. member has most certainly raised a very interesting point and if time permits, Mr. Speaker, I would be quite willing to discuss that.

We can say that generally there is a tendency to assume that, in politics, politicians are concerned with decision-making while civil servants deal with implementation. But I think that this distinction which was certainly worthwhile years ago is less and less appropriate nowadays. The best example I can think of is a conference held in Quebec City on June 2, 1976—barely three weeks ago—by professor Kenneth Kernaghan of Brock University entitled: Politics, policy and public servants: political neutrality revisited.

It is stated on page 7 of his document about the distinction we are trying to draw between politics and administration:

[*English*]

During the 1930's, writers on public administration who recognized the significant and growing political role of the bureaucracy lived uncomfortably with the text-book dichotomy between politics and administration. The dichotomy came under increasing attack during the war years as many scholars gained practical administrative experience in government. Shortly after the war, a number of political scientists launched a devastating assault on the notion that politics and administration were or could be separated. Among this group of post-war authors, Paul Appleby stands out for his defence of the proposition that 'public administration is policy making . . . Public administration is one of a number of basic political processes.' In less celebrated and more broadly focused works than those written by American authors, British and Canadian writers demonstrated during this same period a growing recognition of the blurring of the traditional constitutional line between the politician and the administrator in the parliamentary system of government.

[*Translation*]

And on page 8, he adds . . .

[*English*]

Since the political role of public servants is attributed primarily to their contribution to policy development, much attention in the literature has focused on the intermingling of policy and administration. The conventional view that a clear division may be made between policy and administration has always been a fiction but has become increasingly untenable with the continuing growth of government activities and of administrative power.

[*Translation*]

And in my opinion this fiction is becoming even more obvious, if I may say so, when one sees the momentum gaining process of government decentralization where more head offices and work units of the civil service and Crown agencies as well as government institutions are distributed across the country to allow people closer contact with the administration. In such cases, how can one argue that the ministerial responsibility must be borne by the minister for the least little action made within the department by one of his agents?

In the past, certain distinctions were made concerning the carrying out of actions that I would call normal, executive and administrative, where the ministerial responsibility is quite beyond involvement. The classical example is obviously that of a mailman who steals a letter he should be delivering. In such a case, nobody think of putting the responsibility on the minister who holds that portfolio.

But, as Professor Kernaghan said, where does the distinction lie when the administration has so expanded and become so complex that neither the minister nor his deputy nor even the assistant deputy minister can be aware of all important decisions that are taken within their own department? The best example is control by parliamentarians since, according to the current theory, hon. members not only pass estimates but exercise control over expenditures as well.

More and more, and this has been the case for several decades, no one is fooled by this so-called control of parliamentarians over public expenditures. When one considers that 264 parliamentarians must control expenditures of billions of dollars made by hundreds of federal agencies and institutions, by hundreds of thousands of public servants, one may think that this control is also becoming ever more fictitious.

And I think we should make a case for an evolving theory that would be summed up in the following way: ministers are responsible for the development of their department's policy, they are collectively tied by decisions made by one of their collegues in the cabinet when it comes to the matter of management, when public servants may unknowingly fail to exercise judgment or take action without their minister's knowledge. Under the latter aspect, namely taking decisions that emanate from policies, I suggest the theory rapidly grows into fiction which is far removed from reality. Where is a minister's responsibility when, for instance, to refer to a conventional example, an inmate is released as a result of a collective decision by various people?

● (2150)

Let us recall the case of notary Geoffroy who had been convicted of murder and who had obtained from public servants the authorization to leave to get married. It was a total lack of judgment on the part of the officials who made that decision and according to the traditional doctrine, despite the fact that the minister had not taken part in the decision, he had to assume the responsibility for it. I believe, as Kenneth Galbraith would say, that ideas are conservative, but that facts are always there to demonstrate their absurdity and to contradict them at one time or another.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being 9.45, it is my duty, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Standing Order 58, to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith

every question necessary to dispose of the motion concerning the main estimates and the supplementary estimates (B) and for the passage through all stages of any bill based thereon.

[*English*]

The first question is on the motion of Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

● (2200)

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton)) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 140*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack
Andre (Calgary Centre)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Brisco
Broadbent
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Darling
Dick
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Firth
Forrestall
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilbert
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Horner
Huntington
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
Leggatt
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacKay
MacLean
Macquarrie
Malone
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rodriguez
Rondeau
Rynard
Saltsman
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith (Churchill)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Symes
Towers
Wenman
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—102

Estimates

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras (Port Arthur)
Andres (Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blouin
Boulanger
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lee
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Maine
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Yanakis
Young—130

● (2210)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion lost.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN MAIN ESTIMATES

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board) moved:

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, except those items disposed of at prior sittings, and less the amounts voted in Interim Supply, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

Mr. Chrétien thereupon moved that Bill C-93, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, be read the first time and be printed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I would assume that the bill now having been read a first time and having been printed, it is available and has been distributed to hon. members.

Mr. Chrétien thereupon moved that Bill C-93, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Clause 3 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

An hon. Member: On division.

Clause 4 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

Clause 6 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the schedule carry?

Schedule agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Clause 1 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Preamble agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Title agreed to.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The Chairman: Shall the bill carry?

Bill agreed to.

Bill reported.

[*English*]

Mr. Chrétien moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A), 1976-77—MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE L27a, TREASURY BOARD

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote *L27a*, in the amount of $5,000,000. of the Treasury Board, in respect of Loto Canada, in Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to these supplementary estimates, vote L27a. This estimate deals with the establishment of Loto Canada. It sets out certain conditions for its operation. We in our party agree with the lottery and its purpose, and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), when he appeared before the committee, gave an assurance that the last draw in this particular lottery, based on the current formula as prescribed in the bill, would be December, 1979, and that the annual reports would be referred to the committee each year. To a large extent this satisfies our reservations about Loto Canada. However, our general support for the substance does not alleviate our profound disquiet over the method of its presentation in this House.

● (2220)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: We contend that this is far more than an estimate; it is in fact a legislative measure. Instead of a description, we have a detailed, substantive proposition to which the House is asked to give its approval. This is a measure with all the elements of a bill; it establishes government control over the corporation, and sets out its purposes and structure as well as its finances.

The President of the Treasury Board has stated that the measure is presented in this way so that the House can express its opinion. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point. We are asked to express our opinion on a number of points forming part of a complex scheme, yet the actual vote is the only thing before us that can be amended. The minister is trying to get agreement to the detail of the scheme from the House without giving the House the corresponding right to examine that detail and to propose amendments which may be necessary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: To support our contention that this matter is not properly before the House, I would like to refer to three rulings. The first was made on March 10, 1971. On that occasion Mr. Speaker found that three items in Supplementary Estimates (C) for 1970-71 were clearly

legislative and improperly included in those supplementaries. I will quote from the part of the ruling that discussed dollar items in relation to the opportunity for debate in the House under Standing Order 58, because it has been suggested by the government House leader that Loto Canada could be subject to a debate and vote in the House on the initiative of the opposition on an allotted day. Mr. Speaker said:

> Those members suggest that there is now no real opportunity for the consideration of such items by the House itself. That, of course, is not entirely correct since the new Standing Orders do provide for such an opportunity, albeit restricted, under the terms of Standing Order 58. Clearly the Standing Orders do provide the machinery for the consideration by the House itself of specific items in the estimates to which the opposition might take exception. However, this opportunity is undoubtedly limited and depends very much on the number of allotted supply days which might still be available by virtue of Standing Order 58. In other words, under the old rules there was unlimited time to consider supplementary estimates, including items intended to amend statutes. Under the new rules there may be only a limited time to consider supplementary estimates.

That, indeed, is the relevant point. In the case before us only two such days were left when the estimate was reported back to this House. Mr. Speaker went on to say:

> Is the difference between the two situations so substantial that the past practice of allowing statutory dollar items in the supplementary estimate should now be disallowed? Should the very limited time allotted by Standing Order 58 be restricted to the consideration of what is strictly supply? There is much to be said to support an affirmative answer to these questions.

Then Mr. Speaker went on to endorse that reasoning, and specifically establish the precedent that legislative items should come in as bills and not as supplementary estimates.

The same reasoning applied on December 10, 1973, when supplementary estimate dollar items, back in the House for final approval, were declared out of order. In confirming the previous ruling Mr. Speaker stated:

> —the dollar legislative item is just that—it is legislation by way of a dollar item in the estimates and I think it is not a practice which ought to be condoned and supported by the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Later on Mr. Speaker stated further:

> I suggest that if such justification were put forward, it would have to be based on an emergency rather than on principle. The Chair has to make a ruling on principle, and on this basis I would have to say that these three specific items are not properly before the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, Vote L27a in Supplementary Estimates (A) is a slightly different dollar item in that the dollar actually is used in a purchase, but this purchase is a subterfuge to secure ipso facto House approval for the creation of a corporation. This approval would normally be sought through legislation.

The final ruling to which I would like to refer is March 26, 1974. On this occasion Mr. Speaker rejected the argument that the provision of money for the Food Prices Review Board was legislative in nature. I quote part of that ruling because it puts succinctly what must be proven in this particular case. Mr. Speaker stated:

> I agree with him that Parliament cannot legislate by estimates, but on looking at this particular item I do not see what act it claims to amend or in what way it seeks to establish a legislative principle, or to legislate, to put it simply.

What I am contending is not that the estimate amends a bill other than an appropriation act, but that, more serious still, it asks the House to approve in detail, in a legislative fashion, the establishemnt of a company, its purposes and the benefits of some of its staff. In other words, it simply legislates.

When an estimate goes so far as not only to say what the money is allocated for, but how the proceeds of the corporation it is being lent to will be divided up, and what the financial position of civil servants will be, we have a detailed enactment, not a description. Either this is a legislative enactment or all the other estimates before us tonight have been inadequately described.

It has been contended that most of the things done here can be done by Order in Council anyway. These are the words of the President of the Treasury Board. That may be, although I do not believe that generalization applies to the last clause concerning public servants. This still does not mean that this form is proper.

The fact that the government has two options does not justify its inventing a third. Things intended to be part of statute law should be introduced as bills, even if their purpose could also be pursued, in whole or in part, by an Order in Council. If this type of estimate legislation stands as a precedent, then the next time it is tried it might take the form of legislative action which could not be done by Order in Council. We will have created a legislative form which offers governments speed as well as immunity from parliamentary scrutiny.

This point is raised. Mr. Speaker, not to throw out the lottery, with the general purposes of which we are in agreement, but to allow us the normal input which would be our right if legislation were before us. If you find that this estimate is not properly before the House I would be willing to consult with the minister and his colleagues, as are other members of our party, as to the form and progress of any bill that the President of the Treasury Board may wish to introduce before the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (2230)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before recognizing the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who has given some advance notice of his interest in this subject and his objection on similar grounds to the presentation of this measure in this fashion, I must indicate that I have some difficulty in accepting the precedents relating to one dollar items in the past because they are artificial in both form and substance in that they do not represent legitimate spending estimates. The amount here represents a legitimate spending estimate and is a departure from the one dollar estimate, as stated accurately by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

There is another distinction, that is, that separate and apart from the introduction of this item in the estimates is the legislative authority or licence for the establishment by the federal government of a lottery under the Criminal Code, and therefore again it is not the breaking of new ground to introduce it in the estimates in the legislative

sense but rather is the approval by parliament of what is approved in another statute.

I say that, to make sure that hon. members who speak on this important point of order will address themselves to those questions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support wholeheartedly the point raised by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), and I hope I may be permitted to commend him on the excellent case he has made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have studied the same precedents that the hon. member has quoted, but since he has put them on the record I will not re-quote them. I would simply like to sum up what he said by way of referring to those precedents by saying that he brought them to the correct conclusion, in quoting the words of Mr. Speaker, that the government cannot legislate by estimates.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Even though Your Honour has raised a point—and I shall try to adjust myself to it—as to whether that is being attempted in the supplementary estimate now before us, I think that that principle is so important that this is where we should start, that it is not open to the government to use the estimates as a means of doing what ought to be done by way of legislation brought in in separate bills with first, second, and third readings. This has become all the more important since we changed our rules and do not have an opportunity on the floor of the House to debate anything that is in a supply bill.

The contention that the government has made that we could raise these matters on an opposition day does not meet the point. It is not the business of the opposition to find ways for the government to get its legislation discussed; it is the responsibility of the government to bring its legislation before parliament so that it can be dealt with in the proper way. The proper way is to have a bill that is debatable on second reading, that goes either to a standing committee or a committee of the whole, and that comes back for report stage and third reading. But when the government can put an item of legislation into a supplementary estimate and send it off to a standing committee, it obviates completely the possibility of that matter being debated on the floor of the House. I join the hon. member for Vegreville in using all the adjectives he wants to use. This is high-handed, and is no way to treat the parliament of Canada.

Before I quote some other items which I want to produce in support of the case we are making from this side, I should like to address myself to the point Your Honour raised, namely, that it is not necessarily appropriate to use citations or to use statements from the Chair which were made in relation to dollar items and apply those words to this supplementary estimate because, after all, it is a genuine request for money, namely, in the amount of $5 million. May I point out that though this estimate is genuine in that it asks for $5 million for a loan—which, incidentally, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) told us in committee Loto Canada could have got from the banks if he had not been wanting to bring the thing before parliament in this way—there is in the wording of this estimate far more legislation than there is in many bills we get before this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This estimate does not establish Loto Canada. The government has already done that under legislation under which it can set up corporations. So it does not establish Loto Canada, but it does lay down some of the conditions which will apply to Loto Canada. If that is not legislation, I draw the attention of the Chair in particular to the last couple of paragraphs of the item, which are preceded by the significant words "to deem" and "to provide," and I suggest that in those paragraphs, which relate to the Government Employees Compensation Act, the Aeronautics Act, and the right of persons employed by Loto Canada to have vacation leave, sick leave, and all the things which go to public servants, this item is legislating to an extent which is greater, I say, than is the case with many bills which are brought before this House.

So the fact that it is $5 million instead of one dollar does not set aside the argument. The items of legislation are just tacked on—and I use that word because of a quotation I shall produce in a moment—to get them through. The $5 million is in itself incidental. In fact the President of the Treasury Board said that he was doing it this way so that at least it could be discussed in the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, but I ask Your Honour to read it again, as I know you must have done already several times.

I ask hon. members in the House to read the item L27a, which takes a page and a quarter in the bill which is now before us, and no one can deny the fact that it is a piece of legislation. It does not establish Loto Canada, but it sets out conditions which it will observe, and it amends in effect, legislation such as the Government Employees Compensation Act, the Aeronautics Act, and certain provisions having to do with employment in the public service.

I come back to the pronouncement from the Chair to which Your Honour has agreed, namely, that the government does not have the right to legislate by using the estimates.

I said that there was something else from which I wanted to quote. I add this to the excellent quotations which were given by the hon. member for Vegreville.

I have in my hand a letter which was addressed to me on March 24, 1950, by the then auditor general of Canada, Mr. Watson Sellar. I suggest that that name, to anyone who was around a few years ago or to anyone who knows the history of the public service, stands very high. This is a letter which he wrote in response to a request I made to him, with which he enclosed a copy of a memorandum he presented to a committee of the other place. I suppose I have to expect a few catcalls along the way if I read from something which was brought to light in the other place, but at least it was brought to light by a distinguished public servant, Mr. Watson Sellar. This was a memorandum on estimates and the various issues that arise in dealing with them. There were in it two or three para-

graphs, Nos. 8, 9 and 10 under the heading "Vote Texts That Legislate".

● (2240)

If I may abbreviate it, Mr. Speaker, he said in these paragraphs that the practice of legislating by means of items in an appropriation act is a matter of particular constitutional concern. He spoke not only of dollar items but of any items that were legislative in character, any items that had tacked on to them matters that should be brought in by way of bills. In discussing the matter he said at one point:

Legislating by means of an Appropriation Act is a convenience when a need is transitory. Furthermore, it avoids cluttering the statute books with expired legislation. But from the constitutional viewpoint, it is open to the objection that it is, in fact, incomplete legislation . . .

He was addressing himself particularly to the problems facing the Senate because he was giving this memorandum in the Senate. He said later on that if the Senate is sent a supply bill which has in it matters which are legislative, it should ask that those legislative sentences be struck out and put in another bill. Here are his exact words:

If other matters are inserted in the bill or "tacked to it"—

That is the phrase I used in anticipation a while ago.

—these should be struck out and be made into a separate bill or bills.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is exactly what we have here. We have a supplementary item for $5 million. That is money. That is a proper subject for a supplementary estimate. The purpose of that $5 million is to make a loan to Loto Canada so that it can get started.

May I say parenthetically, Mr. Speaker—it does not need to be said because the House knows where I stand, but it should be put on the record—unlike my hon. friend I have no use for this national lottery at all. If this goes forward my colleagues and I shall be voting against it in its entirety. However, that does not deny me the right to argue that it should not be before us as an estimate at all.

Later in this memorandum Mr. Sellar says that a vote text which deals with a matter which normally should be proceeded with by a bill should be handled by a bill.

In light of all that, look again at what is in this supplementary estimate L27a. It is a money item. It is not just a dollar put in by way of subterfuge. It is real money, $5 million to get Loto Canada going, but there has been tacked on, and incidentally the government did not need the bill—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am having considerable difficulty in hearing the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I wonder if I might be permitted to hear the conclusion of his remarks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I was trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has in it something that is legitimate as an estimate, namely, a request for $5 million to lend to Loto Canada. But there has been tacked on to it things that are legislative in character. The government did not need to bring in this bill to create Loto Canada. It has done this by order in council. It did not need to bring in this bill to establish some of the conditions—who will run it, the officers, how the directors will meet and all that, but it has tacked on to this $5 million some conditions about the money that will be raised out of this state lottery. It has tacked onto it items which are in effect legislative in that they amend some of the other statutes of Canada.

I submit that if the government can get away with this, it can do almost everything by including a matter in the supplementary estimates, and then shipping it off to the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. The government tacks onto an item in the estimates other items of a legislative character and, in the process, completely avoids debate on the matter on the floor of the House of Commons.

We have argued in the past about the impropriety of dollar items in the estimates. I can remember the father of the present hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) telling us that supply bills were legislation; so, why were we kicking about dollar items? He had a bit of a case then, because supply bills were debated on the floor of the House. Now they are not so debated. By using the device of tacking legislative items on to an estimate, the government can avoid debate on the floor of the House.

Earlier in this parliament Your Honour had to rule out of order clause 5 of an appropriation bill precisely because under the new rules there was no opportunity to debate something which was in clause 5 and which had not been included in the notice.

An hon. Member: You have had all day to debate legislation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My friend opposite still thinks there is merit to the government argument that we can use an opposition day to discuss their legislation.

Mr. Broadbent: That is ridiculous.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This side is not the government; the hon. member's side is. His side is responsible for bringing its legislation before parliament in the proper way. I submit, along with the hon. member for Vegreville, that this is not the case with this supplementary estimate.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I say I am thoroughly and totally opposed to the federal government's using its right that was put in the Criminal Code—although some of us voted against it—to hold state lotteries. We are opposed to this national lottery, although that is a separate issue on which we can express ourselves when this estimate comes to a vote. I contend tonight that the government does not have the right to legislate by using the estimates. In my submission Your Honour should find that the item now before the House is out of order.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, commenting on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) you rightly pointed out that we are not dealing with a dollar item. We are dealing with the request for a loan of $5 million to be put at the disposal of Loto Canada for working capital. You drew attention to what

you think are the important issues, namely, whether the item which is in the estimates and the bill now before the House are a proper use of the supply procedure for legislative purposes. This was the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

I draw attention to the fact that many programs are approved, not by separate statute, but by items in the estimates. Indeed, if we look at the main estimates which have just been approved, and the bill based on them which has just been approved by this House, we shall see several items of that character. For example, I draw attention to Vote L25, of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, concerning the General Adjustment Assistance Program. That has its legislative foundation in this item in the estimates. No other legislation is required. Also, consider Vote L15 coming under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion concerning community and industrial infrastructure development. This item in the estimates forms the foundation of this program; no other legislative authority is required.

I also refer Your Honour in these particular estimates which have just been approved by the House to Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Vote L15, dealing with the Indian housing assistance program. These are established as an item in the estimates as approved and carried forward in the appropriation bill. All these give the government authority for programs for which there is not other specific legislative sanction.

It may be that there can be a preference on the part of the government, or of the opposition, as to whether any particular program should be expressed in the form of a bill or bills brought before the House in the ordinary way, or as an item in the estimates.

● (2250)

The point that is before you, Mr. Speaker, seems to be whether in fact a procedure is being followed which has been approved in the past and which is founded upon sound legislative practice.

The only grounds for objection to the legislative impact of an item in the estimates is when the primary purpose of that item is to amend an existing statute other than the Appropriation Act. The rulings on this are quite clear. The classic ruling by Mr. Speaker Lamoureux on March 10, 1967, quite clearly distinguished between items amending other statutes and items whose effects, although clearly legislative, do not amend existing statute law. The key portion reads:

—such proposals, when they are clearly intended to amend existing legislation, should come to the House by way of an amending bill rather than as an item in the supplementary estimates.

In conclusion may I suggest that the creation of Loto Canada is authorized by the Corporations Act and by the Criminal Code. Second, the provision of start-up money to the corporation and the authorization of payments does not amend any existing statute. Finally, and I hope this will be Your Honour's view, there is a strong and irrefutable argument that Vote L27a is entirely in order, and so is the bill based upon it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, if we are to adopt in this House the reasoning just put forward by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), especially his last point, then we are to admit the complete abandonment of any reason at all for a bill such as the one we just dealt with a few moments ago, or a bill of this nature. If we are to say that parliament is to approve all these things without customary debate and to use as the basis for it the Criminal Code of Canada, it is a sorry day for the legislative rights and the rights of this parliament.

[Mr. Sharp.]

The other point that he raised was with respect to a number of programs which he cited as precedents. The first program that he cited as a precedent for this happened to be an emergency program which, as I understand it, would perhaps be one of the exceptions under the ruling that was made in 1973. Surely that does not apply here. There does not seem to be any particular emergency about this that could not be satisfied by a bill before parliament which could be dealt with in the normal way.

The second example which he cited in support of this dealt with an established program under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. That may be a sound precedent. I do not argue that point. However, it is certainly not a sound precedent for what the government is trying to do here, which is a completely new program.

I think the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) ought to be complimented with respect to the argument he has presented. I suggest he has put the case for a bill, a bill which we are prepared to deal with in a reasonable way. The support given by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) indicates that he, too, is prepared for a bill. I believe there ought to be a presumption, in any ruling Your Honour makes, against allowing such large sums of money to be passed through parliament so quickly without the usual trappings which are designed to permit the examination of programs of this nature.

I can quite appreciate the urgency of the matter as seen by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), but to say that this is an emergency, or to argue that this is an established program, or to use the Criminal Code as the basis for producing what really amounts to a brand new program by way of a supplementary estimate, is not an acceptable argument and I believe the view put forward by the hon. member for Vegreville ought to be upheld by Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The point of order raised by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) is a very important one, and it will come as no surprise to hon. members that the Chair has had an opportunity to anticipate it to some extent. The support given by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) was carefully noted; it conformed to many of the pronouncements and precedents which have been cited, as well as to others which have been referred to in the research done up to this point.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) has presented a portion of the opposite case. I note that his parliamentary secretary and the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Francis) were also anxious to get into the debate, but I did not find it necessary to hear them at this time.

There seem to be two questions to be decided. The first is whether the method which has been followed in bringing before the House a matter which involves not only dollars and cents but a question of principle is a desirable one. If we do adhere to the theory that a vote on second reading is a vote for or against the principle of a bill, then certainly it would have been preferable for such a matter as this, which involves not only money but a question of principle, to have been brought before the House in the form of a bill in order to allow hon. members to address themselves at one and the same time to the question of whether or not money should be voted to set up a lottery, and, further, to whether or not in principle the federal government should be involved in a scheme of this sort at the present time. However, that involves the question of the desirability of such a course being followed. The arguments of the three hon. members to my left who have contributed to the discussion made a strong case in this regard.

Nevertheless, what I have to decide is not whether it is a desirable course, but whether it is a legal course in terms of our procedures, in other words, whether it is permissible. It is not proper to compare it with a one-dollar item in the estimates because these are technical in every sense of the word. Neither is it proper to attempt to compare this particular case with cases which have been argued rather ably in the past and which led to difficulty with respect to a supply bill because it contained a borrowing clause.

I say this because the borrowing clause problem surfaced only at the time the supply bill was presented. This item is fundamentally different inasmuch as it was tabled as an estimate a month ago and is therefore substantially different from the principle involved in a borrowing clause. In a situation such as this, I have to conclude that where legislative authority exists separate from the item in the estimates, and where that authority permits the establishment of the kind of corporation which is envisaged here, and indeed both the references to the Criminal Code and to the Corporations Act are supported and do in fact provide that authority, then what is happening is that the government is not coming to parliament for legislative authority to do something, but in fact possesses the legislative authority and is coming to parliament for the money to fund it.

● (2300)

Again I say the desirability of this course is open to severe question, and it would certainly be hoped that where a question of principle is involved in an urgent situation, such as that which has given rise to this course and this particular situation, it would be considered an extremely singular situation, and will not be repeated in the future.

However, I do have to find and rule that in fact the legislative authority exists separate and independent from the estimates, and therefore what is sought in the estimates, the item before the House, is the money to support that legislative action which exists independent from it. In these circumstances I have to conclude that there is no legal bar to proceeding in that fashion.

The question is therefore on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Sharp:

Estimates

That Vote L27a, in the amount of $5 million of the Treasury Board, in respect of Loto Canada, in Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Carried on division.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I might ask hon. members whether, the attendance being what it is in the circumstances, and due to the lateness of the hour, hon. members would be prepared to dispense with the ringing of the bells, or perhaps agree to a short five-minute bell. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Chrétien), which was agreed to on the following division:

● (2310)

(*Division No. 141*)

YEAS
Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Basford
Beatty
Beaudoin
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blouin
Boulanger
Brisco
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cadieu
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dick
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Elzinga
Epp
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Fraser
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Hargrave

Messrs.

Harquail
Hees
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Hopkins
Hurlburt
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jones
Joyal
Kaplan
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lee
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLean
Macquarrie
Maine
Malone
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Martin
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McIsaac
McKinley
McKinnon
McRae
Milne
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Oberle
O'Connell
Olivier
O'Sullivan
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Ritchie
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Rondeau
Rooney
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Rynard
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schellenberger
Sharp
Skoreyko
Smith (Churchill)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Towers
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Wenman
Wise
Yanakis
Yewchuk
Young—190

NAYS

Messrs.

Benjamin
Blackburn
Broadbent
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Firth
Gilbert
Hogan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Leggatt
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Rodriguez
Saltsman
Symes—15

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Mr. Chrétien thereupon moved that Bill C-94, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977 be read the first time and be printed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

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

Mr. Chrétien thereupon moved that Bill C-94, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, be read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to on division.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Bill reported.

● (2320)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien thereupon moved that Bill C-94, for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, be now read a third time and do pass.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

[*Translation*]

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed on division.

Mr. Speaker: It being after 10 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

At 11.23 p.m., the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 23, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH GUIDELINES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CROWN AGENCIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43 to raise a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the revelation yesterday by the Minister of Finance that there are still no conflict of interest guidelines applying to employees of Crown corporations and similar agencies in Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That the House support the immediate establishment and implementation of guidelines with regard to employees of Crown corporations and similar agencies, and that the standard be similar to that set for public servants on December 18, 1973 by order in council, and that in the case of quasi judicial bodies the standards be at least equal to those applying to our judiciary.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR TELEVISION COVERAGE OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON BILL C-84—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, due to the importance of the discussion on Bill C-84 in committee, I move under the provisions of Standing Order 43, seconded by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle):

That this House instruct the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to allow live radio and television coverage of the committee hearings on Bill C-84.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

AGRICULTURE

PROPOSED REVISION OF DAIRY POLICY IN CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCIAL MARKETING BOARDS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Now that the full impact of this government's new dairy policy has been experienced by producers and observation reveals individual producer hold-backs in sufficient amounts and numbers as to result in extreme financial losses and bankruptcies within the industry, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

● (1410)

That this House instruct the Minister of Agriculture, in consultation with the various provincial marketing boards, to revise immediately the present dairy policy, having special regard for the removal of at least a portion of the penalty clause and the return of a percentage of the resultant holdback and a revision of the interprovincial subsidy quotas.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTION BILL C-242 BE PUT FORWARD AS GOVERNMENT MEASURE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the rapid approach of the summer recess I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That Bill C-242, which deals with smokers in transit, be put forward as a government bill in order to facilitate its passage through this House before the House breaks for the summer recess.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: The Liberals said no.

Oral Questions

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AND ENFORCE NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR SO_2 EMISSIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion concerns the continual exceeding of provincial limits on the emission of SO 2 by the Great Canadian Oil Sands Company at the Alberta tar sands site. Since 1974, according to a report by STOP enclosed in a letter to the attorney general of Alberta from that organization, Great Canadian Oil Sands has exceeded the provincial SO 2 limits 258 times.

In view of the fact that this evidence corroborates the view of many that the province of Alberta is unable or unwilling to enforce its standards on GCOS, and in view of the fact that such emissions are a threat to the environment and health of tens of thousands of people living in the vicinity I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez):

That the federal government take action immediately under the Clean Air Act to establish and enforce national standards of SO 2 emissions, which are long overdue in any case, and to enforce those standards in the tar sands operations.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be some indication that this motion has less than unanimous consent.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM AUSTRALIA

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the oral question period, may I take this opportunity to call to the attention of all hon. members the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished delegation, under the auspices of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, from Australia, headed by their distinguished Minister of Defence, the Hon. D. J. Killen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN INSPECTION STAFF OF INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister. The question arises out of the recent remarks of the Prime Minister that rather than the industrial countries giving up their right to sell nuclear power to whoever they wish, the world should not be afraid to live dangerously. In the light of the fact that it seems increasingly unlikely that mankind will be able to control the political chain reaction of proliferation, which now threatens to become critical, will the Prime Minister take steps to achieve an increase in the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards capability, which at present has a staff of only 40 professionals to inspect over 400 nuclear installations?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the question on behalf of the Prime Minister, just a short time ago I had a long discussion with the officers of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, and one of the questions I put to them quite forcibly was the very question the hon. member raised, namely, whether they had at their disposal adequate staff and inspection services to carry out their responsibilities. The answer from the officials was that they had adequate staff and adequate resources, and if the need for future additional resources should arise, they will make the appropriate request. That is the answer to that question.

Mr. Roche: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Secretary of State for External Affairs made a speech to the OECD this week in which he chastized the industrial nations for not doing more in the cause of peace and development in the world. In the light of that speech and the answer he has just given, will the Canadian government indicate to IAEA that Canada is willing if necessary to increase contributions to the agency, with the proviso that the extra resources are to be used to expand the safeguards division?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the first part of the question, my comments with respect to industrial nations were to suggest that in the continuing dialogue that is going on in Paris, it would be dangerous if the industrialized countries engaged in foot-dragging in the vital months that lie ahead. During my discussions with officials of the International Atomic Energy Agency, I indicated to them that Canada was prepared to increase its financial commitment to the agency and I am sure that we would consider, if in their judgment additional resources were required for inspection services, doing precisely the same in that field.

* * *

ENERGY

NUCLEAR POWER—PROPOSED TRANSFER OF ACTIVITIES FROM PROMOTION TO SAFEGUARDS

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Will the government indicate to the governing board of the IAEA that it is this country's view, as expressed by such people as Maurice Strong, the chairman of Petro-Canada as well as many distinguished Canadians who met during the Habitat conference, in Vancouver that the promotion of nuclear power is inconsistent with its proper regulation and that resources presently used in promotion should be redeployed to safeguards activities?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has already referred to his discussions with IAEA and I think has made it very clear to the hon. member what the position of Canada is, as the Prime Minister also indicated in a public statement at the Habitat conference.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PAKISTAN—ALLEGED REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL NUCLEAR ASSISTANCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He says the international agency has sufficient capability for inspection. It would be interesting if he would ascertain how many inspections have actually been carried out in the last three years at the CANDU plant outside Karachi. My question in relation to Pakistan is simply this: the minister has had on his desk for two months a request from Pakistan for added nuclear assistance. Has the government at long last come to a decision in respect of that request, and if so, what is it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has things mixed up. The situation is that Canada has requested a renegotiation with Pakistan of the present safeguards arrangements with a view to upgrading them. This is presently what is before the government of Pakistan and before the government of Canada. They have not requested additional assistance above what is presently provided.

* * *

ENERGY

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACT WITH ARGENTINA FOR NUCLEAR REACTOR—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF COST

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Again the minister has been evading questions with regard to AECL cost of the Argentinian project by saying for six months at least that this has been under renegotiation. How long can the renegotiations go on, and has the government any idea what that is going to cost Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. member a precise time frame. Quite clearly it is in Canada's interest to make the best deal it possibly can. That is what Canadian negotiators are presently in the process of doing.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDIA—INCARCERATION OF GEORGES FERNANDES—REQUEST FOR REPRESENTATIONS FOR RELEASE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In light of Canada's association with the Republic of India in the Commonwealth and the long friendship between the two countries both of which are or were united by respect for democratic freedom, will the minister express to Mrs. Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India or the appropriate representative of the government there, regret that one Georges Fernandes, a leading democratic socialist and trade union leader has been arrested and imprisoned for political reasons. This action is calculated to destroy democratic opposition in that country. Will the minister suggest that Mr. Fernandes should be released?

● (1420)

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, any effort on the part of Canada to suggest to Indian authorities how they should administer the internal affairs of their country would very likely be more counterproductive than helpful in the present situation. The hon. member's representations, I am sure, speak for themselves.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate sincerely what the minister is saying, but suggest that when fundamental freedoms are at stake and many people throughout the world are expressing their regret, Canada might join in.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSING

PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF RURAL HOUSING—POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC ON ELIGIBLE REGIONS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

A few weeks ago the minister sent a communiqué to hon. members in which he announced a support program for the rehabilitation of rural housing. As far as Quebec is concerned, could the minister tell the House whether a special agreement has been reached between his department and a department of the province on the regions to be designated as eligible under this program?

[English]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, yes, agreement has been reached with the Quebec Housing Corporation but I am not quite certain at the moment if the agreement has been signed. I shall be glad to check. The designated areas have been agreed upon with the province.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR TABLING COPY OF AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC ON RURAL HOUSING

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

Given his affirmative answer, could the minister table a document enabling hon. members to read the agreement which was signed with the province of Quebec and could he also tell us what amount of money is made available for the implementation of this program?

[*English*]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to supply that information.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSAL TO ACCEPT FIVE PER CENT CEILING ON GROWTH—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister. In view of his pending visit to Puerto Rico, to attend a meeting of the heads of state of certain states, and in view of the OECD tentative understanding that member countries should accept a 5 per cent per annum ceiling on growth for the balance of this decade, would the Prime Minister indicate what position he intends to take on this important subject in Puerto Rico, bearing in mind that we have much higher unemployment in Canada than exists in most OECD countries and that, if we are not permitted to grow at a faster than 5 per cent growth rate, there is little likelihood of our being able to materially lower our jobless level in the country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we will attempt to grow at the optimum rate, from the Canadian point of view, regardless of what was said in any other place.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister to do with his attendance in Puerto Rico? As Canada's population and work force is growing at a faster rate than is the case in most OECD countries, does the Prime Minister intend, in Puerto Rico, to make it clear that we need a higher than 5 per cent per annum growth rate to even keep level with other countries on a per capita basis?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that is precisely the question the Prime Minister just answered.

[Mr. Danson.]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POSITION OF UNITED STATES NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE ON EFFECT OF AEROSOL SPRAY ON OZONE—SUGGESTION MINISTER CORRECT HIS ANSWER

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of the Environment? Yesterday I asked the hon. gentleman if he would care to correct the misleading impression he left earlier concerning the U.S. Academy of Science, when he said, and I quote:

[Translation]

. . . made a study and came to the conclusion that nothing proved that the use of aerosol sprays could cause damages . . .

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: That's the result of some weeks of Berlitz.

Mr. Jarvis: Since the minister did not take advantage of the opportunity I gave him yesterday to correct the misleading impression he left with the House on Monday concerning the state of scientific opinion with regard to the destruction of the atmosphere ozone layer, will he now admit that his original statement regarding the conclusions of the academy was in error, and will he take the opportunity to correct the impression he left on Monday?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, what I said in substance is absolutely true. I have the confirmation of the department. It has not been proved scientifically that the atmosphere's ozone layer has now so deteriorated that it puts people's lives in danger.

Now, a study was made by the U.S. Academy of Science, the report of which has not been published yet. I simply read the information published in Canadian and American newspapers, which confirms the opinion of my department that nothing shows right now that we are in danger, but that this could eventually happen if we do not take whatever action is necessary to prevent an increase in atmospheric pollution.

[*English*]

SOURCE OF REPORT TO MINISTER ON EFFECT OF AEROSOL SPRAY ON OZONE

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): When the minister referred yesterday to a report that he had received from his department, was he referring to a report from the National Academy of Science or was it an interdepartmental report? If it was the latter, can he indicate the source of that report leading to the conclusion he has just drawn? What is the source of that report and who is its author?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, it is a communication I received from my department. People who work on that kind of pollution, scientists, tell me that an interdepartmental committee composed of representatives of the Department of the Environment, the Department of Transport, the National

Research Council and also some universities, are currently studying that important question. But right now I repeat, that nothing shows that there is an immediate danger for people's lives, but that is an extremely serious problem which is being looked at very closely by all scientists.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

PROGRAM FOR NATIVES IN URBAN CENTRES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. It is with regard to the decision by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to cut off the support program to native housing groups in the larger centres such as Winnipeg, Edmonton and Calgary. In light of the fact that the minister, recognizing the special problems associated with the increasing migration of native people to the cities, has repeatedly promised that a native housing policy for the cities would be established, can he explain why this latest step has not been taken and what remedial action is being proposed before the end of this month?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there certainly have not been any programs cut off or concluded. There are certain programs which are desired by native people in the urban areas that are not possible under present legislation. We are working very closely with them. I recognize, as does the hon. member, the particular nature and growing urgency of the problem of urban native people. I repeat, no programs have been cut off and we are working with them. I was to meet with a group yesterday which unfortunately could not get here because of some difficulty with aircraft. We are continuing on that and indeed emphasizing those programs that are at work now as well as trying to expand upon them. There are some programs that cannot work at the present time, because of provisions relating to ownership as opposed to rental. Unfortunately, I cannot give an answer on it before the end of this month, as much as I would like to.

Mr. Oberle: In the case of Winnipeg in particular, there will be a massive layoff of people who have seasonally and assiduously managed to succumb to their own desperate situation. In view of the fact the minister has promised for three years that there would be a special policy that would address itself to the problems of native housing, particularly in the cities, will the minister, in spite of the air strike, establish a moratorium over the policy of CMHC that has come to light in the past few days?

Mr. Danson: Mr. Speaker, no final policy came to light in the past few days. There is a committee that has been working on this, but no final decisions have been made on that at this time.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REASON FOR RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL TO FOUR COUNTRIES ON MEMBERS' PASSPORTS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will the minister explain to the House under what authority restrictions were placed on passports of members of this House dated June 3, 1976, for four countries. What were the circumstances leading up to those restrictions being imposed? I ask this with particular regard to Taiwan where there is no civil strife, contrary to the three other countries in which civil strife may be anticipated. I am referring to restrictions on travel to North Korea, Namibia, Rhodesia and Taiwan. In particular, would the minister explain why members of this House are forbidden, according to their passports, from travelling to Taiwan?

● (1430)

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I would like to examine the question and reply to the hon. member, probably tomorrow.

An hon. Member: No way; it is a holiday.

Mr. Wagner: St. Jean Baptiste Day.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Would the Secretary of State inquire into the practice whereby personnel in the passport section call in the passports of members who are taking part in parliamentary delegations under the pretext of endorsing their passports accordingly, and then enter restrictions in the passports without giving prior notice?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will do that.

CANADIAN POSITION AT OECD CONFERENCE CONCERNING RATE OF GROWTH OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It arises from an OECD report which suggests there is to be a lower rate of growth and lower employment. According to a news item from Paris in this morning's paper, the Canadian delegation agreed with the thrust of the final OECD communiqué, noting that it was consistent with present government policy in Ottawa. I ask the Secretary of State to tell us what it was that our delegation agreed to, and in what way our position at the OECD can be reconciled with the statement just made by the Prime Minister that we were pursuing our own course at the conference.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have not seen the final communiqué but I do know that one of the questions before the OECD was the attitude of the industrialized countries toward future growth, the context within which future growth should be undertaken and the extent to which the policies of the industrialized countries could be harmonized. As I understand it, the thrust of the final proposal by the Secretary General was that the industrialized countries ought to support economic growth in the future but not to the extent that this would bring about unacceptable levels

of inflation which would obviously result thereafter in greater unemployment and perhaps a further recession. I believe the position has to be understood against the background of a fear of resurgence of inflation in all industrialized countries if growth is permitted to go beyond reasonable bounds.

* * *

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY BUDGET REFLECTS COMMITMENT TO LOWER RATE OF GROWTH

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): I should like to direct my supplementary to the Minister of Finance and ask him to what extent his May budget was influenced by this agreement Canada has made with the OECD countries and whether his budget does reflect that commitment to lower growth and less concern about unemployment?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): It was certainly not influenced by an OECD agreement which was reached about three weeks afterwards. Nevertheless, the position stated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs seems to be a reasonable one and one which, I should have thought, would have commended itself to the hon. member. While we should be seeking growth to meet our employment requirements in Canada we would be the losers if we allowed it at the expense of unrestrained inflation. To that extent, the position stated by my colleague is the position taken in the budget.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO CAPITAL COST ALLOWANCES AND LEASING—EFFECT ON CANADIAN FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. John Roberts (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance—it is one of great concern to film-makers in Canada. In the budget of May 25, the hon. gentleman announced a new rule against tax sheltering related to capital cost allowances and leasing; it is feared that this will militate against the production of Canadian films. May I ask whether it is intended that the rule apply to films produced in Canada?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Subject to confirmation I would say it really applies to movable equipment only in Canada, that is to say, to chattels rather than to the films themselves. But I would have to confirm this through closer examination.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DATE OF TABLING REPORT ON RAILWAY PENSIONS

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour but in his absence I will address it to the Prime Minister. When will the long-awaited report on railway pensions be tabled, and in any event, when will steps be taken to alleviate the distress of railway pensioners covered by inadequate pension plans?

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member is asking me when a report will be tabled. I will inquire.

An hon. Member: You have been doing that for two years.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

DELAY IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR PRIVATE PILOTS' AND AIRCRAFT LICENCES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): My question is addressed to the Minister of Transport. Many hon. members have received complaints because of the heavy backlog in the processing of applications for licences for private aircraft and pilots dealt with by the Toronto District office. Can the minister offer us any hope that there might be a "catch-up" operation in the processing of these applications so that people wanting these licences will not have to wait two months or more as is now the case?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I am afraid I cannot extend a great deal of hope at the present time. The labour dispute is not yet settled in a final way and there is a danger of falling further behind, let alone being able to provide for a catch-up operation. Nevertheless, some steps are being taken to deal with the situation.

RENEWAL OF PILOT'S LICENCES IN VIEW OF POSSIBLE STRIKE OF AIRCRAFT SAFETY INSPECTORS

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): In the light of the planned strike by the aircraft safety inspectors group, is the minister proposing any extension whatsoever of expired pilots' licences once the strike commences and, if so, for how long? Further, will he be conducting proper medical examinations before any of these licences are renewed?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The question is clearly hypothetical but I would refer the hon. member to our past practice.

* * *

TRANSPORT

FREIGHT RATES—METHOD OF MAINTAINING BENEFIT OF CROW RATE FOR RAPESEED

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It arises from the many statements made by the minister in charge of the Wheat Board in this House as well as in Western Canada about discrepancies between freight rates for rapeseed, rapeseed products, feed grains and beef. I refer in particular to one occasion upon which the minister, in answer to a question, said: "I would fight to try to preserve the benefit of the Crow rate in some other way . . . " Would the minister tell us what he meant by "some other way"?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I will send the hon. member a copy of the speech I made in Edmonton a year and a half ago.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

OIL SPILL IN THOUSAND ISLANDS AREA OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—INVOLVEMENT OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT IN CLEAN-UP

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment and it has to do with the recent oil spill in the Thousand Islands area of the St. Lawrence River system. Is the federal government involved in any way in the clean-up operations and, if so, to what extent? Further, is there any danger to the Canadian side of the river?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Yes, Mr. Speaker, some 4,000 barrels of crude oil were spilled in the area of the Thousand Islands, on the American side. There is a real danger that the crude could reach Canadian shores between Brockville and Kingston. Naturally, that will depend on both currents and winds. I know that at the present time violent winds are blowing. The United States have recognized that the spill is their responsibility, they are taking steps to prevent the crude from reaching the Canadian side. But we have no assurance that it will not, and we are working with them to reduce damages to a minimum.

[*English*]

Mr. Murta: My supplementary is, really, the first part of my question. If that is the case, could the minister bring us up to date as to exactly what the federal government is doing to ensure that in the event the oil does move into the Kingston area the authorities will be prepared to deal with it?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are working in co-operation with the American authorities. If at some point the Americans cannot contain the spill alone, there is no doubt that the Department of Transport and the Department of the Environment will help them directly.

* * *

LOTO CANADA

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE ADMINISTRATION NOT MODELLED ON LOTO QUEBEC

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

In view of the revelations made in the last few days concerning Loto Quebec, namely that influence and extortion tactics were resorted to, can the Prime Minister assure the House that Loto Canada will not be modelled on Loto Quebec and that it will not call on the concessionaires and distributors of the provincial lottery?

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): I would be glad to bring that question to the attention of the minister. He will be in a position to answer it when he returns to the House.

● (1440)

[*Translation*]

POSSIBILITY OF GRANTING TICKET CONCESSIONS TO NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): I also want to put a supplementary to the right hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Could the right hon. Prime Minister consider the possibility of granting the Loto Canada concessions to non-profit associations that are above suspicion such as those of the veterans, handicapped, blind and other worthy groups?

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will also bring that question to the minister's attention.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE TO ISOLATED AREAS—REASON FOR DELAY

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State who is reponsible for the CBC. In view of the concern expressed by his colleague the Minister of Communications in a speech at St. Andrews-by-the-Sea over the extension of communication services to the north and isolated areas, would the minister indicate what progress is being made with the accelerated coverage program that the CBC has now had in effect for two or three years? No action, or it appears that no action, has been taken to extend T.V. coverage to remote areas that have yet to receive coverage.

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I do not have the detailed information with me but I will be pleased to provide the hon. member with details of the accelerated coverage plan for the province of Newfoundland.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

POSSIBILITY OF LEBANESE BEING DECLARED REFUGEES—NUMBER IN CANADA

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. First of all, may I welcome the statement that he made regarding the relocation of Lebanese refugees in

Canada. May I ask the minister whether these applicants have been declared refugees by the United Nations high commissioner for refugees, and can the minister give any indication how many people will be involved under the program that he has announced?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the people in question have not been declared refugees by the United Nations high commissioner for refugees, and indeed we are not declaring them refugees either. Faced with the situation of continuing strife in Lebanon, we have made the decision to proceed to offer them the opportunity to seek landed immigrant status through order in council. To the best of our information there are between 1,000 and 1,100 such Lebanese individuals here in Canada now, and of course this will apply to those who have been in Canada as of, I believe, last Monday.

SECURITY CHECKS ON LEBANESE ENTERING CANADA—POSSIBLE USE OF POINTS SYSTEM TO DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether these applicants will have to qualify under Canada's immigration points system, but more importantly are proper security checks being completed at the present time in order to avoid the unfortunate situation that reflected negatively on the Vietnamese resettlement program, which was something that placed in jeopardy the whole question of Canada being a receiving country for international refugees?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, the applicants would be subject to the normal background and medical checks. As to the criteria by which they will be judged, these will not be exactly in accordance with the points system. The other requirement is some assessment that they will be able to adapt successfully to Canadian life, hopefully with the assistance of the Lebanese community.

With regard to the other part of the hon. member's comment contained in his question, I think there were only one or two incidents that occurred in the Vietnamese movement or any other refugee movement. I would defy anybody, faced with the emergency measures demanded by the sad state of affairs that cause refugees to apply for special consideration, to avoid an issue such as that, but I do not think that it should be over-emphasized.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON WHICH BOARD BASED DECISION TO ROLL BACK SALARIES OF REHABILITATION WORKERS IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. Mike Landers (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the recent rollback of the salaries of the pharmacy, physical and mental rehabilitation unit employees who fall under part III of the New Brunswick labour relations act, would it be possible to obtain a copy of the case worker's report on which the Anti-Inflation Board based its rollback decision, and if not, why not, keeping in mind that allegations of inaccuracy have been forthcoming?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have pursued with the Anti-Inflation Board the questions posed to me by the hon. member in this regard, and I am advised by the board that due to the provisions of section 14(1) of the Anti-Inflation Act the documents would not be available because they are confidential. I therefore regret that the answer would have to be in the negative.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

INQUIRY IF DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DESIGNATION OF ELIGIBLE ZONES FOR REHABILITATION OF RURAL HOUSING

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

We know that the minister consults the provinces to set up the designated zones eligible for the RRAP program. Can the minister tell the House whether his department is responsible for the designation of those zones and on which criteria his department relies to determine if a municipal area may be eligible for this program?

[*English*]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I gather the hon. member is referring to the rehabilitation program which replaced the urban renewal program. The first criterion is that the residential rehabilitation and assistance program applies with priority to those areas previously urban renewal areas but which are no longer so designated, having been replaced by this more effective approach. The second priority would be neighbourhood improvement areas and the basic criterion is that area which is most in need, which has the lowest income and lowest standard of housing which has to be revitalized. The province usually selects the areas; final selection is subject to CMHC approval. There is a somewhat different and special situation in the city of Montreal where a special arrangement has been made in two areas in the east part of the city; but other than that there are 12 such designated areas throughout the province of Quebec.

* * *

EDUCATION

INQUIRY AS TO ACCEPTANCE OF INVITATION TO CONFERENCE BY PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Have the provincial ministers of education accepted an invitation to meet with the minister on July 7, and have they asked him to clarify exactly what it is he wants to talk to them about?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I understand it was discussed at the meeting in Manitoba last weekend. I plan to get in touch with the chairman of the council of ministers, Mr. Bennett Campbell, the minister of education for Prince Edward Island. I tried to get him this morning but he was occupied; I hope to speak to him later in the day and to be in a position to give a more complete response to this question next week.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF HOUSING—INQUIRY IF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT APPROVAL IS NECESSARY

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary.

I would like to know if a municipality, to be eligible for grants under the RRAP program, must necessarily get the approval of the provincial government?

[*English*]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it does.

* * *

TRANSPORT

NUMBER OF DREDGING CONTRACTS LET AND AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR SUPERVISION

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Would the minister advise the House what has been done regarding bidding procedures in dredging contracts, have any contracts been let and who is supervising these contracts?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, some contracts have been considered. This question, of course, in the broad area of government, would have to relate to the Minister of Public Works as well as myself. If the hon. member would refer to a specific contract I would be glad to try to deal with it.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, may I direct the same question to the Minister of Public Works. Would the minister advise the House what is being done so far as dredging contracts are concerned? Is he supervising these contracts?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, dredging contracts are the responsibility of the department both with regard to letting and supervision. The department enters into the contract. There is, however, under the chairmanship of the Department of Public Works a committee that monitors not only the tenders but the contracts themselves and their execution.

DREDGING OF TURNING BASIN AT CHURCHILL—REQUEST FOR ACTION TO PREVENT DELAY OF SHIPPING

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport. I understand that the dredging program in the turning basin at Churchill is seriously behind schedule. Would the minister take immediate action to have the situation corrected so that this year's shipping season will not be further hampered or restricted?

● (1450)

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there have been some earlier problems with regard to the dredging program. As much action as is possible has been taken to put that right. As the hon. member knows we are looking forward to a record movement of grain through Churchill this year.

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE INADEQUACIES FOUND IN RAIL SERVICE BY COMMISSION WILL BE RECTIFIED

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the provisions of the Railway Act and specifically section 262 which requires the railway to provide adequate and suitable accommodation for traffic at all places served by it, and in view of the fact that the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission is presently holding hearings in Saskatchewan to determine the adequacy of service to a number of centres in Saskatchewan by the Canadian Pacific Railway, will the minister assure concerned residents in Saskatchewan that where the committee finds the service inadequate the government will undertake to make sure that the provisions of Section 262 will be complied with by the railway.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the very reason the committee is there is to determine adequacy and to take the appropriate action. The committee will do that and the commission has the power.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

USE OF PRINCIPLE OF DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY IN RELATION TO NUCLEAR REACTORS TO GUARD AGAINST DIVERSION OF PLUTONIUM

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is supplementary to the other questions asked on the issue of the export of the CANDU reactor. Would the minister advise whether Canada has ever taken a position in terms of the nuclear exporting powers that she would be willing to grant diplomatic immunity in terms of its own requirements within the country and outside, so that we can enter into the principle of extraterritoriality in protecting reactors that we sell abroad so that there is some protection against diversion of plutonium from those materials. Has that concept been forwarded by the Canadian negotiators at any time.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I understand precisely what is meant by extra-territorial diplomatic immunity and reciprocity in these circumstances. In the normal course Canada relies on the International Atomic

Agency to carry out inspection to ensure that materials are not diverted for explosive purposes. There is also a provision for Canadian back-up to this inspection service where required. On the fact of it I do not see any additional evidence arising from the hon. member's suggestion that does not presently exist.

SUGGESTED REASSESSMENT OF POLICY OF EXPORTING NUCLEAR REACTORS

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister will understand the advantages behind diplomatic immunity for embassies around the world and the same advantage would apply. IRDA, a division of the United States Department of Commerce, has now in a very intensive study indicated that there is no telling economic reason for the export of CANDU reactors to third world countries and that the purchases without exception have been made for power and military prestige only. In view of the continuing body of evidence that is flowing in terms of U.S. and world authorities, is the minister now making a reassessment in terms of Canada's position on the export of those reactors and the increasing risk to world peace that is occurring as a result?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, no one has ever suggested that it would be appropriate in every developing country to have sited power reactors. In some developing countries it may be possible to secure power requirements from other sources. But certainly in a number of developing countries the evidence seems to be overwhelming in the present circumstances that they must rely upon nuclear sources for present power requirements. It is on that basis, and because of the obligation Canada has assumed under the non-proliferation treaty, that we have undertaken to transfer technology to other parts of the world, especially the developing world. It is really one of the most urgent requirements for certain developing countries.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REASON UNITED STATES COMPANY RECEIVED COPIES OF PRICING AND PROFITS REGULATIONS BEFORE MEMBERS

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the recently announced regulations of the Anti-Inflation Board on pricing and profits were made available to the media in time for a news article on Tuesday, June 15 and in view of the fact that the United States office of Eaton-Yal in Cleveland, Ohio, received a copy of the regulations three days later on June 18 and more particularly in view of the fact that the Canadian office of that same company in Ontario was embarrassed and annoyed that they were unable to obtain the same information until three days later, at the same time that the local members of parliament received their copy, I wonder how the minister justifies this order of priority?

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will bring that grievance to the attention of the board.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENERGY

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON PROPOSED ELECTRICAL TRANSMISSION LINE FROM QUEBEC TO UNITED STATES

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Since the province of Quebec has long considered putting up a transmission line which would enable it to sell electricity to the United States, could the minister tell us where those negotiations now stand and would he say if the province of Quebec will receive a positive answer.

[*English*]

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I believe that upon reflection the hon. member would agree that it would be quite improper for me to speculate on the decision that would be rendered by the National Energy Board on this matter.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REASON FOR RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL TO FOUR COUNTRIES ON MEMBERS' PASSPORTS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question arises from an earlier question by the hon. member for Edmonton West. It concerns if it was correctly stated by the hon. member for Edmonton West to be an outrageous interference with the rights of members of parliament to have freedom to go where they will, and the rights of Canadians as a whole under the United Nations charter to have freedom of egress and ingress. Was this order made by Order in Council or is it the consequence of bureaucratic lawlessness?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if that is a question I think the answer to both would be no.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister did not know anything about it when he was asked a moment ago. Has he had some information since the question was asked by the hon. member for Edmonton West? If there is an order in Council, will he table it because this is a gross interference with the rights of members of the House of Commons and parliament in general.

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

TRADE

POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT WITH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND ON IMPORTATION OF BEEF

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture perhaps I might direct my question to the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister confirm or deny reports to the effect that trade agreements between Canada and the Governments of Australia and New Zealand have been reached with reference to the importation of beef from these two countries?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I take note of the question and I will provide the hon. member with the information.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

POSSIBILITY OF POISONED MILK IN CHILLIWACK AREA—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that a dairy farmer in the Fraser Valley telephoned a radio station and stated that he had just put poison in the milk. In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I should like to ask his parliamentary secretary whether the minister has been advised of this report and whether it is being investigated.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, that report was brought to the attention of the Health Protection Branch. I think I can give the hon. member some reassurance. The department is taking the report seriously although it may be a hoax. All milk shipments in Chilliwack have been stopped. Milk will be tested and approved before any will be released. If this is indeed a hoax or a joke it is a pretty expensive joke for the taxpayers.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In light of the fact that we have a group of very distinguished parliamentarians from Australia in our gallery, and in light of the fact that the Canadian cattlemen have lost more money in the last few weeks than ever in the history of this country, would the Prime Minister ask our guests from down under to find another market for their beef and give us a little time to recover.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

● (1500)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

TABLING OF REFERENCES RESPECTING COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN SCHOOL BOARDS

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I should like to table copies of references to the administrator, under the Anti-Inflation Act, with respect to collective agreements concerning the Wentworth County Board of Education, the Prescott and Russell County Roman Catholic Separate School Board, and the Sudbury District Roman Catholic Separate School Board.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

STATEMENT ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to table, in both official languages, copies of the order in council appointing the Hon. W. R. Sinclair, of the Court of Appeal in Edmonton, and the Hon. Julien Chouinard, of the Court of Appeal in Quebec City, to a commission to study the safety aspects of bilingual air traffic control in Quebec, and the terms of reference of that commission.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: General aviation outside the commercial airline field is extremely important in Canada, especially because of our space and because of our income levels, which means that we can take advantage of the means of travel which is fastest and covers that great space of ours. This is true of Canadians who use English, and it is equally true for Canadians who are much more at home or even only at home in the French language, particularly in that great area which is comprised of the northern parts of the province of Quebec. This led us some time ago to look at the question of air traffic control in that area in both languages, and we took some steps in that direction.

I think it is important for me to draw to the attention of the House the fact that what we have done so far is simply extend bilingual air traffic control in visual flight operations to five airports in the province of Quebec and to indicate that within the near future that will be extended to two additional airports in that province. It is important to note that, outside certain radio services in that language, that it is all that has been done, and that all of this has been done now without any argument or disagreement on the part of the air controllers or pilots in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: The key consideration in this policy as it has been developed to this point, and as we look forward to the future, is that the current, strict safety standards and practices in aircraft operations in Canada have not, and will not, be lowered or jeopardized. We have indicated some plans which are subject to greater controversy. They

are, specifically, plans to examine procedures for bilingual air traffic control in the broad Montreal area, in completing bilingual air traffic control in the province of Quebec both in instrument flight procedures and visual flight procedures. Because of the complexity of our air traffic which the interest in general aviation creates, we had to take the time to develop procedures which were particularly suited to this area, in keeping with the fundamental commitment, we will maintain the safety standards and practices in aircraft operations in Canada of which we have been proud. These will not be lowered or jeopardized.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: It is important to note that this matter is under study and examination in terms of the development of procedures, and we have asked for and been given an indication of support from pilots and controllers in the development of these procedures with elaborate simulation equipment which exists here, in the national capital region, and at the Dion site as well. If this succeeds, then we will move to the next step. This was something that was to be done in 1977 and 1978 as we could proceed with it.

In every case it should be emphasized that throughout Canada the pilot of the aircraft will determine the language of use between himself and the air traffic controller. In no case would it be required of any pilot that he become bilingual, certainly not in any case if he was unilingual English, because throughout Canada air traffic control in English would be available to him at all times. What we were hoping to do, and what we are hoping to do, is provide air traffic control in the French language when the pilot is better served by that in the province of Quebec, and perhaps at a later date in the national capital region. No controller will be required to be bilingual except in areas of bilingual air traffic control or, in other words, basically in the province of Quebec.

In order to provide double assurance that safety remains our pre-eminent watchword, we agreed to the appointment of a commission to examine the manner in which our procedures were being developed, and at the end, when those procedures were ready for implementation in our view, to comment upon them and the standard of safety which we have achieved.

As hon. members know, Mr. Keenan, first appointed to such a commission, found it necessary to resign. Today I announced the appointment of a new commission. In view, not only of the distinction of the commissioners who will be at work, but the fact that the work being done is toward the development of procedures which will be put in place if we are successful in developing them in a year or two years from now, and in view of the fact that everything that is being done in air traffic control in Canada at present is judged safe by all the parties involved, I think it is right for me to ask hon. members in the House to join in the request to the parties to go back to work flying passengers in Canada while the work of this commission goes on, and to cease the disruptions which have so afflicted our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Lang.]

Mr. Lang: I ask for that support earnestly, as I have done in the past, in the belief that the right thinking members of all parties in the House—and I take that to be the majority in every party—believe that these steps are reasonable and that so long as the principle of the high standard of safety to which I referred is maintained, this course of action deserves support.

Just before coming to the House I received word that Mr. Maley of the Canadian Airline Pilots' Association had indicated through the press that he would like to see a meeting between himself and Mr. Livingstone, certain of the airline chief executives, myself and senior officials. I immediately responded by inviting Mr. Livingstone, Mr. Maley and such of the executives as can be present at such a meeting tonight to come to a meeting in order to attempt to resolve this matter. I am sure that in that resolution the support of all members of the House will be helpful indeed, and again I solicit it.

● (1510)

Mr. Jack Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, we in this party welcome the statement of the minister and join with him and wish him success in getting our airlines, air pilots and air traffic controllers back to what might be called a cordial effort to return our air freight and passenger travel to a normal situation.

We are deeply concerned about the safety aspects of this question and it is regrettable that language and racial questions have to enter the picture. We also regret that the minister has taken this long to meet the president of the pilots' association and the air traffic controllers. We believe that he, as Minister of Transport, would serve the country well if he answered the question put to him yesterday by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) and released all the air safety studies which have taken place in his department to this date so that we who want to judge this issue in an unbiased and fair way could have an equal opportunity to do so. I urge the minister to consider the question put yesterday by the hon. member for Central Nova, to answer it and to make available to the country those studies, because I think that would be helpful to the country in reaching a favourable decision.

It is regrettable that the minister does not, in essence, come completely clean. He says in his statement that pilots can and will be available to operate in both official languages at five airports. In his statement he also threw in the question of the Ottawa-Hull region, and that leaves the question in the minds of people as to whether this is the beginning and not the end.

An hon. Member: What are you afraid of?

Mr. Horner: I am afraid of nothing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: We urge the minister to come completely clean and to place the facts on the table, and we regret very much that the whole question of safety has become clouded. I am particularly pleased that the minister has agreed to meet with Mr. Maley and Mr. Livingstone, because as a passenger I share their concern—

Miss Bégin: We all share it.

Mr. Horner: —that safety standards are maintained in every part of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: I want to commend the minister for the way he stuck up for and stood by Mr. Keenan. It is regrettable that he had to resign from the commission. I am pleased that the minister has appointed a new commission so that the whole situation can become more stable. It is regrettable, however, that he appointed two members to this commission and not three, because there cannot be a majority decision reached. While the minister appointed a member from each official language group, I think the best recommendation I could give him would be to appoint a third person from neither of those groups.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: In that way, a majority decision could be reached. Hon. members laugh at that, but we all remember the Bilcon report in which a minority position was filed. I think the country wants this issue settled, not for political reasons but for the safety of air passengers, and I do not know whether these two gentlemen, Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Chouinard, are satisfactory to the pilots' association or to the air traffic controllers. I do know that in settling the contract with the air traffic controllers Mr. Keenan was satisfactory. I hope Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Chouinard will be, and I hope we can get back to a more stable situation with the highest degree of safety maintained.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, following the minister's statement and the response of the official spokesman for the Conservative party, I would like at the outset—perhaps it is not necessary, but under the present circumstances perhaps it is worthwhile—to emphasize the very profound commitment of the New Democratic Party to the principle of bilingualism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: As hon. members in all parties recognize, on an issue as sensitive and as important as this, the political issue involved is in maintaining a federal Canada. It is always extremely difficult to apply a principle to a particular circumstance, and it is very important for those of us involved in political decision-making to have a basic sense of trust about the motives of those involved in reaching a decision on this matter so that we do not call into question basic commitments if there happens to be a difference in judgment about the application of a general principle to the particular circumstances at issue.

In his comments today the minister correctly noted that the issue is not whether bilingualism is introduced all across Canada. That, of course, is not the issue. Unfortunately, perhaps that is widely misunderstood, and I am glad the minister emphasized that that is not the issue. The issue pertains very much to the province of Quebec, with a minor extension to the Ottawa-Hull area. The minister is also correct when he says that bilingualism has been effectively in operation for some two years in the province of Quebec, and is in certain areas right now. He might have added that it has been in operation in those aspects of aviation covered only by visual flight rules. That is an important technical consideration, as I am sure the minister recognizes.

The issue is about the extention of bilingualism in air traffic control in the province of Quebec, particularly in the Montreal area, from those areas covered by visual flight rules to those covered by instrument flight rules. Again, that is an important technical consideration. The minister has said that this extension raises more complex questions and that is why technical studies and an independent public inquiry are needed.

There are a number of serious and, for me, as yet unresolved issues flowing from the government's position and from the terms of reference of the commission which were tabled today by the minister when he made his statement. In the preamble of the order in council it is stated that the commission will consider both the safety implications and the operational efficiency implications of extending bilingualism into flight control procedures in the province of Quebec. The order in council elaborates in detail on a number of specific considerations which arise from those two general points. However—and this is an area of serious concern to me—at no point is it stated that the commission, after all its deliberations on all the specific considerations which are referred to it, can reach a negative conclusion. I choose my words with care when I say that if it cannot reach a negative conclusion it can appropriately be seen as some kind of sham, and a costly sham at that. For example, one possible interpretation of the order in council that the minister has tabled is that bilingualism will be extended regardless of the cost, regardless of efficiency and regardless of the inconvenience to passengers. I am saying that is one clear implication of the order in council as I read it.

● (1520)

For this commission to have any validity at all it is much more important, in our view and in the view of the public of Canada, that it must have the genuinely open option of recommending either "Yes" or "No" after it considers all the factors.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: The implication remains with me that the deck has in fact been stacked by the terms of reference as indicated in the order in council that has been tabled. If the deck is stacked, this implies that the conclusion has been reached and what the minister may be going through here is a costly public relations exercise. If that is the case, what we have is a mere form of political advertising and, like all advertising, it is intended more to deceive than to enlighten. I say those words with care, Mr. Speaker. I hope the questions that follow and the answers we will get from the minister will show that the commission can recommend to the government "Yes" or "No"; that it is not wedded by the terms of reference to come in with a "Yes" answer, with all the elaborate justification for that answer. I repeat, if the commission is not open-ended, if it does not have a completely frank mandate, it will be seen as a sham not only by the public but by those now involved in the

aircraft industry who are out of work and who all of us would like to see go back to their jobs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we are thankful to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) for the statement he made in the House today on the serious problem of the strike in air transport. We deplore that such a strike has happened. However we doubt that the commission will be able to proceed quickly enough to allow us to take the necessary procedures so that the problem will not drag on for days and weeks. We are now waiting for the commission's report and, during that time, the Canadian economy is unfortunately burdened with serious problems because air transport in Canada today has become very important, and we know it.

Mr. Speaker, some individuals make it a specialty to turn this problem into a racial issue under the guise of safety. In the last paragraph, the minister said in French, and I quote:

Experience in recent years has shown that while making for better comprehension bilingualism can increase the safety of operations.

I do not think the minister included this sentence in his statement without checking its meaning. Bilingualism can increase air safety. When we see individuals now making a pretext of safety for disrupting air transport, particularly in Quebec, I think that unfortunately they are using a false pretext to cover up a racial issue. We know very well that studies have been made and that in certain other countries more than one language are used even in communications and other areas, and that nowhere else as far as we know has there been a strike because of the hazards the language used in those other countries would have caused.

Mr. Speaker, I myself had the opportunity in recent days when several of my colleagues were caught in the middle of this air strike and remained grounded because air services were no longer working, I had the opportunity to meet a unilingual anglophone, a pilot who feels that this safety issue is a false problem in air transport. He does not believe a word of it. Yet he does not speak French and he is a pilot from western Canada who believes they are creating a problem from a false situation. We wish, therefore, that a solution can be reached by the federal government, which should make it possible for Canada to remain a bilingual country. As far as I know, we still are in Canada, we have two official languages and we should not allow some individuals, under false arguments or for other pretexts, to take steps which will result in one of the official languages of Canada not being recognized in a public service as important as Air Canada or air transport in general. We therefore support the means—not radical means, but means of understanding, we hope—to be taken by the federal government to have the French language respected in Quebec, because it is the official language of Quebecers and one of the country's official languages. We must have the French language respected and prove wrong those who take pleasure in repeating that under the cover of safety, we must use only the English language, and particularly in Quebec.

[*English*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a couple of questions to the minister in view of the statement he has made. The minister indicated he was meeting with the representatives of the air traffic controllers, the pilots' association and executives of the airlines. Could he tell the House if he has had an opportunity of reviewing the terms of reference, whether these have been approved as yet, or whether he intends to put them to these meetings when they take place?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that after sitting down I received a note that my suggestion for a meeting has been accepted at least by Mr. Maley, Mr. Livingston and Mr. Taylor of Air Canada who happens to be in Ottawa. We will meet at eight o'clock this evening and I have no doubt that the terms of reference will be further considered by us at that time. A good deal of what is in the terms of reference already has been the subject of earlier discussions between at least my officials, Mr. Livingston and the air traffic controllers.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question. Could the minister inform the House whether he is going to take the position that unless the parties themselves are satisfied that the terms of reference are sufficiently broad to satisfy their membership or particular companies, the commission will not proceed, or does he intend the commission to proceed notwithstanding the concurrence of the parties affected?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference are very broad, starting out by specifying the safety aspect as the key to allowing, under one paragraph, the commission to report on relevant matters. There is a great deal of breadth. While I hope the terms will be acceptable as they stand, obviously I have to await the discussions to know whether that will be so.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could put a further question to the Minister of Transport, for purposes of clarification. Yesterday, as reported at page 14744 of *Hansard*, referring to the air traffic controllers the minister said:

● (1530)

Indeed, the latest word I have is that there is some lack of interest in the commission because they seem to be taking the position that the only thing they will be satisfied with is a move away from the position which we have taken.

Meaning, the position the government has taken. Could the minister be more precise and tell the House whether he has been advised directly, especially recently, by the air traffic controllers that they will not co-operate in the matter of the technical commission?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, no, I would not put it that way. The reference I made yesterday was to the conversation between them and my officials. I hope we will have their co-operation. They had earlier indicated that they could co-operate on the simulation exercises even before the question of the commission arose. I had a discussion with Mr. Livingston about the announcement I was making today. I spoke to him last night, but had no positive indication then of the attitude he would take.

Mr. Fraser: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the unfortunate situation which has resulted from

what I may call the series of inconsistent statements coming from the government side of the House, can the minister assure us that beginning tonight he will personally make every effort, which will be supported by members on my side of the House, to maintain constant communication with the parties in this matter so that they will not feel, as they put it to us on this side of the House, that there has been a talking to them but not talking with them.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, first I wish the hon. member would not accept the press versions of inconsistent statements. The only thing which has been inconsistent is the way in which these statements have been reported in the press. As hon. members on all sides of the House know, this can happen from time to time. The principal persons involved in the current dispute have been the air traffic controllers. My officials have been in constant contact with them. It was well known that I was available at any time to meet with them as well, if it seemed that such meeting would be helpful or useful.

I happen to have a great deal of confidence in the officials who are involved in these discussions and did not see any particular need to intervene every day or on an hourly basis. I had not been requested by the controllers to meet them personally or directly, at least not until the message reached my office today at about 1.30, and I had not had such a request from the pilots. Actually, I received the request today by way of a report to me by a reporter who said that an indication of interest in the meeting had been shown. I responded immediately by extending the invitation to meet me. But I was always available to meet in that way.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise some rather obviously inconsistent statements which have been made by the government. In the order in council of May 13, three tasks were to be given to the commission. They were to inquire into and report on implications relating to aviation safety, on implications regarding costs, and on the operational efficiency of procedures. Those three considerations were included. However, for some reason, in the order in council tabled today one of those three items has been left out. Why, in the order in council tabled today, is the commission not given authority to inquire into the cost factor? For some reason that item has been left out of today's order in council, but was included in the order in council of May 13. Why has it been left out?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the reason, essentially, is that while operational efficiency is seen as relating directly to aviation safety, we wanted to leave the major impression that safety is the key consideration here. It is included under paragraph E in relation to relevant matters on which the commission may comment. It might not want to pursue to the ultimate limit the question of total additional costs; therefore it seemed better not to highlight that matter as an obligation for the commission.

On the matter of additional costs and whether additional procedures should be instituted, a decision would have to be taken by the government, which accepts its responsibilities in this House and the country for the cost of bilingualism. On the other hand, it is just as clear that although ultimate responsibility rests with the government, on questions involving safety it would, clearly, be practically and politically impossible for the government to take any step which would lower or jeopardize safety. In that area, the commission is playing the key role.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, it was a serious mistake to leave out the matter of operational costs, because those committed to implementing bilingualism as much as possible, where appropriate, should know the costs involved. Leaving out that matter was a serious ommission. My last question to the minister is this: Is it the government's view that if the commission looks at the areas to which it is now restricted it can bring in a recommendation not to proceed with any extension of bilingual operations in air traffic control?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the commission is not limited in its recommendations and therefore that kind of recommendation is essentially open to it. It would be making a judgment on the quality of safety and operational efficiency and would draw conclusions therefrom.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems appropriate, in the circumstances, to conclude our questioning by recognizing the hon. member for Moncton, the hon. member for Winnipeg North, the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich, the hon. member for Vegreville, and the hon. member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, there should be no doubt that I, as a member of this parliament, am not committed to the present system for the implementation of bilingualism, particularly where air safety is concerned. Frankly, I have doubts about the sincerity of the Ministry of Transport in this whole matter.

An hon. Member: Come off it.

Mr. Jones: Let me speak. The airline pilots held a symposium on air safety this spring in this city. I should like to know why Ministry of Transport staff did not participate in that symposium. I believe the airline pilots made an effort to deal with the matter of air safety.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member will see this in a different light when he knows that the date chosen for the meeting was chosen without consulting us, and the organizers of the symposium should have known that my key officials who are involved in air safety were on that date obligated to attend another meeting.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, since it is important to create an atmosphere of good will, trust and confidence as a positive step toward resolving this dispute, can the minister advise if the government will reconsider its somewhat hasty decision to prosecute the Winnipeg controllers, since the threatened prosecution has not been conducive to the achievement of an atmosphere of good will and confidence? Is the government reconsidering its position in view of the appointment of the commission of inquiry?

Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Speaker. It has been the plain and straight-forward position of this government that laws must be upheld and those who offend the law must be proceeded against. I hope that hon. members opposite will in this instance, as they have in other instances involving broad and important principles, support us.

Mr. Fraser: But the contract is still before the courts. Its validity has not been determined. How can the government prosecute in such circumstances?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, since similar incidents in other sectors of the labour force have occurred, and the government has not proceeded with such indecent haste, if I may use that expression, why has the minister and the government taken the present, adamant position in the present situation?

Mr. Fraser: Particularly as the matter is still before the courts and is not resolved.

Mr. Mazankowski: Particularly as the issue is still before the courts, as my colleague says.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why the issue is before the courts. That is where it will proceed, and I do not intend to comment on the subject.

Mr. Fraser: Precisely. It is before the courts.

Mr. Lang: With regard to the question of broad policy, I say to hon. members that there was a time when hon. members opposite would say in every case, "You should not proceed because this would be the first time," or "because you did not proceed the last few times," and so on. We made it clear that this had to change. The law has to be respected. Therefore, when an injunction is issued it ought to be followed with action. I have made that position clear and I have followed that course throughout.

Mr. Fraser: But the validity of the contract has not been determined, and you are prosecuting.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I, along with the hon. member for Vegreville, am concerned to establish stability with regard to air traffic in this country. I want to see good will prevail on the part of those who oversee our air traffic, namely, the air traffic controllers. Can the minister, for the benefit of the House and the country, state that in the selection of Mr. Chouinard and Mr. Sinclair the air traffic controllers were consulted, and whether they agreed to the selection of those two individuals to carry out this commission for the study of air safety?

● (1540)

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, earlier we had asked the controllers to suggest names—we meant in the plural—in order that we might look at those persons as possible commissioners. Certainly, once we had made the decision that it would be better to move to the judiciary for the commissioners, it would have been inelegant to begin discussing the merits of one or another of the commissioners. Therefore, there was not discussion in that sense, although I did have a discussion about the appointments, prior to their being made, with various elements within the dispute representing both CALPA and CATCA.

Mr. Horner: I very much regret the minister's answer. In order to attempt to clarify this, did not the air traffic controllers agree to Mr. Keenan to carry out this commission originally? Was it not the belief of the air traffic controllers that the faith demonstrated by the minister and the ministry in the first instance would be continued in the second instance? I very much regret the fact that the minister now says he did not fulfil the obligation that they would be consulted.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member misstates the situation with regard to an earlier occasion. The earlier occasion was indeed a reason for my not expecting that full consultation, to the last bit of consent, would have been successful. The earlier occasion was evidence that that would not work. In the earlier situation we had submitted certain names to the controllers as possible commissioners, and received no response about those names. We then determined the possibility that Mr. Keenan might be available, and concluded that it would be a practical impossibility for them to disagree that he was acceptable. We indicated his name to them before we proceeded to appoint the commissioner, but received no response. It was really a question of my not wanting to be in the position of having to incur further delay.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the country is now faced with a stoppage of air service. It is obvious that for some time there have been serious misunderstandings and profound disagreements between the minister and his senior officials and the controllers and pilots. If we are to have a resumption of service in the very near future, why did the minister not propose the appointment of a commission or commissioner and set the terms of reference 2½ weeks ago? Why did he not even at this time discuss with the organizations concerned the people he would appoint and their terms of reference, so that we could be assured even today, as I doubt we are, that the organizations concerned are willing to accept the appointment of the commissioners, the terms of reference and are willing to go back to work while the commission is working? Why did he not do these things earlier? Also, will he have any assurance before tonight that he is likely to get an agreement with regard to the working of this commission and the employees going back to work today or tomorrow?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, even now I cannot give any assurance about where we will be moving from here. Indeed, it was exactly for that reason that I asked for the full support of hon. members opposite in urging that we resume normal air travel while the commission gets on with its work. The reason I did not take a certain course of action, and so on, was that it probably would have been more likely to exacerbate the situation than heal or cure it. Therefore, I will take the liberty of not going into that question in detail.

Mr. Orlikow: What consideration, if any, has the minister and his department given to the fairly quick bringing into operation by the controllers much more modern equipment and instrumentation such as that used by controllers in the United States, which I understand would make the plotting of movement and safety much easier? Further, it might have facilitated the agreement of the controllers to implementation of more bilingualism than they have been prepared to do until this time.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, we have, of course, an ongoing program for the improvement and renewal of equipment. I have no reason to believe that that program, or the state at which it is, would have affected the current dispute.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, since it seems to be generally agreed that there must be an atmosphere of confidence created between the government, on the one hand, and those who are directly concerned with air traffic on the other, the air controllers and pilots, a situation which has not been improved by some of the statements made or reported to have been made by the minister, why did the minister decide to avoid some of the provisions of the law last week when a strike was threatened, when he might have appealed to the PSSRB for a ruling as to whether this strike was legal? Also, does he know that a request has been made to the PSSRB by CATCA for a statement as to their legality at the time?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I was aware of that later application after the earlier action that had been taken. Of course, the conduct of employer-employee relations is in the hands, strictly speaking, of my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board, rather than myself as Minister of Transport. However, certain courses of action were open, and one of those courses of action was pursued.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister is not going to aggravate matters even further by turning down the appeal that has been put to his ministry—and I cannot give the legal terms because I am not legally trained—to appear before the PSSRB for a declaratory judgment on this matter.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that, essentially, involves some highly legal considerations. There are other proceedings taking place, and I will not comment on that matter today.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I intended to rise under motions to inquire whether the House would give unanimous consent to my reverting to motions later this day to deal with House business. I am not sure that I will want to take advantage of the opportunity, but if things look reasonably favourable I might put forward a motion for consideration at that time. I would like to have agreement now to revert to motions for that purpose.

Mr. Lawrence: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that there is at least one fairly important committee meeting at the same time as this House is meeting. I do not know what the government House leader has in mind, but it may very well affect the conduct, in one way or another, of what goes on in committee. If the House leader desires to come forward later with a motion, the members on the committee have the right to know, now, what will be contained in the motion. If he is not in a position to tell us that now, and if unanimous consent is required, I must respectfully decline to give that consent.

● (1550)

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps we should wait until we come to motions. We do have one or two routine proceedings to attend to before then.

Mr. MacKay: I rise on a brief point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the seriousness of the transportation situation and the amount of time spent discussing it, would the Minister of Transport tell us whether he has considered the question I asked him yesterday with respect to making public the results of the aviation inspection safety standards investigation?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Standing Order surrounding the making of statements by ministers gives the Chair discretion as to how many questions are permitted during the question period. There could be no other way of interpreting the request of the hon. member except as a request to extend the question period, which I, in my discretion, consider to have been ample. Seven or eight members, representing the parties in equal proportions, have put questions. The hon. member now seeks to put a further question. Two other hon. members of New Democratic Party were also seeking to put questions.

Having indicated halfway through that question period that I would terminate it by recognizing certain members, if I were now to extend it by allowing the hon. member for Central Nova to speak I would obviously have to recognize other hon. members as well. It was an exercise of my discretion to discontinue the question period when I did, and I do not see how I could reconsider that decision now.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be more convenient for the House if I were to make a motion on House business later today, but I must, of course, accept the rules. Since unanimous consent has apparently not been given, I should like to make a motion which would, of course, require unanimous consent because there is not the ordinary notice; it would have been impossible to have given the notice earlier than today.

This afternoon we shall be reaching the conclusion, I would hope, of most of the remaining business before the House with the exception of Bill C-84 and Bill C-83. The House will recall that I said we would continue debating Bill C-83 as long as other business which was on our program was still before the House, but that I would not keep the House in session in order to complete consideration of Bill C-83. That is still the government's position.

The one item which does remain on the government's program and which must be completed before we rise is Bill C-84, apart from Bill C-88 and C-68 on which progress will be made today. This being so, it will not be necessary for the House to sit on Friday for the purpose of completing our business by June 30, unless, of course, the justice committee were to report today, which I think is very unlikely. It would be possible, however, for the House not to sit on Friday if some provision could be made that should the committee complete its business tomorrow, when it might be sitting, or on Friday, the committee could report as though the House were sitting.

This does not, of course, require the committee to report by Friday. That is a matter which is in the hands of the committee, not in the hands of the House or of the government. This proposal would simply facilitate the work of the committee, which would be able to sit more continuously on Friday because it would not be interrupted by the necessity of certain members being here for the ques-

tion period, and so on. I should therefore like to move a motion as follows:

That the House shall not sit on Friday, June 25, 1976;

That, if at any time before 5:00 p.m. on Friday, June 25, 1976, the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs shall have agreed to report Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, the House shall be deemed to have received the report of the said bill as if it had been sitting; and

That, if the said report shall have been deemed to have been received in accordance with this order, it shall be in order for the House to take up the report stage of the said bill on Monday, June 28, 1976;

Provided that it shall be in order for any member to submit to the Clerk of the House notices of proposed amendments at the report stage of the said bill at any time before 8 p.m. on Friday, June 25, 1976.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Speaker: The motion, if it were put forward now, would have to be put forward by unanimous consent. I could, perhaps, hear some brief comments on a point of order if there were some hope the motion might be consented to. Without considering that the motion is being spoken to, the Chair might be ready to accept requests for clarification on a point of order.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am disguising a request for clarification by suggesting that I rise on a point of order. As I understand it, what the House leader is asking is that the House give permission to the committee sitting tomorrow, if it so desires, and to the committee sitting on Friday, if it so desires. It is also proposed that the House should not sit tomorrow and, as well, that the 48-hour period for the reporting of the bill be abridged to 24 hours. This would be the practical effect if the House were not sitting on Friday. In other words, notice respecting the report stage of the bill, if the bill were finished in committee on Friday, would mean that the House could go ahead with the report stage of the bill on Monday. To my mind—and I don't care how you slice it—that still is abridging the time required for the report stage to the House from the committee, because the House is not sitting on Friday.

I suggest to the House leader that perhaps there still might be unanimous consent—I do not know, because this is not a matter for party discipline; there are no party whips and there is no party discipline on this matter—on two conditions only. First, that the House leader give an undertaking that in neither case would the third reading stage of Bill C-84, or the report stage of that bill, be proceeded with until after the House resumed in the fall.

An hon. Member: Come off it.

Mr. Lawrence: Otherwise, members of the committee are perfectly entitled to say "No tickee, no laundly", "No House, no committee". In other words, if the House is not sitting, we have the right to object, in the committee, to the committee sitting.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If the hon. member is denying unanimous consent, I suppose the matter is closed. But I should like to make it clear that we would be happy to agree to this motion. As we understand it, it would provide that if the committee completed its work and made its report on Friday, we would be in exactly the same position on Monday, with the House not sitting on Friday, as we would with the House sitting on Friday. If we sit on Friday and the committee makes its report, then the report stage debate begins on Monday. If the motion passes and we do not need to sit on Friday, the report stage will be proceeded with on Monday. We do not see it shortening anything; all it does is obviate the necessity of sitting on Friday, which would probably be futile anyway. Therefore, although we voted as individuals yesterday we all voted the same way and I can now say that we would support this motion.

[Mr. Sharp.]

● (1600)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, one point that bothers me is that in his proposal the President of the Privy Council has totally abrogated the right of individual members to put forward amendments. Under the rules it is open to any hon. member to put down an amendment at report stage 24 hours prior to the taking up of a bill. In his proposal, the President of the Privy Council is saying that members who wish to put down any amendment shall have until 8 p.m. on Friday, June 25, a day when the House is not sitting.

That is all very well for Ottawa and Toronto members, Mr. Speaker, who are interesting in sitting around here to see whether or not the bill comes in so they can put down amendments. I am sure that the table officers would not be prepared to accept, and would not accept any proposed amendments until the bill is reported back. Therefore, hon. members are precluded from putting down amendments. I would suggest that hon. members read the rules and understand them. I was sorry to see a demonstration of what I consider to be the falsity of a free vote on the other side.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): When I hear a concerted catcall on these particular points, it shows that hon. members opposite are advocating government policy. They are taking a party-government stand.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am prepared to hear the hon. member for Edmonton West on a point of order, but I think we must be careful to stay away from substance.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): My point of order is very simple, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Don't take so long, then.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): If the hon. member even looked at the rule book he would understand my point, which is that there is no possibility of any member of the House being able to put down an amendment, under the proposal put forward by the President of the Privy Council. When the House is not sitting there is no obligation on the table officers to accept amendments. Does the President of the Privy Council expect or insist that any member who wishes to put down an amendment must stay around in Ottawa on Friday, when the House is not sitting, in anticipation of the committee making its report?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in the free vote atmosphere that prevails on this side of the House—I say nothing about the other side of the House—there was one point made by the hon. member for Edmonton West

which concerns the third paragraph of the draft motion, namely, that the House "take up the report stage of the said bill on Monday, June 28, 1976". As I understand the situation, that is quite within the rules of the House and it can be done on that short basis, but it is not within the common courtesies of the House. As I understand the courtesies of the House, if the draft followed what has been the normal custom of the House it would read in this way: "... take up the report stage of the said bill on Tuesday, June 29, 1976". This would give the time the hon. member for Edmonton West suggested for filing report stage amendments in the normal course of things.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will give consideration to that, if I may speak as a private member. It might be that with that kind of consideration the position taken by the hon. member for Edmonton West would be satisfied, and perhaps the feelings of other members on this matter would be soothed somewhat. I believe there would be time for this consideration to be given, and perhaps we could deal with the matter later.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. By previous agreement, two deferred divisions are to be taken almost forthwith. I think the House is agreed that both divisions will be taken one after the other, with only one calling in of the members. That will require some time.

Despite some technical objections, there seems to be a general will to accommodate members by not sitting on Friday so long as the rights of members who wish to file amendments at the report stage are not in any way prejudiced. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has made the point that technically the situation remains the same as if the House sits on Friday, but as the hon. member for Edmonton West pointed out, members who wish to file amendments will have to stay here on Friday if the House does not sit. It does seem to disadvantage those members if the House does not sit on Friday. Obviously, they would have to stay here to file amendments if the report does come forward, which is an eventuality that does seem unreasonable in view of the uncertainty. They, alone, would be the ones who would have to wait here if they wished to file amendments. I think technically we could probably make the arrangements at the table, but it does seem to put some members who wish to file amendments at report stage under an extra burden.

Perhaps during the ringing of the division bells and the taking of the vote which is about to be taken forthwith there might be some further discussion to see whether the motion could be refined in order to accomplish this purpose. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following 30 questions will be answered today: 4,187, 4,192 to 4,213 inclusive, 4,795, 5,203, 5,410, 5,426, 5,466, 5,534 and 5,637.

[*Text*]

PSYCHIATRISTS—SASKATCHEWAN FARM ANNEX

Question No. 4,187—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychiatrists at Saskatchewan Farm Annex and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada and abroad (iii) salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

ESCAPES—ONTARIO REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,192—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	1	1	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	1	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	1	—	—	—	—
Total	1	3	—	—	—	—

At large (December 31, 1975): Nil

ESCAPES—PACIFIC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,193—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	1	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	1	—

At large (December 31, 1975): Nil

ESCAPES—MILLHAVEN

Question No. 4,194—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Millhaven Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	2	15	3	—	4
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	2	15	3	—	4

At large (December 31, 1975): 3

ESCAPES AT LECLERC

Question No. 4,195—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at LeClerc and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	16	24	21	14	5	2
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	1	—	2	2
without escort	1	4	4	7	11	3
Total	17	28	26	21	18	7

At large (December 31, 1975): 6

ESCAPES—SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 4,196—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Saskatchewan Penitentiary and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	197
Escapes	18	1	1	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	4	—	—	2	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	1	—	1
without escort	—	—	2	6	1	—
Total	18	5	3	7	3	1

At large (December 31, 1975): Nil

ESCAPES—COWANSVILLE

Question No. 4,197—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Cowansville and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

[Mr. Poulin.]

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	8	12	26	15	1	4
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	2
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	1	—	3	2	2
without escort	1	5	10	6	12	13
Total	9	18	36	24	15	21

At large (December 31, 1975): 11

ESCAPES—STE-ANNE DES PLAINES

Question No. 4,198—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Ste. Anne des Plaines and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	6	—	—	—	—	2
Walkaways	2	16	6	2	—	3
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	2
without escort	4	1	2	2	3	3
Total	12	17	8	4	3	10

At large (December 31, 1975): 3

ESCAPES—ARCHAMBAULT

Question No. 4,199—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Archambault and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	4	10	8	1	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	1	—	—	—	—	1
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	5	10	8	1	—	1

At large (December 31, 1975): 2

ESCAPES—FRONTENAC

Question No. 4,200—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Frontenac Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	1	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	3	5	21	10	7	4
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	4	10	7	6	12	11
Total	8	15	28	16	19	15

At large (December 31, 1975): 3

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	5	5	17	2	4	—
Walkaways	2	2	2	—	—	2
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	1	—	—	2	1
without escort	2	23	10	11	9	19
Total	9	31	29	13	15	22

At large (December 31, 1975): 10

ESCAPES—ROCKWOOD

Question No. 4,201—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Rockwood Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	4	6	7	9	2	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	2
without escort	3	11	20	13	15	6
Total	7	17	27	22	17	8

At large (December 31, 1975): 8

ESCAPES—MONTÉE ST. FRANCIS

Question No. 4,204—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Montée St. Francis and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	2	—	—
Walkaways	3	3	7	5	7	6
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	1
without escort	—	14	3	6	4	3
Total	3	17	10	13	11	10

At large (December 31, 1975): 7

ESCAPES—STONY MOUNTAIN INSTITUTION

Question No. 4,202—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Stony Mountain Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	4	4	7	2	1
Walkaways	—	2	—	1	2	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	2	—	—	2	1
without escort	5	10	8	14	20	12
Total	5	18	12	22	26	14

At large (December 31, 1975): 4

ESCAPES—BEAVER CREEK

Question No. 4,205—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Beaver Creek Correctional Camp and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	6	—	—	—	—	2
Walkaways	2	1	2	7	1	1
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	11	3	5	4	2	6
Total	19	4	7	11	3	9

At large (December 31, 1975): 7

ESCAPES—JOYCEVILLE

Question No. 4,203—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Joyceville Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

ESCAPES—PITTSBURG INSTITUTION

Question No. 4,206—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Pittsburg Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

Order Paper Questions

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	2	5	4	7	10	6
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	1	10	15	8	8	10
Total	3	15	19	15	18	16

At large (December 31, 1975): 9

ESCAPES—QUEBEC FEDERAL TRAINING CENTRE

Question No. 4,207—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Quebec Federal Training Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	4	13	—	6	3
Walkaways	—	—	—	1	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	1	—	—	2
without escort	—	—	6	2	6	5
Total	—	4	20	3	12	10

At large (December 31, 1975): 6

ESCAPES—COLLINS BAY

Question No. 4,208—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Collins Bay Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	3	1	4	7	3	3
Walkaways	—	—	1	—	—	1
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	2	4	1	—	—
without escort	4	9	13	5	6	12
Total	7	12	22	13	9	16

At large (December 31, 1975): 18

ESCAPES—WARKWORTH

Question No. 4,209—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Warkworth Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	7	4	8	9	3	—
Walkaways	—	1	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	1	3	2
without escort	8	6	4	1	2	5
Total	15	11	12	11	8	7

At large (December 31, 1975): 4

[Mr. Poulin.]

ESCAPES—BATH INSTITUTION

Question No. 4,210—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Bath Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	4	11	9	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	4	8	3	2
Total	—	—	8	19	12	2

At large (December 31, 1975): 2

ESCAPES—SASKATCHEWAN FARM ANNEX

Question No. 4,211—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Saskatchewan Farm Annex and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	4	—	9	6	10	7
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	2	5	3	2
Total	4	—	11	11	13	9

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—LANDRY CROSSING CORRECTIONAL CAMP

Question No. 4,212—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Landry Crossing Correctional Camp and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	1	—	—
Walkaways	8	5	7	12	10	10
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	1	1
without escort	1	13	12	7	8	4
Total	9	18	19	20	19	15

At large (December 31, 1975): 7

ESCAPES—QUEBEC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,213—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	1	—	1
Total	—	—	—	1	—	1

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

LIVING UNIT-OFFICERS AT FERNDALE

Question No. 4,795—Mr. Reynolds:

1. For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of living unit-officers at Ferndale?

2. Was their education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12 (c) some college (d) beyond a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1 and 2. For the years 1970 to 1974 inclusive: Nil.

1. For the year 1975: 11.

2. (a) 3; (b) 7; (c) 1; (d) Nil.

PEST CONTROL SERVICES—TYPE OF PESTS BROUGHT UNDER CONTROL

Question No. 5,203—Mr. Cossitt:

With reference to the answer to Question No. 86 of the Second Session of the 29th Parliament which listed expenditures from public funds in various years for "pest control services" at the Prime Minister's official residence, 24 Sussex Drive, what is a detailed description of the type of pests that the Prime Minister was attempting to have brought under control?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): The pests referred to were: rhynchophora, rodentia, tinea pellionella, plodia interpunctella, lepisma saccharina, musca domestica.

NAMELESS POSTMARKS

Question No. 5,410—Mr. Dinsdale:

1. Has the Post Office Department recently introduced a policy of nameless postmarks and, if so, for what reason have the names of cities and towns been replaced by a code?

2. Does the Department have a policy of replacing all names with numbers and, if so, what is the next planned change?

3. Did the Department examine the experience of the USA Postal Service, which introduced similar nameless postmarks, and which more recently restored city and town names in the face of popular demand?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. The Post Office recently introduced the use of the postal code in its cancellation mark primarily for certain centres where changes in the pattern of mail processing made the continued use of a community name identifier impractical. This has occurred where mail from a number of communities is now gathered into one major processing plant and collectively processed in one stream. In these new mechanized plants it is impractical to keep segregated the mail from different source locations, and rather than select the name of one community to be used for the cancellation of all mail processed through such a plant, it was decided to use the postal code of the plant. For example, the processing plant located in Scarborough, Ontario will process mail from surrounding areas such as Richmond Hill, Willowdale, Thornhill, Markham, Ajax, Pickering and others.

2. No, the Post Office does not have a policy of changing all names to numbers; postal code postmarks will be used only at a limited number of locations. The next location where such a postmark is to be used is St. John's, Newfoundland, to be followed, possibly later this year, by new plants in the Toronto and Montreal areas.

3. Yes, the Post Office Department is familiar with the United States Postal Service experience. However, the systems are different in the two countries and there is no practical relationship.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT WITH CANADA CUSTOMS

Question No. 5,426—Mr. Cossitt:

1. How many persons, including university students, applied for summer employment with Canada Customs from within the Constituency of Leeds and of these (a) how many sought employment at the Port of Lansdowne (Thousand Islands Bridge) (b) how many were interviewed and on what basis were they selected for such interviews (c) when were interviews held (d) were those not interviewed at least given the courtesy of an acknowledgement (e) of those interviewed, how many were actually hired (f) were those with previous experience given preference and, if not, for what reason (g) what are the names of all those actually hired?

2. What is a full description of the manner in which persons are selected for summer employment with Canada Customs?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Public Service Commission and the Department of National Revenue as follows: 1. 124 students within the Constituency of Leeds have applied for summer employment with Canada Customs. They are divided as follows: four students came from secondary institutes; 18 students came from colleges; 102 students came from universities. (a) 30 students within the Constituency of Leeds have sought employment at the Port of Lansdowne (Thousand Islands Bridge). They are divided as follows: six students came from colleges; 24 students came from universities. (b) 23 were interviewed. They were selected for interview on the basis that they were considered: full-time registrants at a recognized University or Community College of Arts, Science or Technology (or similar post-secondary educational institutions, technological institutes, C.E.G.E.P.'s, etc.), returning to an educational institution in the fall of 1976; residents within the area of the Port of Lansdowne and, had been referred by the Public Service Commission; (c) From April 26, 1976 to May 7, 1976 inclusive; (d) All 26 candidates referred by the Public Service Commission were invited for interview but 3 declined; (e) five; (f) Yes, 11 students are returning this season; (g) Names of returning students: Colville, C. A.; Duff, J. A.; Gagnon, D.; Galway, E.; McDonald, M. A.;

O'Brien, S. K.; Ready, C. P.; Rupners, J.; Watters, K.; Wheeler, A. B.; Whiteland, B. N. Names of those offered employment this season: Lynch, S. E.; MacDonald, D. G.; Raymond, R.; Reid, B. J.; Walsh, M. P.

2. Persons selected for summer employment are considered for three types of employment: Customs Officers, Carreer-oriented employment, Other temporary employment. Customs Officers and Career-oriented Employment. Eligibility: To be considered for this type of employment during the 1976 summer period, selected persons must be: full-time registrants at a recognized University or Community College of Arts, Science or Technology (or similar post-secondary educational institutions, technological institutes, C.E.G.E.P.'s, etc.); returning to such an institution in the fall 1976; available to the Department for the full period of requirement, e.g., May 15 to September 15, their employment to be on an "as required" basis during this period. Preference in Employment is given to: students employed last summer who have retained their eligibility and received a satisfactory performance rating in 1975; students who reside in the locality in which the position is being filled or who are enrolled in the academic institution within or in close proximity to the locality; Canadian citizens.

NOTE: Students enrolled at academic institutions at locations other than their normal place of residence and locality may, if they so select, be regarded as having dual locality preference.

Qualifications: At interview, candidates are assessed by a Rating Board on relevant knowledge, ability to analyse, control and communicate as well as their tact, judgment, maturity and other factors which would contribute to their effectiveness. These selection standards are prescribed by the Public Service Commission; qualified students, sufficient to meet our requirements, are placed in order of merit on an eligible list. Application: To be considered for employment, students must have filed an application with the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program, Public Service Commission. Candidates are referred to the Department as appropriate. Other Temporary Employment: For other summer employment opportunities, persons must have registered with their local Canada Manpower Centre and/or Regional Office of the Public Service Commission. Candidates are referred to the Department as appropriate. Preference in Employment is given to: persons employed last summer who have retained their eligibility and received a satisfactory performance rating in 1975; persons who reside in the locality in which the position is being filled or who are enrolled in the academic institution within or in close proximity to the locality; Canadian citizens.

NOTE: Students enrolled at academic institutions at locations other than their normal place of residence and locality may, if they so select, be regarded as having dual locality preference.

[Mr. Sharp.]

POST OFFICE—STEINBACH, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,466—**Mr. Epp:**

1. Is a new building to house the Steinbach Manitoba Post Office contemplated for the fiscal year 1976-77 and, if not, on what date is it planned?

2. Has $75,000 been allocated for 1976-77 for site acquisition for a new building to house a post office?

3. Have budgetary acquisitions in the amount of $850,000 been made for the year 1976-77 for the building of a new post office building in Steinbach, Manitoba?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. No new building is contemplated for the fiscal year 1976-77. Our current status at this location is for the provision of new Post Office facilities to be in service in the Spring of 1979. The present schedule is subject to availability of funds, Canada Post Office priorities and Treasury Board approval.

2. No.

3. No funds have been included for Steinbach, Manitoba in the Department of Public Works Accommodation Capital Program for the fiscal year 1976-77.

SALE OF CANADAIR LIMITED

Question No. 5,534—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Did the government sell Canadair to General Dynamic Corporation and, if so, what was the price?

2. Did the government recently purchase Canadair from General Dynamic Corporation and, if so, what was the price?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Canadair Limited was a privately owned company established in 1944, with an authorized share capital of $10,000, to operate the aircraft manufacturing facility at Cartierville. Canadair leased the land, buildings and equipment from the Crown. Included in the lease agreement was an option for Canadair to purchase these assets. According to the share transfer records of the company, the Crown did not own any of the shares of Canadair at any time prior to January 1976. In February 1947, the company's authorized share capital was increased to $3,000,000 by supplementary letters patent. Electric Boat Company subscribed for 990,000 of the new shares for $1.00 per share cash. It should be noted that this subscription was paid to the company treasury and not to the Crown. On 24 October 1949 Canadair purchased some of the land, buildings and equipment at Cartierville from the Crown for $3,760,745. In 1953 Electric Boat Company, Consolidated Vultee and Canadair became General Dynamics Corporation. On 1 December 1955 Canadair purchased additional Crown owned land, buildings and equipment at Cartierville for $11,468,409.83. On 14 November 1958 General Dynamics subscribed for a further 306,963 shares of Canadair for $7,674,080. As in the February 1947 transaction, this money went to the company treasury. Over the years, General Dynamics acquired a further 111,494 shares from the original shareholders, employees and directors. As of the date of the option agreement, General Dynamics holdings amounted to 1,408,457 shares out of a total issued and outstanding of 1,408,463.

2. The Crown purchased Canadair Limited from General Dynamics on 5 January 1976 for a maximum price of $38,150,000.

STEEL BELTED RADIAL TIRES

Question No. 5,637—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Is the government aware of the report to the Ontario Traffic Conference by Mr. Leonard Thomas of the accident research team of the University of Western Ontario stating that older-model steel belted radial tires designed in or injury?

2. Has the government done any research which would confirm or dispute Mr. Thomas' findings and, if so (a) by whom was the research conducted (b) what were its conclusions?

3. Is the government aware of an abnormally high level of failures of such tires under actual driving conditions?

4. Does the government intend to (a) order a recall of any of the tires presently on sale or in use (b) issue a warning to motorists about a possible hazard?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. Yes. (a) Transport Canada, Accident and Defect Investigation Division; (b) That a specific series of tires failed to meet the compliance test requirements.

3. Yes. As in (2) above.

4. (a) A recall was instituted by the manufacturer on the specific series of tires that failed to meet the tests; (b) Press coverage was given at the time of the recall to warn the motorist of a possible hazard. A press release on Transport Canada's tire safety program was issued on June 15, 1976.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 4,040 and 5,115 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

GRAIN

Question No. 4,040—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. In each of the past two years what was the amount of feed grain in storage at the beginning of the crop year and at the end of each month since the beginning of the crop year in commercial positions (a) in Eastern Canada (b) on the Prairies?

2. In each case, what amounts were held by (a) the Wheat Board (b) others?

3. Was the initial price raised by the Wheat Board in the past two years and, if so, on what date?

4. What was the initial Wheat Board price for feed wheat, oats and barley at the beginning of the past two crop years?

5. What was the average off-board price on wheat, oats and barley from August 1 to the date of increase in the initial Wheat Board price?

Return tabled.

ENCEPHALITIS

Question No. 5,115—**Mr. Jones:**

1. In regard to the reports of encephalitis being spread by mosquitoes, have steps been taken by the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of the Environment to study and survey the increasing problems caused by the mosquito population in various regions of Canada and, in particular, southeastern New Brunswick and, if so, what are they?

2. Have any studies and surveys been made by any department with respect to mosquitoes, their breeding habits and their disease carrying capabilities?

3. (a) How many persons died from encephalitis spread by mosquitoes in the years 1965 to 1975 (b) in which locations and areas did such deaths occur?

4. (a) How many cases of encephalitis were there in the years 1965 to 1975 (b) in what locations and areas (c) what were the defects left to those who suffered from the disease?

5. Has consideration been given to studying the relationship between encephalitis and the mosquito and, if so, in what manner?

6. Will steps be taken to eliminate disease carrying mosquitoes and, if so, what are they?

7. Have any studies been made of the efforts of the Moncton Mosquito Control Authority in its efforts to control mosquitoes?

8. Will the government consider making a substantial grant to the Moncton Mosquito Control Authority to assist in its efforts to eradicate the mosquito population in the greater Moncton area?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*English*]

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 5,393?

[*Text*]

*CANADIAN FORCES PERSONNEL REQUIRED TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF A SHIP'S CREW

Question No. 5,393—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Does QRO article 10.015 still provide that former members of the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force will not be required to serve as a member of a crew or of a ship's company without first consenting, "except in an emergency" and (a) if not, when was such a provision altered and with what has it been replaced (b) if so, does the government intend to honour that provision?

2. Does CFAO order 10.3 still provide that no member of the CAF who, as of January 31, 1968, was a member of the Canadian Army or RCAF will be required to serve as a member of a crew or of a ship's company without first giving his consent, "except in an emergency" and (a) if not, when was such a provision altered and with what has it been replaced (b) if so, does the government intend to honour that provision?

3. Is the government presently requesting members of the CAF, who were members of the Canadian Army and Royal Canadian Air Force on January 31, 1968, and whose consent has not been obtained, to serve as members of a ship's company or crew and, if so, how many have been so requested?

4. Are the Canadian Armed Forces in an "emergency" situation of the type contemplated by article 10.015 of the QRO or order 10.3 of the CFAO and, if so, for what reason?

5. Is Maritime Command in an "emergency" situation of that type and, if so, for what reason?

6. Is the government contemplating any changes in CFAO 10.3 or QRO 10.015 and, if so, in what respect and for what reasons?

7. What steps, if any, is the government taking to upgrade manpower levels within Maritime Command?

8. Is any attempt being made by the government to induce members of the CAF, protected by CFAO 10.3 and QRO 10.015, into serving as members of a ship's company or crew and, if so, for what reason?

9. Are the responsibilities assigned to the CAF particularly Maritime Command, compatible with the provisions of QRO 10.015 and CFAO 10.3 and, if not, in what respects?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there are several parts to question No. 5393. 1. The answer is yes. (*a*) The answer is: not applicable; (b) Yes.

2. Yes. (a) Not applicable; (b) Yes.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No.

6. No.

7. The following are the major steps being taken to upgrade manpower levels within Maritime Command: (a) The training capacity of the two Fleet Schools has been increased three-fold in the critical trades to accommodate the increased recruit intakes; (b) A new retirement plan is presently being offered to selected navy personnel to extend their period of service; (c) A plan is now being developed to guarantee a definite period of shore time to naval personnel after a reasonable period at sea.

8. Yes, to provide relief for certain trades personnel from countinuing sea duty so that they may serve for periods ashore.

9. Yes.

● (1610)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 22, consideration of Bill C-88, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2), as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I again remind hon. members that there has been an understanding that members being called in for the deferred division on the motion of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) will at the same time, without further ringing of the bells, be proceeding to take the deferred division on Bill C-68 as well. Call in the members.

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

(*Division No. 142*)

YEAS
Messrs.

Alkenbrack
Allard
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Beatty
Brisco
Cadieu
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fraser
Gillies
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hnatyshyn
Horner
Huntington
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Korchinski
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald
(Egmont)
MacLean
Macquarrie
Malone
Marshall
Masniuk
Mazankowski
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Wagner
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—76

NAYS
Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Brewin
Broadbent
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Caron
Clermont
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Fox
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Herbert
Hogan
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Lajoie
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)

Messrs.

LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Maine
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stollery
Symes
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Yanakis
Young—132

● (1640)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-88, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2), as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): At the next sitting of this House.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed, from Friday, June 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Speaker: The other motion on which a deferred division has been ordered, and which I understand there is agreement to take now, is the question on Bill C-68.

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

(Division No. 143)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alkenbrack
Allard
Andre (Calgary Centre)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Brisco
Broadbent
Cadieu
Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Firth
Forrestall
Fraser
Gilbert
Gillies
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Horner
Huntington
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Lawrence
Leggatt
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacLean
Macquarrie
Malone
Marshall
Masniuk
Mazankowski
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rodriguez
Rondeau
Saltsman
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith (Churchill)
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Symes
Towers
Wagner
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—91

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andres (Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Caron
Clermont
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lachance
Lajoie
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Maine
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Yanakis
Young—117

● (1650)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. I understand that the third reading of the bill will be the order of the day. Before we call the order, let me say that there has been discussion about reverting to motions. Is now the appropriate time to discuss this, or does the House wish to proceed with discussion on Bill C-68?

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Joliette on a point of order.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members know, custom would have it that on St. John the Baptist Day parliamentarians should not work or assume their responsibilities as parliamentarians. I should like to draw your attention to the fact that, a few minutes ago, in committee of justice and legal affairs a motion moved by a government member proposed that the committee sit on St. John the Baptist day. Recognizing, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Joliette has brought up a very interesting point of order but, it is permissible, under the Standing Orders of the House, for standing committees to sit whether or not the House is sitting. All matters brought up in standing committees are theirs to decide upon, and not the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You may recall that just before we took the votes I had risen on a question of procedure. There have been some discussions, and also discussions with members of the committee. I understand that the justice committee is most unlikely to report by Friday; therefore, I am not proceeding with the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The question is now on the main motion, and the Chair recognizes the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth).

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, may I make a few remarks on Bill C-68 when the House has quietened down?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth) might be given the opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Firth: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on third reading of Bill C-68. I should not like to see the bill pass in its present form; I do not think it will be of advantage to the country. This opinion is shared by many hon. members, especially those who sit on my side of the House. This bill is a retrograde step and will decrease the amount of health and medical service available to people of this country. Bill C-68 has been in the works now for over a year. That, I think, is a pretty good indication that there is something wrong with it. It has been through committee and has been amended slightly, but it is still nowhere near the sort of bill it should be.

Not long ago the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), seconded by myself, proposed an amendment which if passed would have hoisted the bill for six months. We did not propose our motion because we wanted to be nasty; we did it to give the government an opportunity to look more closely at the bill and, hopefully, to bring it back to the House in a form which would satisfy the majority of hon. members. That, essentially, is why we proposed our amendment. We do not want to see the bill pass in its present form.

The principle of the bill is wrong. We are asking the government to take another hard look at it. The bill will not solve the problems it is alleged to solve. Although members on the front benches opposite have spoken in rambling detail on the bill, they have not convinced us that it is satisfactory. We say that the bill will not solve health problems in this country. I think the general idea behind it would have been more acceptable and it would have received our consent if it had provided for improved, basic health care for all the people of Canada, since health care is extremely important and a basic human right to which all Canadians are entitled.

We as a country are rich enough to provide such health care. The government ought to provide better health care and streamline present facilities so that all who need health care may receive it. I am sure no Canadian would begrudge paying a little extra here and there if this could be done. This bill fails principally because the government has failed to realize that one can divide the problem of the high cost of medical care into two parts. The government has put all its efforts into the cost part but has ignored the part to do with providing high quality medical care and services. In short, Mr. Speaker, the bill shows no leadership. It is a narrow-minded bill which does not take into consideration all those things which make for good health in this country.

We have a system of health care in this country which is based on the idea that if something goes wrong, we should try to fix it. We have built up a system of hospitals, doctors and insurance, all geared to waiting around for something to happen, until something goes wrong. Now that we have established the system, the government is saying to us, "We are going to save money and give you less health care." There is no provision for changing the type of health care available in this country. It is almost as if the government were treating health care as if it were potatoes. First the government decides that it will give everybody potatoes. It begins a program and supplies all the potatoes. Then, when the price of potatoes goes up, the government comes along with Bill C-68 and says, "We cannot afford to give you potatoes at these prices; we will set a limit on how many you are to get next year." Mr. Speaker, health is not like potatoes. You cannot measure it and divide it up. What is more, it does not fit easily into whatever accounting system the department is working on this year. Instead of giving us better health services, instead of showing a little leadership and imagination, the government has presented this bill. I do not like it because, as I said earlier, it gives us fewer potatoes.

We ask the government to look seriously at the bill and to listen to the important proposals and suggestions which have been made in the debate on the bill, especially by members on my side of the House. Over and over again the point has been made in the House that a number of changes can be made to our health care system which would accomplish the government's aim of saving money. They can all be made without reducing the present level of health care. Some of them may even make it better.

● (1700)

I think this bill should be studied further because of the very important and good suggestions made in this House on many occasions, particularly with regard to Bill C-68,

by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), a pioneer in the health insurance field. He was implementing health care programs when the biggest health program the present minister had to deal with was acne. There have been all kinds of good suggestions for ways to replace this bill, ranging from use of paramedics to group or community clinics, from increased public education about nutrition to stricter safety standards in the work place.

I want to single out one area that I think shows this government's lack of concern for cutting down health care expenses except in the most visible ways. It is a pretty extreme example, but it points out one of the areas where the government should be concentrating its efforts. The example is mercury pollution. I read the other day that government officials are running around saying that there is no documented case of Minamata disease in either Ontario or Quebec. They cannot say for sure that anyone has it. However, there are a number of experts who have discovered symptoms of that disease in people who depend on fish from the several river systems affected by mercury pollution. The Japanese experience shows that Minamata disease takes a number of years to reach a stage where it can be diagnosed. Therefore, if we have symptoms this year we may very well have diagnosed cases next year or the year after. We have known about mercury pollution in our rivers for over six years now, and this government has done very little or nothing. I am not even going to mention the pain and suffering this horrible disease causes. Nor am I going to dwell on the costs of replacing a fisherman's livelihood, especially the Indian people who live on reservations.

These remarks are for the health care planners opposite. I just want to ask them how much they think it will cost to provide what little treatment is available for people with Minamata disease. While they are doing this, it might be good for them to keep in mind that their colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), gleefully announced the other week that he was going to allow pulp and paper plants to continue dumping mercury. They will do it a little more slowly, perhaps, but they will continue to dump it all the same. At least, they will continue to dump it until their machinery wears out. Then they will replace it with the next generation of machinery that does not use mercury.

For the price of writing-off some out-of-date plant facilities we will continue to get mercury in our rivers for another eight or nine years. Add that to the cost of providing health care to the Minamata disease victims. That is only one example where increased attention to environmental problems would have an effect on the cost of health care.

There is another area in the Northwest Territories where we spend a lot of money and which should be looked at very seriously. It has been estimated by some people in a position to know that it costs between $2 million and $3 million a year on what we call "medivacs". This situation arises because there are not enough health care facilities, hospitals, doctors, eye specialists and dentists. To evacuate to the areas where these facilities and experts are available costs the taxpayers millions of dollars. As I mentioned earlier, it costs between $2 million and $3 million a year for charter aircraft to airlift people from the north to facilities in the south. That is a lot of money.

That problem can be partly solved by building one or two more hospitals and having a few more people to work in the north. I suggest that a hospital in the Cambridge Bay-Copper Mine area would save a large number of lives. Who can put a price tag on a life? I do not think you can do it. It would certainly save the taxpayers of this country a lot of money, and a lot of families much misery and grief.

These are the areas this government should be looking at—disease prevention, paramedics, and so on—in the north. On behalf of many people in this country, I wish to register these comments against the implementation of Bill C-68. I hope that other hon. members who have similar objections will make them known to the government.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to speak at considerable length on second reading of Bill C-68. I also had the opportunity to express some very specific concerns about this bill at the committee stage. I am fortunate to serve on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. As a result, I participated in the dialogue and debate with regard to the amendments which were introduced in reference to this bill. Indeed, as the House knows, we were successful in having one amendment accepted. It requires this government to report back to parliament, before they make any substantive changes, some 18 months down the line.

Throughout the debate there has been one area that has caused me considerable concern. It is, indeed, unfortunate that any party that is concerned about a federal bill dealing with the health and welfare of Canadians should decide that at the same time they should drag in the red herring of the health and medicare situation in a particular province. This has been the tactic of the NDP. I have read some of their speeches and some of the other things they have said. There is no question but that they have made a valuable contribution to the debate. However, I see no necessity whatsoever, nor do I see any similarity in the situations when they make reference, in a most derogatory fashion, to the situation in the province of Ontario. They would have us believe that the problems faced by the province of Ontario have been generated solely by that government, that they are the authors of the piece, the architects of the piece, and therefore the responsibility rests entirely with them. They fail to recognize that in their own province of Saskatchewan, the same restraints are now being clearly demonstrated. In my view, they will become more and more apparent as the days go by.

Only recently there was evidence in the newspapers that the province of Saskatchewan, with a limited budget—they do not, after all, have the wealth of British Columbia—would probably be horror-struck, at the government level, if some cabinet ministers decided to spend an extra $100 million on welfare. Mind you, the NDP government in British Columbia did not agonize over that. After all, most of it was federal money. However, in the province of Saskatchewan $100 million is a great deal of money. To the taxpayers of British Columbia it is not a great deal of money, and to Canadians generally it is not a great deal of money.

I can say to the Liberal government that it is not a great deal of money. When the province of Saskatchewan is forced to reduce their health care budget or hospital care by $44 million, there has to be something seriously wrong with the government's operation of that province and the way in which they are managing their economy. If such be the case, it is a question of the pot calling the kettle black, and maybe the NDP members should examine conditions in Saskatchewan if, indeed, they know what is going on there.

● (1710)

I call their attention, for instance, to a report in the *Globe and Mail* of June 19, 1976, which states that one of the major reasons for the increase in hospital care in Saskatoon hospitals is that patients are coming in from outside points. This indicates that there is a breakdown in hospital administration in the outlying communities. What they are probably trying to do in Saskatchewan is reduce the staff employed in those hospitals. They are taking action in those situations where they have a hospital in one community, and another 10 miles or 20 miles down the road.

There are similar situations in the province of Ontario. The distances are the same; population densities are the only variants. The NDP should address itself to this question, I suggest, rather than bring in the red herring of the province of Ontario. If they are so concerned about Bill C-68, I suggest that is what they should do. Because of the criticism and comments of the NDP with reference to medicare in Ontario, the unfair, unjustified criticisms they have made, I felt obliged today to rise and defend the province of Ontario even though it is not my home province. In fairness, I feel bound to defend it, while pointing out that all is not well in the province of Saskatchewan. What are we to think when a good doctor there, Dr. Louis Brand—

An hon. Member: An ex-Conservative candidate.

Mr. Brisco: That is right. At any rate, he is a man sufficiently responsible to be chief of the emergency department of the St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon. He comes out with the facts and tells us that 33 per cent of the patients in St. Paul's, 40 per cent of those at the city hospital and 70 per cent of those at the university hospital, came from outside the city. This clearly shows there is something wrong with the system.

I should like to make a few comments now about Bill C-68. The evidence is there as a result of the conference between the federal minister and his provincial counterparts. The chickens have come home to roost. When the federal government, in its largesse, indicates to British Columbia that it owes the government of Canada some $750 million retroactive to 1972 or 1973, where does that put the Province of British Columbia in relation to its budget of some $2 billion? When that happens, what kind of faith can exist at the federal level in its dialogue with the provinces?

Once more we face the age-old problem of a party which has been in power too long. The arrogance is there and it will ever more be so. When there is consultation with the provinces it is always after the fact, never before the fact. That is the sickness which is ingrained in the pores of this administration. How can the government expect to get the co-operation of any province while Bill C-68 is being forced down the throats of Canadian citizens?

The inevitable is already happening. In Ontario we see proposals for increases in medicare charges. In British Columbia the situation is the same. In Saskatchewan there will unquestionably be increases in medicare costs to the province, as predicted when this bill was introduced. The chickens have come home to roost and it has been clearly demonstrated that the only hope for the provinces is to increase charges to the consumer. Who will suffer most? Who are we most concerned about at this time? Here I speak for the NDP as well as for my own party. We are concerned for the poor, we are concerned for the sick, those who will suffer most from this increase in medicare charges.

What happens? The poor get poorer, the sick get sicker, the poor get sick and the sick get poor. Let it ever be on the conscience of the Liberal government. Let them answer for the increases in medicare charges. Let these people answer as to how widows and pensioners will cope with these increases. There is the possibility that the provinces will be obliged to impose a deterrent fee applicable not just to the wealthy but to the poor. That is the type of thinking demonstrated by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) at the federal level.

It was interesting to note that while the vote was being taken today, to a man members on the opposition side of the House opposed this bill. This measure has been debated as long as any other I can remember, and this has been the case for a valid reason. The reason is simply that the bill is wrong. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), in a moment of truth of which he is frequently capable, I will admit, stood at his desk, banged it and said, "This bill is wrong. It is wrong, wrong, wrong." I felt that there was a demonstration by a man who felt sincerely that an injustice was being foisted upon the nation.

Our own critic, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) holds the same view as me. Other members who come from the medical profession have condemned the legislation, especially at committee level, because they can see clearly the hardship it will cause, the fiscal, financial and technical problems it will create. They realize the effect it will have on the workingman who carries the main burden of the tax load. I want it on record, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Kootenay West, along with every other member on this side of the House, is strongly opposed to the basic thrust of this bill, that he believes it to be wrong and will not support it.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, it was just a year ago today that the then minister of finance delivered one of his budgets of 1975 in which he announced government policy, part of which is contained in the bill before us. This policy has become clearer with every day of this past year to members of parliament and provincial governments, whether Liberal, Conservative, NDP or Social Credit. It represents a substantial pull-out on the part of the federal government from shared-cost programs, and therefore means either sharp cutbacks in services or very much greater funding by the provinces than has been the case till now.

● (1720)

As these matters have become clearer, the provincial governments have become more adamant in their opposition to the proposals outlined by the federal government in this bill, as well as in other bills that have either been introduced or proposed. Just this last week the premiers of the ten provinces met with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and in public and in private expressed their complete opposition to the course being followed. I am told by reliable sources that the Prime Minister admitted to them in private conversations that the cutbacks outlined in this bill were part of a deliberate, arbitrary and unilateral decision on the part of the federal government directed toward reducing the financial participation of the federal government in shared-cost programs as part of its restraint program which restrains expenditures in certain major fields.

These are programs which to a large extent were initiated and promoted by the federal government. Indeed, as I have said on other occasions, they were forced as a result of blackmail on the provinces. What are these programs? We have hospital insurance, a tremendous program of post-secondary education, the Canada Assistance Plan, regional economic expansion, a fantastic increase in expenditure on behalf of the native people, and this medical care insurance program.

All these programs were made national in scope as a result of generous funding on the part of the federal government. The hospital insurance plan and the medical insurance plan did not become national in scope but were restricted almost entirely to within the province of Saskatchewan until the federal government, first a Liberal government and then a Conservative government headed by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), said to the provinces that they would pay 50 per cent of the cost of the programs if the provinces would implement such programs.

In many cases the provinces were reluctant to implement these programs. I remember when the Liberal government of Manitoba accepted the idea of hospital insurance, but then the leader of the Conservative party, later premier of Manitoba, Duff Roblin, opposed a universal hospital insurance plan that would cover everyone. At that time he said, as many people both in politics and in the professions said, "We already have voluntary plans such as Blue Cross covering most people. We do not need a bureaucratic government plan that will grow in size. All we need is a government program that will meet the premiums of people who cannot afford to join a voluntary program".

However, each province succumbed to some good arguments, and time has proven this to be an excellent program, as a result of which every person in Canada is now insured against large hospital bills. I am sure all members of this House know of families in their constituencies that have had major illness, with a hospital bill running into thousands of dollars. For years this has not been a worry for the people of Canada in the ten provinces and two territories.

What is happening now, Mr. Speaker? The federal government has given notice to the provinces that in 1980, which is the earliest it can do it, it will no longer be willing to pay 50 per cent of the cost of hospital insurance. After that time the increase that the federal government will be prepared to pay in any one year will be tied to the increase in the gross national product.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the amount of illness in the country, the number of people who fall sick, the kinds of sicknesses they are subject to, and the time they have to spend in hospital, does not depend in any way on what is happening to the gross national product. If the federal government is not prepared to pay 50 per cent of the cost, the provinces will have to choose from among a number of pretty unhappy methods of meeting the increased cost. For example, they will have to cut back on services, they will have to implement some kind of deterrent charge of so much a day spent in hospital, or they will have to meet the increased cost that will not be paid by the federal government through a subsidy out of general revenue.

The provinces are hoping, just as much as the federal government, that the increased costs in the year 1980 will not be in the neighbourhood of 20 percent, as they have in recent years, but that they will be half that. Nevertheless, each province is looking at ways in which the increased costs can be reduced, if not eliminated. Some have had considerable success in new programs, though they have no assurance that they can succeed entirely. They do not know what the rate of inflation will be, any more than they know what the rate of illness will be. Indeed, the federal government has a great deal more responsibility, authority and ability for dealing with inflation increases every year than any provincial government, yet the federal government has already given notice that beginning in 1980 it is going to restrict the amount it will pay to cover any increase in the cost of hospital insurance.

● (1730)

At the same time, as I say, they insist on sticking pretty closely to a policy under which they are prepared to pay 50 per cent of the cost of hospitalization in acute-bed hospitals, while they are not prepared to pay for any of the costs, or virtually none of the costs for alternate methods of caring for ill people, which involves such things as nursing homes, convalescent homes and visiting nurses, any one of which is substantially less in cost than the intensive care hospital bed for which the federal government has been paying 50 per cent of the cost.

There is a similar situation in the field of post-secondary education. The federal government has given notice that it will limit the amount it will pay for post-secondary education. At least, it will limit the increase in the amount it will pay for post-secondary education to 15 per cent in any year. Post-secondary education costs have been going up substantially more than 15 per cent in each year. In the 30 years since the end of World War II we have done a fantastic job of improving the educational facilities and the educational opportunities provided the people of this country.

This is not the time to discuss it, but a recent report prepared by an examining committee appointed by the OECD authorities detailed what the provinces and the territories in Canada have done to improve the educational facilities in this country. The number of young students attending high school has more than doubled, percentage-wise, over what it was in the years up to and including

World War II. The number of people attending our universities has grown fantastically. Community colleges which did not exist until a few years ago are now functioning and growing in every province in this country. We have built technical institutions in this country for thousands of young people. We have retrained hundreds of thousands of Canadians whose education was such that they could not fill the jobs that were vacant in this country.

Despite that, this federal government has again, in the field of post-secondary education, announced that it is restricting the size of the increase it will pay in any year for such education to 15 per cent. Was that done on the basis of an examination of the needs? No. Was there consultation among the federal government, the department of the Secretary of State, which is the department responsible for what Ottawa does in the field of post-secondary education, and the provincial departments of education and/or the colleges and the universities? No. There was no formal discussion, and so far as I can find out there was no informal discussion. Yet there is to be a limit of 15 per cent on what the federal government will pay out, beginning this year.

Is this being done because it is good for education? No, not at all. Why? It is because the federal government set itself the goal of restricting the increase in its expenditures for the year 1976-77 to 16½ per cent, regardless of the consequences of that policy. The government was not satisfied with simply saying it would restrict the increase of expenditures for post-secondary education to 15 per cent. It has now decided to cut back on the actual payout to the provinces for post-secondary education.

Let me place on the record what that meant as of just a month ago. Although we have had no formal announcement, I believe the situation in fact is much worse than will be indicated in the figures I will now put on the record. The provinces, in the field of post-secondary education, will lose in two ways in the year 1976-77. First, the application of the 15 per cent ceiling which Ottawa has annouced will mean a payments shortfall of $63.1 million for all provinces, combined, for the coming year. Second, the newly-announced cut-back in cash payments will mean an additional reduction of $110.7 million for the ten provincial governments. Thus, the total shortfall resulting from these two figures will be $173.8 million.

Because of the decision to cut back on cash payments, the expected or true ceiling on federal payments for 1976-77 will not be the 15 per cent announced by the federal government but, in fact, will be 7.7 per cent for each of the ten provinces. As a result of the federal cutbacks, Ottawa's total share of shareable post-secondary costs in 1976-77 will be just 45.5 per cent instead of the normal 50 per cent. Of course, Ottawa counts 4.357 percentage points of provincial personal income tax and one point of provincial corporation income tax for which the provinces take political responsibility, along with related equalization and revenue-guarantee payments as part of the federal share. If these amounts are netted out, the real federal share, in terms of cash payments, is only 15.1 per cent of total shareable post-secondary education costs. The provinces affected most seriously by the double impact of the 15 per cent ceiling and the cash payment cutback are as follows: Ontario, which loses a total of $80.4 million; Quebec, which loses a total of $42.5 million; B.C., which loses a total of $22.6 million; and Alberta, which loses a total of $9.4 million.

I place those figures on the record partly for the benefit of members like the member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), who spoke before me, who seemed to feel that we usually criticize the government for purely partisan political purposes. I would point out to the hon. member that respecting the four provinces I used in my illustration, Ontario and Alberta have Conservative governments, Quebec has a Liberal government and British Columbia has a Social Credit government.

Mr. Blackburn: Of sorts.

Mr. Orlikow: Of sorts, as my colleague so rightly points out. About a month ago, since the facts about the real cutback became known, some questions have been asked by members of the official opposition, which were replied to by the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien). It is interesting to look at the questions which were asked, not purely for information purposes and not just for the replies which were given, but for the language used in the replies. I shall place the questions and the answers on the record, because the answers show that the ministers felt that the provinces had to be taught a lesson in restraint, that the federal government believed the provinces may have submitted false or overly high estimates of the costs, and that the federal government has no immediate plan to make up the cuts in cash payments and may wait for three or four years before paying the outstanding amounts.

● (1740)

The Secretary of State suggested that the provinces were reluctant to meet with him to begin negotiations on a new financing scheme. There is no truth in that at all. Let us just look at a couple of the questions and answers that were given. On May 14, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) asked the Secretary of State the following question:

> It has to do with his admission of a $111 million mistake in estimating the payments due to the provinces for the financing of post-secondary education under the Fiscal Arrangements Act. What justification does the minister have for reneging on the agreement with the provinces to pay the full amount calculated under Section 6 of this act in respect of post-secondary education?

The minister replied:

> First of all, Mr. Speaker, the notion of an admission of a mistake is the contribution of the CBC, not mine. I have never admitted to a mistake. It was not a mistake. It was one the realities of a restraint program.

He went on to say:

> We shall be paying 50 per cent of the operating cost of post-secondary institutions. What is at issue here is the rate at which we shall be paying over the next three years.

Then the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands asked a supplementary question, and the minister said:

> As to the time frame, that is a matter I shall be discussing with the provinces . . . It is not a question of error. We are talking here about estimated costs. The estimate offered by the provinces may in fact be higher than the real costs. We have a certain estimate—it happens to be a bit lower than the provincial one—but neither has been confirmed.

In other words, the Secretary of State is saying in his answer that the provinces inflated their estimates of cost, not just one province but all the provinces. I suggest that if the minister really believed that the place to deal with that was at meetings, either his meeting with ministers of education of the provinces or with his officials sitting down with the appropriate officials from the provinces and showing them where they had inflated their costs, that is the road he should have taken instead of giving some kind of rambunctious answer to an MP in this chamber.

The same day, the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) asked a question about the same matter. He suggested it might be an idea to have a federal-provincial meeting to try to delineate the goals of post-secondary education, or education in general. He asked the minister how he responded to that idea. The Secretary of State said:

Mr. Speaker, I have responded sympathetically to that idea. I think it is a sensible and constructive idea. I have not at this point had any response to the idea from the provinces.

I do not believe for a moment that the provinces would not be prepared to discuss the whole question of education costs, particularly at the university and community college level, with the federal government. I am sure that they would be more than happy to discuss with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) what he and the federal government are doing to the provinces with the unilateral and cruel cutbacks in their expenditures for post-secondary education, having induced the provinces to get in the business of building and staffing community colleges, a large percentage of whose students consist of people whose expenses are being paid through manpower training grants.

These students are now being told that the federal government is cutting back on the number of seats it is prepared to pay for in the coming year. All the provinces have the unenviable task of deciding whether to cut back on the number of courses which they offer, which means telling a number of professors and teachers that they will no longer be employed, or meeting the increased cost out of their general revenues.

On May 17, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands asked questions of the President of the Treasury Board. She asked him how he could justify the deliberate tabling of misleading estimates designed to show restraint in the federal government's spending program, when he knows that final payments under this program for 1976-77 will be much higher and that what he is trying to pass off as restraint is in fact a deferred payment of an expenditure mandated by law. The President of the Treasury Board replied in part:

We had, under the law, the privilege of postponing payment of certain debentures to show to all levels of government that we are serious about our restraint program and indirectly encourage them to do likewise. Those expeditures will be settled when the government deems it opportune.

I have dealt with the question of post-secondary education and the way the federal government has cut back in this field, unilaterally, because it is one more example in the growing list of programs sponsored originally and encouraged by the federal government of a program which is now being virtually destroyed, certainly being cut back drastically and unilaterally by the federal government. They are breaking the faith, they are reneging on promises which they made to the people of Canada and to the provinces over the years. Of course, it is two years away from the next federal election and Liberal governments have learned from experience that if they can show some form of repentance—

Mr. Saltsman: On their deathbed.

Mr. Orlikow: —they often have a miraculous recovery. This time it will need a miracle for them to recover, but that is what they will try. What they have done in hospital insurance and post-secondary education is, as I have tried to indicate in some detail, to prepare the poor people who have been supported under the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan for what they propose to do to them. Some of us were here when that plan was brought in with such great fanfare. It was one more part of the Liberal program of providing total social security to meet the needs of the people of Canada, one more plank in that program of promises began away back.

Mr. Saltsman: Thirty years ago.

Mr. Orlikow: No, back in 1919.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The year the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was born.

Mr. Orlikow: That bill, which was to be so important to Canadians, is going to disappear. In its place we will have a social services act which will take the place of the Canada Assistance Plan. It is going to provide a guaranteed income to all Canadians.

● (1750)

The provinces are not completely stupid, although the Prime Minister may often think so. How many times do the provinces have to be burned before they will recognize that they are dealing with a pyromaniac? Whether the governments of the provinces are Liberal, Conservative, NDP or Social Credit, they are beginning to ask questions. They are saying that this sounds great, and that the federal government is telling the public that it will have to look after, not only the people on welfare, the old and the needy, but also the working poor, but let the government give us some of the nitty-gritty and answer some of the small questions, like who is going to qualify and how much they will get. Are they going to get $50 a week, are they going to get something near the poverty level, or is Ottawa going to pay 50 per cent or 60 per cent? I am speaking from memory, but I think I am not far wrong when I say that Newfoundland has an unemployment rate of 18 per cent. Newfoundland cannot pay 50 per cent.

Is the federal government going to be prepared to pay more, and if we are going into this program will the government come back in 1977, 1978 or 1981 and say that it has changed its mind and will no longer pay the 50 per cent or whatever it will have promised to pay? Will it pay only 20 per cent, 30 per cent, or 40 per cent?

We want to know these things before we get involved. Despite all the meetings of first ministers, of finance ministers and of health ministers, the provincial ministers still do not have the facts, and they are not going to get any more information from this government than the govern-

ment is prepared to give them—and that is damned little. Let us look at this medical insurance bill. We opposed this bill from the day it was first mentioned in that infamous budget of a year ago, and so have the provinces. I do not know why the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) digressed from a pretty constructive and positive speech to attack the Saskatchewan government. It is caught in the same bind as every other government, whether federal, provincial or municipal, and it is trying to cut back on increased costs.

The provinces have not agreed, and we oppose this bill. We have held it up. We have been accused of filibustering. While we are accused of that publicly, privately the provinces are told by officials not to worry, that there is time, that agreements will be worked out, that the deal will be sweetened and that the federal government will look after the provinces within the next few months. We do not trust this government, and we do not trust the statements it makes in public. Nor do we trust the statements it makes in private, and it is for that reason that we will continue to oppose this bill.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. BAKER (GRENVILLE-CARLETON)—PRIME MINISTER'S FORTHCOMING STATEMENT ON TV CONCERNING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS AND PILOTS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time on a question of privilege. It has been brought to our attention by representatives of the media that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) intends to go on national television this evening. He intends to interrupt the regular programming on both national television networks at nine o'clock to make a statement to the country with respect to air traffic controllers, airline pilots and the situation in Canada in that respect.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) made a statement in the House today, and the Prime Minister sat through that statement and listened to it with all of us. We had occasion to question the minister. There was a vigorous question period after his statement, and under those circumstances, for the Prime Minister to pre-empt, as he is apparently now able to do, network time all by himself on a matter of such significance that it was discussed in the House of Commons and has been the subject matter of the question period for many days, offends all the rules of the House. It offends not only the rules of the House, the privileges of hon. members, the rights of parliament and the position of parliament in the scheme of things, but I say, with respect, that it also offends good taste, common sense, and involves a downgrading of this parliament. This is not the first time this sort of thing has happened, and if it is going to continue, I think it is time this House looked into its privileges with respect to the Queen's first minister appearing here first to make his statements.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Just a minute. I still have the floor on a question of privilege.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It is not a question of privilege.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The matter which disturbs me is that the Prime Minister has—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest the hon. member should come to his question of privilege.

An hon. Member: Before six o'clock.

Mr. Basford: Let's have a little free speech so that we can reply.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What do you know about it? The Prime Minister is going on television and—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): My submission is that the privileges of this House are being infringed upon, and that parliament is being bypassed by a Prime Minister who at one time called members of parliament nobodies outside parliament, and now we are being called nobodies when we are here. Further, the Prime Minister must have known, as he sat in his place here today, that he was going to pre-empt that network time, and if that is the case he did not have the common courtesy to tell hon. members that that would be done. More than that, he has not had the common courtesy to tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) that this would be done, or to consider the importance of giving the other parties in this House the opportunity to appear and comment as well. This is a matter for the consideration of all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I am raising this matter now, but I do not suggest that you should deal with it now. I am raising it as a matter of notice to the Chair that this is a matter which may well be pursued on a later occasion. I would like the right to pursue it on a later occasion and to reserve the right of other hon. members to pursue it, including the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) who had the bad manners to rise when I was in the middle of a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I trust that hon. members opposite who have been talking about free speech will not cut me off by the clock. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) did not cite one Standing Order or one rule of this House relating to this question of privilege. There is no question of privilege.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been in this House every day this week during the question period to be examined and cross-examined on the air traffic controllers' situation. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) made

a statement on motions in this House today on behalf of the government, which includes the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: The matter was fully canvassed by the Minister of Transport on behalf of the government and the Prime Minister. The opposition parties replied to his statement, and the minister was examined and cross-examined. That, Mr. Speaker, is totally in accordance with the rules of the House. However, I am not aware of any rule of this House or any question of privilege which says that any member of this House, the peoples representatives, be he Prime Minister or no, is not entitled at any time to go outside this House and speak to the people he represents and is supposed to be reaching. It is, surely, no question of privilege, in a free society and a free parliament, for one of its members, including the Prime Minister to go out and speak to the people of this country.

● (1800)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) said he did not know what rule the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) was citing in raising this question of privilege.

An hon. Member: Cite it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My hon. friend has asked me to cite one. Mr. Speaker, I cite a very simple rule—the rule of fairness.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The Liberals are all leaving.

Mr. Paproski: They do not care about parliament.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I suggest to the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé), either in her own capacity in that portfolio, or maybe she is Acting Secretary of State—and I would be delighted if she were—that the suggestion be made to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation right away that if the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is given free and extra time tonight for a political broadcast, equal or commensurate time be given to the other party leaders in this House. Mr. Speaker, I make that plea simply on the basis of the rule of fairness, which I think is still in existence.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member's question may be a question of propriety, but in my opinion it is not a question of privilege and I consider the case closed.

At 6.04 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 25, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED PROHIBITION OF THE EXTENSION OF BILINGUAL TRAFFIC CONTROL UNTIL AUTHORIZED BY PARLIAMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to propose a motion under Standing Order 43, the urgency and pressing circumstances of which are quite apparent. I therefore move:

That as a basis for resumption of air transport the government forthwith put before the House a motion that there be no alteration and extension of bilingual air traffic control unless and until parliament has enacted legislation to that effect.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REASON INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED DEFRAUDING OF COMMISSION IN OTTAWA AREA CEASED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity stemming from events occurring subsequent to the matter I raised Monday with regard to the fact that three Unemployment Insurance Commission investigators and the RCMP were working full time on an investigation into defrauding the Unemployment Insurance Commission in the Ottawa area and examining the possibility that such defrauding was connected with trafficking in narcotics.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That the Minister of Manpower and Immigration advise the House immediately as to why, with his approval, removal was made within 24 hours of the matter being raised in the House Monday of the Unemployment Insurance Commission investigators working full time on this case, and finally, that the Minister advise the House all reasons why Real Meilleur, chief benefit control officer, and two former Ottawa police officers, Mike Richard and Claude Charron, were instructed to cease forthwith any further investigation into this matter.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PROPOSED IMPARTIAL HEARING FOR SERGEANT JOSEPH PRIMEAU—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43 with reference to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to emphasize, as a matter of principle, another example of unnecessary, unjust and arbitrary treatment of a fine officer, Sergeant Joseph L. N. Primeau, who completed almost 23 years of good service to the force.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That Joseph L. N. Primeau be given a fair and impartial hearing and review of the circumstances involved in his discharge, which circumstances involved, among other things, further ramifications of the Securex matter, which has had widespread repercussions on the force, and which has graphically illustrated certain policy deficiencies and weaknesses in the upper echelons of the RCMP.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO SAFETY OF BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transport. Now that it has been possible to compare more carefully the two versions of the terms of reference, the one agreed to by all parties involved and the new one prepared for the two new commissioners, could the minister explain why it was

decided to change those terms of reference, and in particular, would the minister be prepared to re-issue the terms of reference using the wording which was agreed to by all concerned, the Ministry of Transport, the Treasury Board and the air traffic controllers, when they met in Newfoundland two weeks ago?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I believe there are only two changes of any significance of which I am aware. One is the potential for issuing interim reports, and the other is the removal of the specific reference to implementation costs in the body of the document, whereas it would, as I indicated in answer to questions earlier, be capable of comment by the commissioners under subparagraph (e) of the terms.

However, I should say that in my discussions on Wednesday evening with the representatives of the controllers I made it quite clear that in our view these were not significant changes in that everything was still before the commissioners and there was no great demand at that point for a change of the terms, but I certainly indicated that I was prepared to entertain discussions along those lines if in fact the controllers do indicate a preference for a somewhat different form.

REASON FOR ELIMINATION OF COST FROM TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): I think the House would be interested in knowing why the reference to costs in particular was deleted from the terms of reference for the Sinclair-Chouinard inquiry, and it is obviously clear that a suggestion which creates a capacity to comment upon those matters is not at all the same as a requirement to comment on those matters. I should like to ask the minister to tell us now specifically why there was a deletion of the requirement to comment on the cost factor, and whether he would be prepared to give us an undertaking that such a requirement would be reinserted in the terms of reference?

● (1110)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, this matter is being discussed with the controllers. I should think that is the proper place for the discussion about the terms of reference to take place rather than across the floor of this House at the present time. I say that with full knowledge of the interests of hon. members in this matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: If hon. members opposite would wait for a moment perhaps they would get some information. What I have said to the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he asked for the reasoning is that, first of all, it was in order to emphasize that the key role of the commission is very much related to the safety and operational efficiency aspects of any proposal for air traffic control that it seemed appropriate not to throw another item into that particular section of the area; second, to give the commission some greater freedom about how much it did want to get into the cost question. I am prepared to say the real issue of what it will cost if further certain steps are taken is one upon which we will certainly be interested in having full information. I am prepared to undertake that we will make our estimates of costs available to members here, too, as we have them and before we take further steps. In any case, apart from the work of the commission we are prepared to make it quite clear what the costs are and, therefore, what it is what we are prepared to pay for the specific further implementation of bilingualism.

REASON FOR GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENT CONCERNING DISPUTE OVER BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think it is not at all presumptious of me to suggest that the House of Commons itself is very much interested in this question of costs and that we would be more satisfied with a finding on the question of costs that came from the inquiry rather than simply from the minister himself. In light of that I would express the hope that the item might be reinserted in the terms of reference as a result of the interest of the House of Commons, bearing in mind that we, as well as the controllers and the minister, have an interest in this matter.

My supplementary question relates to the approach of the government toward the goal of trying to maintain an atmosphere of calm and avoid the inflammation of this dispute which has already become too seriously inflamed. In that light, I ask the minister why he felt it necessary to take the extraordinary step of issuing advertisements over his signature, paid for by the government of Canada, setting forth one side—the government's side, of this dispute—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: —and whether he would not agree that this kind of advertisement by the government of Canada will serve to inflame relations between the parties—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: —and if he would not agree specifically to desist from that kind of advertisement until there has been some resolution of this matter?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in my view what is contained in the advertisement is an explanation of fact and of the truth. I thought it was not just our side but perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition's side as well.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: I shall certainly try to do everything I can to avoid inflaming or inciting any additional feeling on this issue. But it should be obvious to all hon. members that, because of a great deal of misunderstanding and misdepicting of what we are doing and a certain amount of aversion to basic principles and policies, the country is aflame with antagonism toward fundamental Canadian facts like bilingualism. It will be important for all members of this House including, I hope, hon. members opposite, in support of bilingual policy to make it known throughout this country that our whole approach to any extension of bilingual air traffic control has always, as stated specifically, been: only when and if consistent with safety. But, given that consistency, we believe there are some rights of importance to francophones in this country, particularly in the province of Quebec, and I ask hon. members opposite to remember that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clark: I would like to make it very clear to the minister that the matter of bilingualism is not at stake within the Progressive Conservative Party.

[*English*]

My question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the minister will not recognize that the kind of advertisement which was run this morning, coupled with the tone of some of the remarks unfortunately made by the Prime Minister in his speech on the matter, has served to inflame this situation. Would he not agree? I make this plea to him as one whose interest is in trying to achieve a resolution of this question and avoid any inflammation of questions relating to bilingualism. Bilingualism is not at issue. Would he please accept the plea of this side of the House not to engage in actions which are bound to be interpreted by the pilots and controllers as inflaming the situation, and would he desist from actions or advertisements of this kind in future?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition noticed another ad in that same paper which he was waving, which is an example of another, basic problem in this country. I see the Leader of the Opposition nods his head about that. Now, what I should like to ask him is if he would—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Answer questions; do not ask.

Mr. Lang: —in response to his question—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is a natural and strong temptation to engage in debate over this question. I suggest we should keep to questions; therefore the questions ought to come from the opposition side, and not from the government side.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that that was rather a manner of speaking, not an indication that I expect the Leader of the Opposition to respond in this forum.

What I wished to say was this: I would be delighted to receive from the Leader of the Opposition any indication on whether any of the matters contained in that ad are wrong, false or anything but plain statement of fact, which is very much needed. I say to him that if there is to be an understanding of this issue throughout this country so that, indeed, bilingualism policies may be supported, it will be important for all facts to be known by the people of this country. If opposition to what we are apparently doing is based on failure to understand that a commission has been appointed, that we have put safety first, that we will take no steps if safety is jeopardized, that at present there is only a limited amount of air traffic control bilingually in five airports, going on to seven and only for visual flight rules; if it is based on the belief that there is danger in the skies over Winnipeg because there is bilingual air traffic control there now, and if those beliefs have been put abroad by a lot of people, some of whom have done it perhaps accidentally but some of whom may have done it without any good intent, it is important for us to make facts known and to make these factual statements. I will be pleased to have from the Leader of the Opposition any indication of what specifically is wrong in the ad or ought not to be included in it.

● (1120)

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, what is wrong in the ads is that they add to the atmosphere of confrontation in which, on one side, the pilots and the controllers see the government as being opposed to the interests of the pilots and the controllers. All I ask is that the government of Canada act in a way that is not inspired by a stubborn desire to state its own case, but inspired instead by a determination to achieve a resolution of this problem. In order to try to achieve that kind of climate, will the minister consider desisting from this type of ad or from statements by other of his members which he must surely know will simply inflame relations between people whom he must bring together.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I believe that on reading the ad, if one is in touch with people across this country, one will understand the extreme misconceptions which occur across this country on this issue and which, therefore, have people inflamed against what we are doing, even though what we are doing, if properly depicted, has the full agreement and support, as I read it, of reasonable members opposite, including the Leader of the Opposition. The more important point right now might be for the Leader of the Opposition to indicate, as he did to the nation last night, that he does in fact support what we are doing because we have put security first, because we are saying to the pilots and controllers, "now, let us get back to work; we are taking no steps until the commission is over and taking no steps until safety is assured." With that kind of support from the Leader of the Opposition, the day of traffic flying again in this country will come just that much sooner.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SUGGESTED INCLUSION OF COST IN TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, in his last two answers the minister appealed, on the one hand, for understanding and, on the other, demonstrated

the need to provide more facts. I remind him that one of the essential facts required for those who support the principle of bilingualism is to know the real cost in advance. If that is not known, the whole principle subsequently becomes undermined.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I say that seriously. I refer the minister to the answer he gave to me on Wednesday when I first pointed out the change in the terms of reference of the commission involving costs. He seems to have changed his mind a bit since then. He said on Wednesday, and I quote:

It might not want to pursue to the ultimate limit the question of total additional costs; —

The minister said at that time that was the reason for the government not now including in its terms of reference the question of costs. I would like to get a commitment from him now that the government will look once again at the question of costs in defence of the principle of bilingualism and make that a mandatory requirement for this commission to investigate.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I regret the diversion to this particular issue because, in the end, the impression will be left that in some way there is a lack of support for what we are in essence doing here. Therefore, I repeat what I did say to the Leader of the Opposition, that I really believe that the negotiation of this dispute between ourselves and the controllers—where, after all, the first terms of reference were developed—is the appropriate place for these discussions to be held. I indicate that, quite apart from what the commission might do with regard to costs under its general terms, I was prepared to do more specifically on our own part before action was taken; I should have thought that was enough to satisfy them.

If they want me to go further and say I will put on the table before the controllers that we re-include the cost expression up in the earlier paragraph rather than in the lower one, I will be glad to do that in order to make it quite clear to hon. members opposite they ought not to deflect attention to such an issue as that. Obviously, at certain points in time bilingual programs in this country will cost more than unilingual programs. We will know that; we will want to state that very clearly and we will want to defend those costs clearly and expressly and it will not be a part of this party's program at any time to hide behind the ignorance of costs but rather to know those costs, to support them and to fight for them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: The minister is obviously desperate and trying to deflect attention from the issue. I would remind him that he changed unilaterally the terms of reference; he did not consult the unions involved.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: If we now have his assurance that costs will be reinstated, then those who are committed to the principle are just as prepared as is the minister—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Broadbent.]

Mr. Broadbent: I was pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition assert this, too. All the parties are committed to the principle of bilingualism. But we want to look at it honestly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST FOR ACTION ON ALLEGED BREACHES OF REGULATIONS GOVERNING BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Since goodwill is obviously a pre-requisite to reaching an acceptable solution to this labour dispute, would the minister assure the House that current violations of existing MOT regulations as they pertain to bilingual air traffic control in the Province of Quebec will be looked into and corrected, because this is one area of concern expressed both by the pilots and by the air traffic controllers. Will the government give a commitment that those violations will be investigated and stopped immediately?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I think the hon. gentleman must have missed my opening remarks in answer to the Leader of the Opposition. I had already indicated a willingness on Wednesday night to review the terms of reference with the controllers and they did not show great interest in having this particular section reinstated. That is an important fact. He should realize that this is a matter that will be the subject of negotiation. I have now made the fullest statement I can possibly make about what I am willing to put on the table in those discussions.

I can also say that the incidents which were brought to our attention—and there were, I believe, a total of six in a period of about a week, two or three weeks ago—where an improper and irregular use of language was reported, have been the subject of investigation. Up to this point we have been able to verify the existence of four cases in which French appeared to have been used in IFR communication, contrary to the regulations. We are following up that investigation with appropriate action. We are on the verge of having the necessary information regarding what has happened to enable us to take proper steps and we will do that. So I do give the House an assurance that our regulations must be adhered to; that while we are trying to make progress with bilingual air traffic control once safety is assured, it is a fundamental principle that as long as the regulations prohibit the use of a language, that must be the guide for all controllers. That is what I have said time and time again, and I went to Montreal to say it to the controllers there who had been on the edge of some violations.

REASON FOR CHANGE IN TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL RELATING TO SIMULATOR TRIALS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question, too, is addressed to the Minister of Transport. There are other ambiguities in the terms of reference to which I should like to refer. There seems to be some ambiguity as to the manner in which the new commissioners are being asked to deal with procedures devel-

oped in the simulator trials and the manner in which Mr. Keenan was being asked to deal with them. Could the minister explain the difference and why it was decided that he should change the manner of dealing with procedures, if only—and this seems to be the most important part of the whole business—to restore confidence which has been completely eroded?

● (1130)

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the changes should indeed restore complete confidence. If the hon. member is referring to differences between the terms of reference when Mr. Keenan was appointed and the terms of reference now for the new commissioners, most of the changes were proposed and agreed upon for the Keenan commission prior to Mr. Keenan's resignation. Therefore, most of them were made as a result of suggestions or requests by the controllers themselves to which we, in our usual flexible way, to try to accommodate their wishes, were willing to agree.

ALLEGATION LACK OF ADHERENCE TO LANGUAGE REGULATIONS BY CONTROLLERS—REASON FOREIGN PILOTS BOYCOTTING CANADIAN AIR SPACE

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I think one could take issue with a statement of that sort just given off the cuff, but I should like to ask the minister whether he could comment on the report coming from the Montreal area control centre that language use regulations are not being respected or enforced. I wonder whether he would explain if this is perhaps the reason foreign air pilots have decided to boycott Canadian air space—because they are being confused and endangering their passengers?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker. Outside of the six incidents to which I referred earlier, of which four have been verified by the investigation to this point, there is no evidence of any substantial deviation from our rules in the Mirabel and Dorval areas where the incoming activity of a foreign nature, and indeed of Canadian transporter travel, occurs. There have been some rather more complicated situations arising at St. Hubert and they also have been subject to investigation.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister say what attitudes and positive matters he is going to take to the meeting that he is going to have this afternoon which will calm the atmosphere and enable negotiations to take place?

EFFECT OF DIFFERENCE OF OPINION BETWEEN THE TWO COMMISSIONERS INQUIRING INTO SAFETY OF BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport and it relates to a statement he made out of the House after the tabling of the terms of reference. As I understand the statement, bearing in mind the commission is a two man commission and the possibility that there could be a difference of opinion, with no third person to break the tie, so to speak, is it the position of the government that in the event of a difference of opinion between the two commissioners this would be taken by the government to be an indication, as the outcome of the commission, that it was not safe to extend bilingual air traffic control? I ask this because I think it is important that we all understand the parameters of the commission's considerations.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is important to understand that all along, as we have developed the program for establishing procedures for possible IFR flight control in the Montreal area, we have asked for the participation of the controllers and pilots and indicated that we did not see how we could proceed unless there was at the end, when we had the procedures ready, a broad consensus that the procedures were satisfactory and safe. We had always counted upon having to persuade reasonable individual pilots and controllers of the safety of our procedures. So I have no trouble in saying about the commission that safety is too important a matter to say that we could proceed in any way if there is any significant dissent, and the commissioners' dissent would certainly be significant. We would therefore need the approbation of the commission and the commissioners.

ALLEGED STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF LABOUR CONCERNING PROSECUTION OF STRIKING PILOTS—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, which has to do with the atmosphere that we were discussing a few moments ago. The Minister of Labour indicated yesterday that he was prepared to issue warrants under the Canada Labour Code to pilots who failed to return to work. I understand the position of the government with respect to breaches of collective agreements and all those things, but in view of the Prime Minister's admonition to "cool it", which I assume applies to the Minister of Transport, if it should apply, and to the Minister of Labour and all others, is the minister going to speak to his colleague the Minister of Labour with respect to these statements, which I think can only help inflame a situation which is a pretty serious one in this country? If he has not done so, would he do so in terms of trying to bring some peace to the situation?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Labour did not go out of his way to volunteer any such statement but rather responded to a question about what he would do as a matter of duty. I would say broadly speaking that what we want, of course, is as reasonable and positive an atmosphere as we can establish. On the other hand, there is the law, and the law is there to be enforced; we have certain obligations in that regard.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR RESULTS OF ICNAF CONFERENCE AND AGREEMENT WITH SOVIET UNION

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move from airline

traffic to fish traffic in Canada. My question is directed to the Minister of State for Fisheries.

Could the minister advise the House and Canada fishermen what optimism they can expect from the ICNAF conference which has just ended in Montreal and what is the position of rosefish fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and eastern Canada, following the agreement between the Soviet Union and Canada which he recently signed in Moscow on behalf of Canada?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I think that the conference which has just ended in Montreal yielded excellent results for Canada. ICNAF member countries have accepted that special efforts should be made to rebuild the stocks; thus the total rosefish catch will decrease from 985,000 down to 697,000 tons for the year 1977. On the other hand, Canada's share will be comparatively higher. As for the exchange of rosefish and capelin between our country and the Soviet Union, there was indeed an agreement that 14,000 tons of the Soviet quota would be transferred to Canada, as well as 1,500 tons of the Cuban quota in exchange for our support for a higher capelin quota for the Soviet Union.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM SOVIET UNION

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to underline the presence in your gallery of a delegation from the Soviet Union.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to underline the presence in your gallery of a distinguished delegation from the Soviet Union to the recent ICNAF conference, which was led by their able deputy minister, Mr. Kamentsev.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

FISHERIES

POSSIBLE DISCUSSION OF LANDING RIGHTS WITH ICNAF COUNTRIES FOLLOWING EXTENSION OF FISHING ZONES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Minister of State (Fisheries). May I ask him whether at any time preceding, during or following the ICNAF conference discussions took place with member countries of ICNAF respecting landing rights for these countries after we have declared our jurisdiction over the 200 mile economic zone?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the hon. member means landing rights for fishery products, not for repairing vessels. Normally, this matter would not come under the terms of reference of the ICNAF commission; it would be the subject of bilateral discussions and is part of the ongoing discussions within the framework of our bilateral treaties with six of the ICNAF nations.

* * *

ENERGY

ELLIOT LAKE URANIUM MINE—POSSIBILITY GOVERNMENT WILL REQUEST SAFER METHOD OF OPERATION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister of energy, but in his absence may I direct it to the acting minister or the parliamentary secretary. In view of the large expansion program at Elliot Lake uranium mine and the ensuing waste disposal problems, has the Atomic Energy Control Board demanded that the company must utilize safer methods of operation, such as increased and continuously monitored ventilation, recycling of waste water and backfilling of surface pollutants underground, in order that we do not have a repeat of the severe health problems affecting miners at Elliot Lake?

● (1140)

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Control Board is constantly reviewing these standards relating to the health and safety of uranium miners. This is a shared responsibility with the provincial departments of health. I may say that the government is increasing its research programs this year by some $600,000 as they relate to continuous monitoring and improvements to the mine atmosphere, and they will work with provincial governments in this regard.

Mr. Symes: Mr. Speaker, I take it from the answer that no new instructions have been given to the company about environmental safety.

* * *

MANPOWER

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO FIND ABOVE-GROUND JOBS FOR URANIUM MINERS WHO HAVE HIGH RADIATION EXPOSURE

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that as of the end of 1974, the latest figures available, some 139 employees at Elliot Lake have a high radiation exposure, some as high as three times the allowable limit, and are having difficulty in being placed in non-exposure jobs above ground, will the minister establish a special job search and job creation program for these miners who are facing extreme health hazards by continuing to work underground?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will note that suggestion and consider it.

PENITENTIARIES

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON LEVEL OF ABSENTEEISM FOR THOSE ISSUED DAY PASSES

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General which has reference to peace and security and, particularly, safety for society. It is based on a new report that in respect of day passes there appears to be an absenteeism level of approximately one-third. In light of that report, whether it is correct or incorrect as to the percentage, would the minister be prepared to give a full statement on motions covering the details of absenteeism, the action that is being taken on recommendations to tighten up the system rather than have it like a sieve?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not know to what report the hon. member is referring. The report I have in respect of temporary absence passes is that last year they were 98 per cent to 99 per cent successful.

SUGGESTION COURT ORDER BE OBTAINED BEFORE GRANTING DAY PASS TO CONVICTED MURDERERS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, it was in the newspaper. Perhaps the minister would be prepared to answer this question as it is a serious one. As Bill C-84 deals with first degree murder and provides that even convicted murderers can get day passes with escorts on humanitarian grounds, and this is the law as it now stands, will the Solicitor General not agree, in view of the serious situation we dealt with in the committee and in the House, that under any circumstances, whether they are humanitarian or otherwise, when a person has been convicted of capital murder and given a life sentence, either through commutation as it exists today or under the law, there must be an order of a superior court before granting such leave? I do not think this would inconvenience anyone and would certainly provide the element of safety the public is looking for at the present time?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-84 provides that no day parole or temporary absence without escort can be granted until three years before the full eligibility date for parole. That means that for first degree murder there can be no unescorted absence until after 22 years, and for second degree murder until after seven years. If the date of full eligibility is changed by three judges of the court, as provided in the legislation, then there would be eligibility for day passes three years before the end of the eligibility date. These are very strict provisions and, at the moment, that is all we are considering.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the minister is deliberately doing this, or perhaps he is misunderstanding my question. He has answered it in one form. Let me put this specific question to him. Under Bill C-84, and this is as the law now exists, a person convicted of first degree murder may be released on a day pass with an escort. Putting aside the 15-year rule, and that is a beautiful thing to throw in as it confuses the issue, under the present circumstances will the minister not agree that under no circumstances when a person is given 25 years or life for first degree murder, whether it is of a police officer or as a result of a planned and premeditated act, shall the person be released before obtaining a judge's order, because we know how wishy-washy humanitarian grounds can be, and in this regard you just have to check the Geoffroy case?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time the hon. member has made that suggestion to me. I will look at it, but I must say I cannot agree with his statement that the great majority of escorted temporary absences are not being carried out successfully. They are being carried out in accordance with the Penitentiary Act. This is a new proposal and we will look at it.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

RESPONSIBILITY FOR MISLEADING STATEMENTS IN ADVERTISEMENTS PUBLISHED BY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. A. C. Abbott (Mississauga): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I wish to address my question to the Prime Minister. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to the advertisement of the Minister of Transport. There also appears today a full page advertisement in the *Globe and Mail* sponsored by a so-called "Voice of Canada" concerning the present pilots' strike. Considering we are in the midst of a national emergency, and considering that this advertisement is riddled with vicious, false and misleading statements, is there no lawful method by which those persons sponsoring such an ad can be held legally responsible for such misleading statements?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would have to consult with the Minister of Justice to see if such an ad would fall under the heading of mischief or some other criminal offence. I think the existence of the ad indicates very clearly that this country is in very serious danger of being divided on as basic an issue as has ever divided the country in the past 34 years. I would hope that all parties in parliament and everyone in the country—

An hon. Member: The chickens come home to roost.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would remind all hon. members that the question as put has a rather narrow scope, namely, the legal responsibility concerning statements in the ad, and I wonder if the Prime Minister would confine himself to that answer.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I will consult with the Minister of Justice on this. I am somewhat disturbed by the remarks of the opposition. I was not trying to divide this House, I was trying to appeal to everybody, to every member of this House to talk to the country in the

next few days and to make it understood that the issue in this regard is indeed national unity and no other issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTION MOTION BE PUT PROHIBITING EXTENSION OF BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL WITHOUT PARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on that level I will go back to the Prime Minister and ask him this question. In light of the fact that one of the problems is in unlocking the logjam which now exists, and in view of the fact that, for a variety of reasons which in any event I would not be allowed to go into, there appears to be deep distrust, suspicion and an unwillingness to accept guarantees by the government, would the Prime Minister not consider the suggestion I made earlier, that a motion be put before this House which would make this place the underwriter of the government's guarantee in terms to be set forth in the motion?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think immediately of a debate in this House three years ago when the government brought the question of bilingualism before parliament, at which time opposition spokesmen of both the NDP and the Tories were suggesting this was a very decisive issue that we should not be bringing to parliament through this kind of a question. Now the hon. member is asking parliament to arbitrate in this particular case! I believe the reason members on this side said no to the hon. member's proposition is that the suggestion was, if I understood it correctly, that there be legislation by this House. That is the way his suggestion seemed to be phrased. At this stage there is no need for legislation, there is merely a need for understanding that the government's concern in respect of safety is foremost, but that we believe the people of Canada should understand that within the parameters of safety the issue is that of bilingualism and whether we believe in it in this country. That is the issue. That is why I say that, even after this strike hopefully is peacefully settled, the kind of misconception which is revealed in the ad to which the hon. member for Mississauga has referred, and the kind of misinformation that is being repeated over the airways, indicates that the issue is not the strike, but that the issue is national unity. I would hope that in this issue we have the support of every Canadian.

● (1150)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: The Prime Minister should know better; I am not proposing any discussion or any motion dealing with bilingualism in the House. What I proposed, and what I now ask the Prime Minister if he would consider in the light of my explanation, is that this House may be in receipt of a motion proposed by the government which would underwrite the government's guarantee that no steps and no action will be taken further with regard to bilingual control unless and until certain conditions have been met and I have indicated those conditions. Let the House have the opportunity to underwrite the government's proposition in the terms of the motion as a means of trying to settle the present impasse.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I misunderstood the hon. member. I believed the hon. member had mentioned legislation. If he did not, I apologize. I thought in his earlier question he was talking about legislation. If he is referring to a motion, I would accept the suggestion, and ask the Minister of Transport perhaps to help draft a motion which, I hope, will get the unanimous consent of the House on Monday or Tuesday, if the problem is not solved before that. The motion would indicate that the House supports unequivocally the government's intention to apply its bilingual policy within any strictures required by safety regulations, or some other wording. I see the hon. member shake his head. It would indicate that safety must be first and foremost in flying passengers in this country and that it is within this first and foremost requirement that we would see how far we can go in implementing the bilingual policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Will the government consult members of this party and other parties in the House as to the terms of any such motion and discuss it with the other interested parties who have a considerable stake?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Transport is indicating his assent. Certainly, it would be our intention to have the minister or the House leader meet immediately, at one o'clock if possible, to draft the terms of a motion. If it can be adopted later in the day, that would indeed be very helpful. If not, we could do it for next week.

* * *

AIR CANADA

ALLEGED CHANGE IN REGULATIONS GOVERNING ISSUANCE OF PASSES TO WIVES OF MEMBERS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Some years ago passes were issued to former prime ministers and their wives—not at my request nor, I think, at Mr. Pearson's request. Naturally, I am concerned over the revelations, to use the mildest term possible, as reported in the Toronto *Sun* of yesterday's date and the *Globe and Mail* of today, concerning promiscuity in the issuance of passes. In the absence of the minister concerned, who apparently admitted everything contained in the statements, I will ask just one question: Has there been any change made by Air Canada concerning qualifications on the part of spouses for passes, and why is it that a pass was issued to one described as a common law wife, an expression which of course is non-existent except in the vocabulary of certain people?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is accurate to say that that was the description used in the past. However, I will be glad to have a look at what is the current policy of Air Canada

with regard to passes and to report more fully on whether there have been any changes since the time the right hon. gentleman was prime minister.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Can the minister not say whether or not the rules that have applied through the years have been changed in order to meet the request of a minister?

Mr. Lang: I indicated that I do not know of any change of rules and I will be glad to determine whether or not the rules are the same. I thank the hon. member for repeating his question.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

ALLEGATION LANGUAGE REGULATIONS VIOLATED BY CONTROLLERS AT DORVAL AIRPORT

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. I know that he and all hon. members agree that there has to be a maximum of trust and good faith shown by both sides in order to resolve the present situation with air traffic controllers and the Department of Transport. Therefore, in order to obtain a greater degree of trust and good faith, can the minister tell us whether in fact pilots on instrument flights communicated in French in violation of the regulations at Dorval airport and, if that has occurred, have instructions been issued for it to cease?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question put by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre was answered by the minister.

ALLEGATION AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS DO NOT HAVE BINDING COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Transport in an attempt to find a way through the difficulty the minister will have this afternoon when he meets with the air traffic controllers. The argument put forward by the government a week ago was that a collective agreement is in existence and, as a consequence, air traffic controllers are in breach of it. The air traffic controllers are saying that the collective agreement was conditional upon or collateral to the arrangement to set up the commission and the acceptance of Mr. Keenan, and as a consequence they do not feel they are in breach of the total agreement they had with the government. In view of that, can the minister give consideration to instructing counsel for the government when the parties reconvene on Monday in such a way that the court could be made aware of the fact that the government also realizes that there was more to this deal than just the collective agreement? With respect, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this might go a long way toward assuaging feelings and finding a way through the difficulty.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): These issues would be before the courts, as the hon. member has indicated, and therefore it would be wrong to argue them in any detail here. I have no doubt that my colleague, the Minister of Justice, will know what instructions to give properly to counsel in this matter. I should point out to the hon. member, however, that the question of bilingual air traffic control is not a bargainable issue and was so found by the Public Service Staff Relations Board. Our willingness to continue discussing the possibility of a commission, and all the arrangements in relation to a commission, were in that sense not technically a requirement but something we did willingly and gladly to try to continue to improve the atmosphere. Of course, it was in that way that we followed up the withdrawal of Mr. Keenan by an indication immediately that we would search for appropriate other commissioners, and of course I have now done so and appointed them.

Mr. Fraser: I appreciate the minister's reply and I understand the legal issue clearly, I think, but my point is that no matter what the narrow legal issue may be—and I know what the judge found a week ago and as a consequence the government is moving on that narrow legal issue—the traffic controllers thought they had a bigger deal than that with the government. It is the feeling that this has been forgotten, that it is not agreed to by the government, and that somehow or other in their dealings with the government the government is taking a narrow position rather than a broader one. I entreat the minister to consider this very carefully this afternoon and over the weekend, because I think if a little flexibility were used here, we might be able to find a way to get everybody back to work.

● (1200)

Mr. Lang: I think to some extent we are infringing on matters before the courts and certainly also on matters which may be discussed a few minutes from now, and which I would not particularly want to discuss here. However, I think it should be clear that we made it known immediately that whatever feelings the controllers had toward the importance of the commission, we were fully in accord with the notion that a commission should go forward and that Mr. Keenan's withdrawal was not the basis for simply forgetting about the commission. We made that clear immediately, and therefore at all times we were, as much as we could be, in keeping with the obligations which we ourselves had assumed, but which were not a matter of legal obligation.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET WAYS AND MEANS MOTIONS

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government House leader may I, on behalf of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), and in accordance with Standing Order 60, request Your Honour to designate the necessary orders of the day for consideration of the notices of ways and means tabled by the Minister of Finance at the time of his budget presentation.

Order Paper Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following 50 questions will be answered today: 4,460 to 4,472 inclusive, 4,827 to 4,840 inclusive, 5,262, 5,270, 5,283 to 5,289 inclusive, 5,371, 5,470, 5,484, 5,531, 5,532, 5,555, 5,556, 5,708, 5,734 and 5,738.

[*Text*]

ESCAPES—DORCHESTER

Question No. 4,460—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Dorchester Penitentiary and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	2	1	8	—	—
Walkaways	—	2	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	1	—	—	5	1
without escort	3	1	6	—	5	1
Total	3	6	7	8	10	2

At large (December 31, 1975): 2

ESCAPES—CARLTON CENTRE

Question No. 4,461—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Carlton Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

Insert Table 4461

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	1	1	—	3
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	1	1	—	3

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—PORTSMOUTH CENTRE

Question No. 4,462—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Portsmouth Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

[Mr. Basford.]

ESCAPES—MONTGOMERY CENTRE

Question No. 4,463—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Montgomery Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	4	2	—	—	1
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	2	3	7	2	—	—
Total	2	7	9	2	—	1

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—ST-HUBERT CENTRE

Question No. 4,464—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at St. Hubert Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	2	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	6	9	1	5	2	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	4	8	7	2	1	—
Total	12	17	8	7	3	—

At large (December 31, 1975): 3

ESCAPES—PARRTOWN CENTRE

Question No. 4,465—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Parrtown Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	3	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	1
without escort	—	—	—	2	—	—
Total	—	—	—	5	—	—

At large (December 31, 1975): Nil

ESCAPES—ONTARIO REGIONAL RECEPTION CENTRE

Question No. 4,466—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Ontario Regional Reception Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

ESCAPES—QUEBEC REGIONAL RECEPTION CENTRE

Question No. 4,467—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Quebec Regional Reception Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	2	1	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	1	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	1	—	—	—	—
Total	2	3	—	—	—	—

At large (December 31, 1975): Nil

ESCAPES—LAVAL

Question No. 4,468—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Laval and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	7	5	10	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	7	5	10	—

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—ONTARIO PRISON FOR WOMEN

Question No, 4,469—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Ontario Prison for Women and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	2	6	—	—
Walkaways	1	—	1	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	1	—
without escort	3	11	20	19	11	10
Total	4	11	23	25	12	10

At large (December 31, 1975): 17

ESCAPES—DUNGARVON

Question No. 4,470—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Dungarvon and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	3
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	—	1	—
Total	—	—	—	—		13

At large (December 31, 1975): 2

ESCAPES—SPRINGHILL

Question No. 4,471—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Springhill and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	9	4	7	6	1	5
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	1	—	—	—
without escort	1	4	10	2	4	7
Total	10	8	18	8	5	12

At large (December 31, 1975): 2

ESCAPES—WESTMORELAND

Question No. 4,472—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Westmoreland and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	3	—	—	—	4	—
Walkaways	13	6	1	4	9	6
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	2	—	2	7	1	4
Total	18	6	3	11	14	10

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—FERNDALE

Question No. 4,827—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Ferndale and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

Order Paper Questions

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	1
Total	—	—	—	—	—	1

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—MATSQUI

Question No. 4,828—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Matsqui and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	8	13	14	12	2	6
Walkaways	1	3	5	1	1	1
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	6	—
without escort	12	24	33	13	2	1
Total	21	40	52	26	11	8

At large (December 31, 1975): 9

ESCAPES—MOUNTAIN INSTITUTION

Question No. 4,829—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Mountain Institution and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	6	11	17	7	5	4
Walkaways	—	1	1	2	—	2
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	4	16	15	8	10	5
Total	10	28	33	17	15	11

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—AGASSIZ CORRECTIONAL CAMP

Question No. 4,830—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Agassiz Correctional Camp and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	4	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	4	6	13	7	8	11
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	1	—	1
without escort	4	8	15	8	5	3
Total	12	14	28	16	13	15

At large (December 31, 1975): 7

[Mr. Poulin.]

ESCAPES—WILLIAMS HEAD

Question No. 4,831—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Williams Head and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	3	—	—	—	2	3
Walkaways	3	20	21	10	—	3
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	3	3
without escort	—	3	12	5	7	5
Total	6	23	33	15	12	14

At large (December 31, 1975): 7

ESCAPES—BOWDEN

Question No. 4,832—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Bowden and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	—	1
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	1
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	7
Total	—	—	—	—	—	9

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—DRUMHELLER

Question No. 4,833—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Drumheller and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	7	6	1	3	1
Walkaways	—	2	6	—	1	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	1	3
without escort	2	16	10	13	10	10
Total	2	25	22	14	15	14

At large (December 31, 1975): 5

ESCAPES—BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY

Question No. 4,834—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at British Columbia Penitentiary and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	3	—	2	5	3	1
Walkaways	2	—	—	1	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	1	—	—	—	—
without escort	1	1	1	—	—	—
Total	6	2	3	6	3	1

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—PANDORA CENTRE

Question No. 4,835—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Pandora Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	—	3	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	3	—

At large (December 31, 1975): 2

ESCAPES—GRIERSON CENTRE

Question No. 4,836—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Grierson Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	2	5	5	1
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	5	6	3	—
Total	—	—	7	11	8	1

At large (December 31, 1975): Nil

ESCAPES—OSKANA CENTRE

Question No. 4,837—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Oskana Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	1	2	—	2
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	1	1	—	—
Total	—	—	2	3	—	2

At large (December 31, 1975): 3

ESCAPES—ALTADORE CENTRE

Question No. 4,838—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Altadore Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

ESCAPES—SCARBORO CENTRE

Question No. 4,839—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Scarboro Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	5	4	—	—
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	—	6	—	—
Total	—	—	5	10	—	—

At large (December 31, 1975): 1

ESCAPES—BURRARD CENTRE

Question No. 4,840—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of escapes at Burrard Centre and how many are still at large?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Escapes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walkaways	—	—	—	1	5	2
Failure to return from Temporary Leave of Absence						
with escort	—	—	—	—	—	—
without escort	—	—	1	—	—	—
Total	—	—	1	1	5	2

At large (December 31, 1975): 6

Order Paper Questions

RDIA OFFERS NOT ACCEPTED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND REST OF CANADA

Question No. 5,262—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. What was the number of RDIA net offers made and not accepted from 1969 to 1975 in (a) British Columbia (b) the rest of Canada for the (i) establishment of new industries (ii) expansion of existing industries?

2. What were the total amounts in each case for the incentives offered but not accepted?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: See table below.

Regional Development Incentives Program
Information as of September 30, 1975
for Offers Made Between April 1, 1969 and September 30, 1975
Which were Subsequently Declined or Lapsed

	Number of Offers Made which were Subsequently Declined, or Lapsed	Estimated Amount of Incentive Grants Offered
1. (a) In British Columbia		
(i) New Industries*	15	$ 4,038,853
(ii) Expansion of Existing Industries**	2	303,600
	17	$ 4,342,453
(b) Rest of Canada		
(i) New Industries*	376	96,683,949
(ii) Expansion of Existing Industries**	143	13,265,939
	519	$109,949,888

* New industries include the following categories: (a) new facility (b) new product expansion (c) expansion and new facility (d) expansion and new product expansion (e) modernization and new facility (f) modernization and new product expansion (g) new facility and new product expansion (h) expansion, modernization, new facility (i) modernization, new facility, new product expansion (j) expansion, new facility, new product expansion (k) expansion, modernization, new product expansion (l) expansion, modernization, new facility, new product expansion.

** Expansion of existing industries includes the following categories: (a) expansion (b) modernization and (c) expansion and modernization.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP APRIL 10, 1976

Question No. 5,270—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Prime Minister attend an event sponsored by the Mount Royal Liberal Association on April 10, 1976 and, if so (a) did he travel by helicopter to and from Ottawa (b) who owned and who paid for the use of the helicopter?

2. If the helicopter was government owned (a) what was the entire cost to the taxpayer including all flying time and waiting time (b) what are the names and addresses of all persons who travelled in the Prime Minister's party (c) were any other helicopters used to accompany the Prime Minister and, if so, what are all the details in this regard including names of those on board exclusive of news media personnel?

3. Is the Prime Minister giving consideration to changing his past procedure of travelling to Liberal Party functions at public expense and, if not, is he prepared to immediately give such reconsideration?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): 1. Yes. (a) Yes; (b) Ministry of Transport.

2. (a) $357; (b) Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, Sacha Trudeau, Mary Macdonald, Administrative Assistant to the Prime Minister, Room 214, East Block; (c) Not applicable.

3. See reply to question No. 2,333, part 3, answered October 14, 1975.

COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAM

Question No. 5,283—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Community Services Programme (Program 2) and, if so, in what amount?

2. (a) How much is allocated to Project 1, Community Water Supply and Sewage Disposal (b) how many Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (c) how many departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

3. How much is allocated to Project 2, Multi-Purpose Community Facilities, for (a) Sub-project 1, Fire Halls (b) Sub-project 2, Town Halls (c) Sub-project 3, Community Halls (d) Sub-project 4, Municipal Buildings (e) Sub-project 5, Streets (f) Sub-project 6, Gymnasiums (g) Sub-project 7, Educational Facilities (h) Sub-project 8, Potato Lake Probationary Hostel (i) Sub-project 9, Group Home for Boys-Beauval (j) Sub-project 10, Creighton-Home for Girls (k) Sub-project 11, Pinehouse Health Centre (l) Sub-project 12, Dental Clinics and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

4. How much is allocated to Project 3, Community Planning, for (a) Sub-project 1, Housing Needs Survey (b) Sub-project 2, Terrain Analysis and Photogrammetric Contour Mapping (c) Sub-project 3, Legal surveys and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Yes. The Canada-Saskatchewan Interim Subsidiary Agreement on the Saskatchewan Northlands allocates $7,320,000 to the program.

2. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $4,861,680 in DREE funds have been authorized; (b) A number of northern communities with a total population of approximately 9,000 will be served by the program. A high percentage of the population is made up of people of native ancestry. Priority is also given to the employment of northern people in the construction of individual sub-projects. Funds are not specifically allocated to people of native ancestry; (c) See reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

3. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $59,355 in DREE funds have been authorized. Two northern communities, Buffalo Narrows and Green Lake, with a total population of approximately 1,700 will be served by the sub-project; (b) As of March 31, 1976, $18,312 in DREE funds have been authorized. The community of Cumberland House, with an approximate population of 938 will be served by the sub-

project; (c) As of March 31, 1976, $51,374 in DREE funds have been authorized. The communities of Deschambault, Sandy Bay, and Sturgeon Landing, with a total approximate population of 1,150 will be served by the sub-project; (d) As of March 31, 1976, $23,760 in DREE funds have been authorized. The community of Turnor Lake, with an approximate population of 316 will be served by the sub-project; (e) As of March 31, 1976, $85,418 in DREE funds have been authorized. Twelve northern communities, with a total population of approximately 5,300 will be served by the sub-project; (f) As of March 31, 1976, $961,207 in DREE funds have been authorized. The communities of Beauval, La Loche and Green Lake with a total population of approximately 2,782 will be served by the sub-projects; (g) As of March 31, 1976, $204,463 in DREE funds have been authorized. The communities of Pinehouse and Wollaston Lake with a total population of 863 will be served by the sub-projects; (h) As of March 31, 1976, $84,224 in DREE funds have been authorized. The sub-project, located adjacent to the community of La Ronge, is intended to serve the eastern side of the Northern Administration District; (i) As of March 31, 1976, $3,960 in DREE funds have been authorized. The sub-project is located in the community of Beauval but intended to serve the entire population of northern Saskatchewan; (j) As of March 31, 1976, $2,680 in DREE funds have been authorized. Located in the community of Creighton, the sub-project is intended to serve the people of northern Saskatchewan; (k) As of March 31, 1976, $6,600 in DREE funds have been authorized. The sub-project will serve the community of Pinehouse which has a population of approximately 512; (l) As of March 31, 1976, $78,000 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) In (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k) and (l), priority is given to the employment of northern people in the construction phase of individual structures. Precise figures relating to the employment of people of native ancestry are not available. No specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is made; (ii) See response to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

4. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $18,000 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The sub-project is being carried out by the Northern Municipal Council under contract to the department of northern Saskatchewan; (b) As of March 31, 1976, $16,200 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The sub-project is being carried out by staff of or consultants under contract to the department of northern Saskatchewan; (c) As of March 31, 1976, $21,060 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The sub-project is being carried out by staff of or consultants under contract to the department of northern Saskatchewan; (ii) In (a), (b), and (c)(ii) above, see response to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

INDIAN RESERVE PROJECTS (PROGRAM 3)

Question No. 5,284—Mr. Korchinski:

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Indian Reserve Projects (Program 3) and, if so, in what amount?

2. How much is allocated to (a) Project 1, Community Water Supply and Sewage Disposal (b) Project 2, Multi-Purpose Community Facilities (c) Project 3, On-Reserve Transportation Facilities and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows. 1. Yes. The Canada-Saskatchewan Interim Subsidiary Agreement on the Saskatchewan Northlands allocates $5 million to the program. Approximately $3 million of this amount is allocated from DREE funds, with the remainder being committed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

2. (a) As of March 31, 1976, the following funds have been allocated to the projects. All funds to date have been contributed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. (a) $135,000; (b) $171,000; (c) $87,000; (i) The projects are directed at assisting treaty Indians in northern Saskatchewan. The allocation of funds is 100 per cent to treaty Indians; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii)

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (PROGRAM 1)

Question No. 5,285—Mr. Korchinski:

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Resource Development Programme (Program 1) and, if so, in what amount?

2. (a) How much is allocated to Project 1, Resource Development Planning (b) how many Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (c) how many departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

3. How much is allocated to Project 2, Tourist and Recreation Facilities, for (a) Sub-project 1, Campground construction improvement and relocation (b) Sub-project 2, Tourist, recreation and resource access roads (c) Sub-project 3, Legal surveys—recreation sub-division (d) Sub-project 4, boat launches (f) Sub-project 6, Wells at tourist and recreation sites (g) Sub-project 7, Septic tank pumpouts at tourist and recreation sites (h) Sub-project 8, Nuisance grounds at tourist and recreation sites and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

4. (a) How much is allocated to Project 3, Fisheries Sector development (b) how many Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (c) how many departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows. 1. Yes. The Canada-Saskatchewan Subsidiary Agreement on the Saskatchewan Northlands allocates $1,422,000 in DREE funding to the program.

2. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $328,208 in DREE funds have been authorized; (b) The work is being carried out by consultants under contract to the department of northern Saskatchewan. The project will assist all the people of northern Saskatchewan. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (c) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii)

3. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $133,846 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (b) As of March 31, 1976, $154,500 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people.

Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (c) As of March 31, 1976, $23,700 in DREE funds have been authorized; i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (d) As of March 31, 1976, $36,000 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (ii) see response to question 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (e) As of March 31, 1976, $12,900 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (f) As of March 31, 1976, $35,369 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (g) As of March 31, 1976, $14,000 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (ii) see response to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (h) As of March 31, 1976, $12,000 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The numbers of people of native ancestry directly employed is not available. The results of the sub-project are expected to benefit all northern people. Specific allocation of DREE funds to each group is not made; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

4. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $603,390 in DREE funds have been authorized; (b) Over 20 people of native ancestry are employed directly year-round in the project with approximately 15 more employed in summer months. The project is aimed at assisting over 700 northern fishermen, of whom approximately 95 per cent are people of native ancestry. Specific DREE funds have not been allocated to each group; (i) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (PROGRAM 2)

Question No. 5,286—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Community Economic Development Programme (Program 2) and, if so, in what amount?

2. How much is allocated to Project 1, Economic Development Planning and Feasibility Studies, for (a) Sub-project 1, Development Unit—Economic Development Branch (b) Sub-project 2, Green Lake Socio-economic Study and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

[Mr. McIsaac.]

1. Yes. The Canada-Saskatchewan Interim Subsidiary Agreement on the Saskatchewan Northlands allocates $198,000 in DREE funding to the program. The program complements the Canada-Saskatchewan Special ARDA Program.

2. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $39,000 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The Development Unit—Economic Development Branch is an office of the provincial department of northern Saskatchewan. DREE funds are not specifically allocated to each group; (ii) See reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (b) As of March 31, 1976, $22,200 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The Green Lake Socio Economic Study is being carried out by Amisk Planning Consultants of Winnipeg, under contract to the provincial department of northern Saskatchewan. Local people of native ancestry are being employed to gather information for the study. The total population of Green Lake is 675. DREE funds are not specifically allocated to each group; (ii) See response to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM (PROGRAM 1)

Question No. 5,287—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Transportation Planning Programme (Program 1) and, if so, in what amount?

2. How much is allocated to Project 1, Transportation Planning, for (a) Sub-project 1, East Side Transportation Study (b) Sub-project 2, Southern Overland Access Study and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

3. How much is allocated to (a) Project 2, Highways (b) Project 3, Community Access Roads (c) Project 4, Community Airstrips and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

1. Yes. The Canada-Saskatchewan Interim Subsidiary Agreement on the Saskatchewan Northlands allocates $9,300,000 in DREE funding to the Program. An additional $7,500,000 has been allocated by Transport Canada.

2. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $12,000 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) A consulting firm, Clayton, Sparks and Associates of Regina is carrying out the study, under contract to the provincial department of northern Saskatchewan. No specific allocation of DREE funds to each group has been made; (ii) See reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (b) As of March 31, 1976, $6,000 in DREE funds have been authorized for the Southend Overland Access Study; (i) The work has been carried out by a consultant under contract to the provincial department of northern Saskatchewan. No specific allocation of funds to each group has been made; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

3. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $5,969,310 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The direct involvement of people of native ancestry through employment in the sub-project is not available. Priority is given to the employment of northern residents in the work. Funds are not specifically allocated to each group; (ii) See reply to question No. 5,282,

2(a)(ii); (b) As of March 31, 1976, $2,088,030 in DREE funds have been allocated; (i) The construction of five general access roads to the northern communities of Pinehouse, Sandy Bay, Stanley Mission, Patuanak and Black Lake involves work forces composed primarily of people of native ancestry. In addition, the roads will service communities composed largely of native people with a total population of over 3,000. No specific allocation of DREE funds to each group has been made; (ii) See reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (c) As of March 31, 1976, $646,800 in DREE funds have been authorized; (i) The construction of community airstrips in the northern communities of Île-à-la-Crosse, Pinehouse, La Loche, Buffalo Narrows, Cumberland House, involves work forces composed primarily of people of native ancestry. In addition, the airstrips will service communities composed largely of native people with a total population of over 5,000; (ii) See reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (PROGRAM 2)

Question No. 5,288—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Communications Development Programme (Program 2) and, if so, in what amount?

2. How many (a) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (b) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Yes. The Canada-Saskatchewan Interim Subsidiary Agreement on the Saskatchewan Northlands allocates $1,200,000 in DREE funding to the program.

2. (a) As of March 31, 1976, no projects have been authorized under the program, (b) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM (PROGRAM 1)

Question No. 5,289—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Co-ordination and Implementation Programme (Program 1) and, if so, in what amount?

2. How much is allocated to (a) Project 1, Administration (b) Project 2, Management Information System and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Yes. The Canada-Saskatchewan Interim Subsidiary Agreement allocates $960,000 in DREE funding to the program.

2. (a) As of March 31, 1976, $240,420 in DREE funds have been authorized. The administration project is a unit of the provincial department of northern Saskatchewan. No allocation of DREE funds to each group is made, (i) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii); (b) As of March 31, 1976, $463,200 in DREE funds have been authorized, (i) The work is being carried out by consultants under contract to the provincial department of northern Saskatchewan. The number of native people directly employed is not available; (ii) see reply to question No. 5,282, 2(a)(ii).

CNR TURBO TRAIN POSITIONS

Question No. 5,371—**Mr. Halliday:**

On the regular CNR "Turbo" train between Montreal and Toronto (a) what is the number and title of all positions (i.e. conductor, engineer, etc.) on each train (b) what is the minimum and maximum salary for each (c) what is the number of hours worked per week by each?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows:

	Number of employees	
(a)	Train Nos. 60-61	Train Nos. 66-67
Enginemen	2	2
Conductors	1	1
Brakemen	1	1
Flagmen	1	1
Trainrider	1	1
Steward-Waiter	2	6
Take-out Attendant	1	2
Cart Attendant	1	2

(b) Enginemen and trainmen are paid on a mileage rate rather than hourly or weekly rates, and it is not the company's practice to disclose information respecting employees' salaries. (c) Enginemen, estimated 21 hours; Conductors, estimated 26 hours; Brakemen, estimated 26 hours; Flagmen, estimated 26 hours; Trainrider, estimated 33¼ hours; Steward-Waiter, estimated 30-40 hours; Take-out Attendant, estimated 33-38 hours; Cart Attendant, estimated 31-35 hours.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 5,470—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Does the Post Office Department publish a publication called *Postal Progress* and, if so (a) how many copies are printed per issue (b) how frequently is it issued (c) what is the cost per issue (d) who prints it (e) was the printing contract awarded by tender (f) who is the editor and how many staff does he have (g) to whom is it distributed?

2. How many requests have been received asking (a) to be kept on the mailing list (b) that it be discontinued?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. Yes. (a) 10,000; (b) Quarterly; (c) Average cost of printing an issue, $3,583; (d) Marketing Communications, Toronto; (e) Yes; (f) Manager, Promotion Division—No staff, prepares it himself, (g) Executives of Large Volume Mailers.

2. (a) 5,425; (b) 22.

COMPENSATION—BUTTER SPOILAGE

Question No. 5,484—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. For each year (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976 to date, what was the total number of requests for compensation filed with the Canadian Dairy

Commission on account of mouldy, rancid or tainted butter which had been sold by the Commission to their customers?

2. Of the requests received (a) what was the total number in which compensation was paid (b) what, in each year, was the total amount of the compensation (c) how many pounds of butter were involved?

3. To the knowledge of the government, was any of the butter upon which compensation was paid, eventually sold to the public and, if so, how was it graded?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. (a) Fifteen; (b) Two; (c) Two.

2. (a) Nineteen requests for compensation for mouldy butter were paid; (b) 1974: $9,130.80; 1975: $3,850.00; 1976: $3,114.44; (c) 321,905 pounds.

3. Butter upon which compensation is paid is first examined by a government inspector to verify the seriousness of the complaint, and secondly, it is kept under control until corrective action is taken. The corrective action in the case of mouldy butter involved removing the mould and re-pasturizing or re-processing. It is then re-graded and sold to the public with the appropriate grade certification.

MILK POWDER IN STORAGE

Question No. 5,531—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many pounds of domestic skim milk powder were in storage at the end of March 1976?

2. In what locations is the powder stored and what are the names of companies providing the storage?

3. What are the (a) costs of storage (b) interest costs on a monthly basis?

4. What is the value of stocks held as of March 31, 1976?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Stocks of skim milk powder held by the Canadian Dairy Commission, not including stocks held by the private trade, at March 31, 1976, were 282.5 million pounds.

2. Locations of powder storage and names of companies providing storage: Quebec; SLW Distribution, Lachine; Coop Fédérée de Québec, Montréal; Eastern Packaging Corp., Montréal; Montréal Refrigerating, Montréal; Seaway Midwest Inc., Montréal; Blaicklock Bros., Lachine; Coop Agricole de Granby, Lawrenceville; Coop Agricole de Granby, Plessisville; Lactantia Ltée, Victoriaville; Vermette & Fils Ltée, St. Agapit; Schenker of Canada Ltd., La Salle; National Warehouses, Montréal; Fleur de Lys Warehouses, Montréal; Supply & Services, Montréal; Coop Agricole de Granby, Louiseville; Lebourg Warehouses, Ville St. Laurent, St. Patrick Warehouse, Montréal; Placements des Bois Francs, Victoriaville; Québec Lait, St. Lambert. Ontario: N.W. Distribution, Toronto; Schenker of Canada Ltd., Mississauga; Central Warehouse, Toronto; Intercontinental Whse., Rexdale; J.D. Smith, Downsview; Toronto Harbour Commissioners, Toronto; Seaway Midwest, Toronto; Ault Foods Ltd., Winchester; Manitoba: MacCosham Warehouse, Winnipeg; Seaway Midwest, Winnipeg. Alberta: Seaway Midwest, Edmonton; Canada Messenger, Edmonton; MacCosham Warehouse, Edmonton; MacCosham, Calgary. Maritimes: Maritime Warehouse, Nova Scotia; McQuaids, P.E.I. Saskatchewan: Dairy Producers Coop, Regina; Dairy Producers Coop, Yorkton; MacCosham Warehouse, Saskatoon. British Columbia: Fraser Valley Milk Produce, Vancouver.

[Mr. Stevens.]

3. (a) Cost of storage on a monthly basis. The Commission's cost of storage for each month of the dairy year 1975-76 (not including one time costs such as in-and-out charges, transportation charges and related costs) were: April, $107,551.79; May, $159,682.80; June, $141,036.44; July, $222,548.61; August, $203,919.80; September, $415,223.73; October, $133,183.60; November, $319,758.68; December, $509,240.33; January, $534,995.21; February, $378,916.11; March, $404,197.17; Total: $3,530,254.27; (b) Cost of interest on a monthly basis: The commission's costs of interest are not separately available for skim milk powder and butter. The total of interest costs for both products in 1975-76 was $8,717,133.17. This total comprises the actual monthly interest payments made to the Minister of Finance upon repayment of loans, total $3,389,152.51, and interest accrued at year-end in respect of outstanding loans for a total of $5,327,980.66.

4. Value of Canadian Dairy Commission's stocks at cost held at March 31, 1976, was $177,237,170.00.

BUTTER IN STORAGE

Question No. 5,532—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many pounds of butter were in storage at the end of March 1976?

2. In what locations is the butter stored and what are the names of companies providing the storage?

3. What are the (a) costs of storage (b) interest costs on a monthly basis?

4. What is the value of stocks held as of March 31, 1976?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Stocks of creamery butter held by the Canadian Dairy Commission, not including stocks held by the private trade, at March 31, 1976, were 42.2 million pounds.

2. Locations where butter is stored and names of companies providing storage: Quebec: Coop Agricole de Granby, Lawrenceville; Coop Agricole de Granby, Granby; Coop Agricole de Granby, Plessisville; Coop Agricole de Granby, Weedon; Granby Locker, Granby; Frigorifique Québec, Lachine; Canada Packers Ltd., Montréal; Jersey Brand, Montréal; Olive & Dorion, Montréal; Montréal Refrigerating & Cold Storage, Montréal; Lansdowne Storage, Sherbrooke; Vermette & Fils Ltée, St. Agapit; Associated Freezers, Montréal; Beaudoin & Marcoux, Sherbrooke; Québec Apple Growers, Farnham; Lovell & Christmas, Montréal; Entrepôt Igloo Ltée, Québec; Thompson & Alix, Sherbrooke; Produits Laitiers, St. Hyacinthe. Ontario: Teeswater Creamery, Teeswater; Toronto Harbour Commissioners; Stacey Brothers, Mitchell. Manitoba: Diamond Cold Storage, Winnipeg; Winnipeg Cold Storage, Winnipeg. USA: Harbour Side Terminal, Management-New Jersey.

3. (a) Cost of storage on a monthly basis. The commission's cost of storage for each month of the dairy year 1975-76 (not including one time costs such as in-and-out charges, transportation charges and related costs) were: April, $51,540.46; May, $40,899.88; June, $42,106.57; July, $119,411.40; August, $202,343.96; September, $142,675.80; October, $194,360.00; November, $176,183.32; December, $278,165.42; January, $296,835.58; February, $202,525.75; March, $153,935.93. Total: $1,900,984.07; (b) Cost of interest on a monthly basis. The commission's costs of interest are not separately available for skim milk powder and butter.

The total of interest costs for both products in 1975-76 was $8,717,133.17. This total comprises the actual monthly interest payments made to the Minister of Finance upon repayment of loans total $3,389,152.51, and interest accrued at year-end in respect of outstanding loans, for a total of $5,327,980.66.

4. Value of Canadian Dairy Commission's stocks at cost held at March 31, 1976, was $43,654,651.00.

VEHICLE ALLOWANCE FOR CABINET MEMBERS

Question No. 5,555—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What was the total amount of taxpayer money paid to all Ministers for automobile allowances since April 20, 1968 and does the government plan to eliminate such payments in the interest of cutting expenditures?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): See reply to question No. 4,126, *Hansard* 321, page 14415, dated June 11, 1976.

PRIME MINISTER—CAR ALLOWANCE

Question No. 5,556—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Does the Prime Minister receive an annual car allowance and, if so (a) what is the amount per year (b) what is the total amount he has received since April 20, 1968 (c) what are the reasons justifying the payment when the Prime Minister travels in government owned automobiles?

2. Has the Prime Minister ever returned, or offered to return, any of this money to the Treasury and (a) if so, on what date and how much (b) if not, will he make such a return?

3. In the interest of restraint, will the Prime Minister refuse to accept this allowance in future and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): See reply to Question No. 4,126, *Hansard* No. 321, page 14415, dated June 11, 1976.

FARM IMPROVEMENT LOANS PROGRAM—RIMOUSKI

Question No. 5,708—**Mr. Allard:**

1. Since the introduction of the Farm Improvement Loans Programme, what was the total amount of subsidies granted to farmers in the Constituency of Rimouski?

2. How many farmers (a) applied for (b) were granted such a loan and, in each case, where is their residence located?

3. For each loan granted, what was the (a) name of the lending institution (b) repayment period (c) average rate of reimbursement?

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Statistics concerning the F.I.L. Programme are not maintained on a constituency basis. Under the terms of the programme loans are made at the discretion of approved lending institutions who are responsible for the administration of individual loans.

VALUE OF BUTTER AND SKIM MILK POWDER STOCKS

Question No. 5,734—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

What is the total value of stocks based on the cost of the Canadian Dairy Commission for (a) butter (b) skim milk powder, as of March 31, 1976?

Order Paper Questions

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): (a) See answer to Question No. 5,532, part 4; (b) See answer to Question No. 5,531, part 4.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—COST OF ADMINISTRATION

Question No. 5,738—**Mr. Alexander:**

What was the (a) estimated (b) actual cost of administration under the Unemployment Insurance Act for (i) 1974 (ii) 1975 (iii) 1976 to date?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned:

	Estimated	Actual
1974	$166,200,000	$162,942,320
1975	198,100,000	191,890,289
Year-to-date May, 1976	88,064,600	82,355,700

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 5,328 and 5,403 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (PROGRAM 1)

Question No. 5,282—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion committed itself to the Human Development Programme (Program 1) and, if so, in what amount?

2. How much is allocated to Project 1, Options North, for (a) Sub-project 1, Manpower Planning (b) Sub-project 2, Northern Careers Plan (c) Sub-project 3, Training in Government for (e) Sub-project 5, Community College Developers and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (ii) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

3. (a) How much is allocated to Project 2, Public Information and Extension Services for Sub-project 1, Regional Communication Centre (b) how many Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (c) how many departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

4. How much is allocated to Project 3, Human Development Planning and Pilot Action, for (a) Sub-project 1, Community Correction Officer (b) Sub-project 2, Ethnohistorian and Instructional Services Consultant (c) Sub-project 3, Nutrition Study (d) Sub-project 4, Health Services Planning—Health Education Programme (e) Sub-project 5, Trapper Training Development Programme (f) Sub-project 6, Work Training Centres (g) Sub-project 7, Services to the Elderly and, in each case, how many (i) Indian or Metis people are involved and what is the allocation of funds to each group (b) departmental or resource people are involved and what is the cost of their services?

Order Paper Questions

Return tabled.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

Question No. 5,328—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. For each year 1970 to date, how much has the government granted under the Regional Development Incentives Act to the Constituencies of (a) Témiscamingue (b) Abitibi (c) Villeneuve?

2. In each case, what was the (a) location (b) purpose of the grant (c) amount granted (d) year it was granted?

Return tabled.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Question No. 5,403—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. How many Unemployment Insurance offices are there in Canada and where is each located?

2. How many agents of the Commission are working in each office?

3. From 1970 to 1975, how much was spent annually for the professional development of the agents in each office?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*English*]

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred Question No. 5,724?

[*Text*]

*TREASURY BOARD

Question No. 5,724—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. What members of the Cabinet were on the Treasury Board on December 2, 1975?

2. Was the financing of the Lockheed (LRPA) deal discussed at the Treasury Board meeting of December 2, 1975 and, if so, what members of the Cabinet were present?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. The President of the Treasury Board, The Minister of Finance, The Honourable Charles Mills Drury, The Honourable Stanley Ronald Basford, The Honourable Jean-Pierre Goyer, The Honourable Daniel Joseph MacDonald. *Alternates:* The Honourable W. Warren Allmand, The Honourable André Ouellet, The Honourable Barnett Jerome Danson, The Honourable J. Judd Buchanan, The Honourable Roméo LeBlanc.

2. The inner workings of cabinet, cabinet committees, and the services rendered by support staff are traditionally considered confidential matters. Canadian precedents in this regard flowed from British practice over many years. In response to a question in the House the Canadian Prime Minister of the day on 4 February 1960 in part replied:—

"The means by which the cabinet conducts its business are traditionally regarded as its own domestic affair, and questions on the subject are normally neither asked nor answered."

A detailed answer to the question would be a departure from the traditional position that has always been taken that meetings of the cabinet and of cabinet committees are private and no information is given concerning attendance.

I should simply like to indicate that—

[*English*]

It is evident, from the number of questions we are answering so late in the session, that our office is making its best efforts to be able to clear the order paper of all questions which have been inscribed thereon.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed, from Wednesday, June 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the third reading debate on Bill C-68. I want to comment on some of the remarks made the other evening by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco). I am afraid he got his facts wrong, and I know he would not want incorrect facts to remain on the record of this House. I want to point out, first, that in this federal-provincial cost-sharing relationship the situation is that there are three main programs which the federal government cost-shares with the provinces, namely, medical care, which was started in 1968; hospital insurance, which started in 1958; and the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, part VI, post-secondary education program, started in 1967. In the current fiscal year federal payments under these programs will be in excess of $5 billion. That represents 40 per cent to 45 per cent of all federal cash payments to the provinces. Most provisions of the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act expire on March 31, 1977, and the hospital service provisions expire in 1980.

The federal government is currently proposing that it replaces the current cost-sharing agreements. That is essentially the same as the proposal the federal government made in 1973 which was rejected by the provinces as being unfair to the have-not provinces. The federal government proposes that federal contributions to health care and post-secondary education should begin at about the present level and rise at a rate similar to the rate of increase in the gross national product; that federal contributions should rise independent of provincial expenditures; that the provinces should receive, after some kind of transitional period of indeterminate length, equal amounts in per capita terms; and that there should be three years' notice of any intention on the part of the federal govern-

ment to withdraw, instead of the present five years' notice which is required for hospital insurance changes.

This proposal would come into effect in 1977 for post-secondary education, and in 1981 or 1982 for health care. The federal government proposes that federal contributions be made up in two parts: one would be cash payments based on an unknown base year and rising at the same rate as the GNP. There would be tax room: Tax points would be transferred to the provinces and equalized to the national average of revenue yielded from that number of points by the use of transitional payments. Tax room would probably grow at a faster rate than the gross national product, according to the federal government.

The provinces reacted to these proposals and they certainly were not enthusiastic. A number of questions have to be answered before the provinces can reply rationally to the proposals. What base year is to be used? What escalation factor is to be used? What proportion of payments will be in the form of cash grants, and what proportion in tax room? How can the federal government guarantee equal per capita contributions to the provinces, given the wide discrepancies in the tax base of have and have-not provinces? What amount of money is the federal government prepared to add to existing medical care cost-sharing? There has been a vague mention of $200 million over the next five years. If that is so, what services will this cover?

If the federal government, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) would answer those questions, the provinces could then more rationally assess the government's proposals in terms of their own situation and the government might stand some chance of getting a more enthusiastic response from the provinces. Manitoba, Saskatchewan and, formerly, British Columbia are not in favour of transferring tax points, particularly if revenues are equalized only to the national average as opposed to the average of the two or three richest provinces, as this would reduce federal contributions. In fact, Manitoba has calculated that if federal contributions to post-secondary education and health care had been tied to the gross national product for the past three years, the ten provinces would have received $800 million less than under current arrangements.

● (1210)

One has to be suspicious of any guarantees that the federal government promises. It should be remembered that the federal government is currently reneging on $800 million to $900 million of the revenue guarantee promised at the time of tax reform in 1972. What good is a federal guarantee that the provinces will not lose under the transference of tax room?

Even if it were possible to equalize per capita contributions to the provinces, would that be appropriate? Cost may be higher in some provinces because of any number of factors. A widely dispersed northern population, for example, could mean a great difference in the costs of one province compared to another. What could happen to national standards if all provinces received the same per capita funds? What possible correspondence can there be between an increase in health expenditures and the rise in the gross national product? Manitoba has taken the position that we do not spend nearly enough on health care, that there are many health care services which we should be providing. If the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) is serious about preventative medicine, as was espoused in the 1974 white paper on health care, he should be expanding federal contributions, not limiting them.

I do not think we should be impressed by the guarantees of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) at the first ministers' meetings that federal contributions to health care after 1981-82 would represent the same proportion of the total gross national product as at the moment.

In 1973, Canada spent 6.9 per cent of the gross national product on health care. Frankly, that is not enough. It is not something the Canadian government can be proud of.

I think the federal government's sharing of revenues with the provinces is now being put in the form of a federal squeeze. Since the budget of June last year, the government has been putting ceilings on federal contributions to cost-shared programs as part of the restraint program, and forcing provincial governments to pick up more and more of the costs of programs. The attack started prior to the last budget. In 1972, under tax reform—which were just tax changes—the provincial share was reduced from 28 per cent to 23.4 per cent. To make up the revenue guarantee, a formula was drawn up to protect provincial tax revenues for the five-year period 1972-77.

At the most recent finance ministers' conference on April 1 and 2, the federal government announced it was changing this formula. They predicted a loss to the provinces of $800 million to $900 million as a result of the change in the formula. Is it any wonder there is lack of enthusiasm by the provinces when the federal government's earlier guarantees were reneged upon and changed in the middle of the game? The provinces have not received much money under the formula. In 1975-76, which was the first year any funds were actually paid out, the provinces had estimates and had budgeted accordingly. In 1974, indexing was unilaterally introduced by the federal government. This measure cut significantly into provincial as well as federal income tax revenues.

Since 1975 we have seen a limit placed on equalization of oil and gas revenues, a 15 per cent limit on federal contributions to post-secondary education, limits on medicare contributions, withdrawals from services to treaty Indians, cutbacks in funds for police protection, manpower training and regional economic development. It was estimated at the recent finance ministers' conference that in 1975-76 alone, the ten provinces lost $1 billion in potential revenue as a result of just three of the federal government's actions: limiting the equalization of oil and tax revenues, indexing, and changes in the revenue guarantee formula. This figure is expected to increase to $1¼ billion to $1½ billion.

The federal government has been making a great deal of noise lately about the need to increase the efficiency of shared-cost programs. For example, it introduced the medical care limits bill in order to force the provinces into steering away from expensive hospital care and toward less expensive forms of treatment. All the while, the provinces had been carrying about $1 billion in such health care programs without any assistance from the federal govern-

ment. As the Premier of Manitoba stated at the April finance ministers' conference:

—the provincial governments have an even greater interest than the federal government in ensuring improved efficiency—of programs—because with less broadly based taxing powers, it is generally more difficult for the provinces to match federal funds than it is for the federal government to provide them.

The 15 per cent limit on post-secondary education contributions is estimated to have cost the provinces $120 million to $150 million in 1975-76 in forgone revenue. This statement is borne out by the figures of the Department of Finance. In the April, 1976, Economic Review, figures are provided on a national accounts basis for federal, provincial and local government revenues. Even taking into account the dramatic turn-around in 1975, when the federal government went from a surplus of $593 million the year before to a deficit of $4.5 billion, the federal government's cumulative deficit for the years 1960 to 1975 amounted to $3.6 billion, compared to a cumulative deficit for provincial and local governments of $9.6 billion in the same period.

The equalization formula is now under review. The federal government has consistently retreated in recent years from the concept of equalizing revenues: for example, the 1971-72 proposal of the Department of National Health and Welfare for a new formula for cost-sharing health care based on percentage changes in the gross national product on a per capita basis. This plan was rejected by the provinces because it would adversely affect the have-not provinces and destroy national health standards.

It is possible that the federal government could come up with a new equalization formula which bears no direct relationship to the taxing capacities of the provinces. Alternatively, it could produce a formula which simply makes minor adjustments to the present formula to neutralize the impact on equalization of the widening disparities in income among the provinces. Either way, the federal government will most likely seek to reduce the amount it expends on equalization.

● (1220)

Another potential problem concerns the taxation of provincial Crown corporations. I think it most unlikely that the federal government would tax such agencies, although it may in future threaten to hurt the provinces by proposing such a move. Given the figures I listed with regard to fiscal imbalances as between federal and provincial local sectors, one cannot have much sympathy for government claims that the potash takeover, for instance, would have a severe effect on federal government revenues. I do not believe it; therefore, I have little sympathy for the federal government's claim.

I bring these facts forward to show why we feel this bill in its present form should not pass. The government should not retrench in areas as vital as national medicare and hospital care, post-secondary education arrangements with the provinces and the cost-sharing of those programs. Surely, our efforts at restraint should not include such areas. This should be done in other areas; there are other ways of doing it, Mr. Speaker.

On Wednesday afternoon the hon. member for Kootenay West, referring to a newspaper article, quoted the comments of Dr. Louis Brand of Saskatoon. Interpreting what had been said, the hon. member concluded that Saskatchewan has been forced to reduce its budget for health and hospital care by $44 million and, therefore, there is something seriously wrong with the operation of the province and the way in which it is managing its economy.

The hon. member for Kootenay West has his facts wrong or has accepted wrong information printed in the newspapers. The fact is that the health care budget in Saskatchewan was not reduced by $44 million; it was increased by $46 million in the face of the federal government's threat to restrain, hold at present levels, or even reduce its contributions to hospital and medical care. Even so, Saskatchewan increased its budget for that field by $46 million. The provincial ministers of health and finance have estimated that of the $46 million increase, inflation will have eaten up about $30 million, so that in real dollars the health care budget of Saskatchewan will have risen by only $16 million.

Let me explain what happened in Saskatchewan. I suspect my explanation will show why Dr. Brand, of St. Paul's Hospital, Saskatoon, complained. The sums required by hospitals were reduced, partly for the sake of maximum efficiency and partly to show restraint in areas which do not harm medical services. It was felt that what had already happened with regard to contributions from the federal government had increased the pinch on the provinces and they had to pass some of that pinch on, so to speak. The federal government had already cut back cost-sharing with regard to the Victorian Order of Nurses, air ambulance services and home care programs. Some of the pinch the federal government had put on the provinces was in turn passed on to the hospital districts, health regions and health care agencies.

The hon. member for Kootenay West made disparaging remarks about the operation of hospital and medical care in Saskatchewan, the province which originally led Canada and North America in the health care field. I am proud enough of that province's accomplishments and of the way those programs are presently operating in Saskatchewan not to be worried by the remarks of the hon. member for Kootenay West. He defended the province of Ontario's record in this field. He can do that if he wishes, but I find his arguments indefensible in this field.

Let us consider the costs of delivering hospital and medical care to individual citizens and families. For example, in British Columbia, medicare premiums are $90 for single persons, $180 for a family of two, and $225 for a family of three or more. In Alberta, the premium is $76.80 for a single person, and $153 for a family of any size. That is somewhat better than the premium charged in British Columbia. Next, let us consider rates in Ontario, the province for which the hon. member for Kootenay West felt sorry and so defended it. Ontario assesses $192 for a single person, and $384 for a family.

In Saskatchewan, the premiums charged individual citizens and families are zero: no premiums are paid by citizens in that province. Not only are our provincial programs well run, contrary to what the hon. member for Kootenay West alleges, but they are run in the best possible fashion from the standpoint of financing; that is, the funds raised by the province are raised fairly through taxation based on ability to pay. Funds are raised by way of income tax,

corporation tax and sales tax, as well as from revenues derived from our natural resources. Our people get the benefit of their natural resources and funds derived from those resources are applied to programs such as hospital care, medicare, and so on.

Of course, we must always be vigilant in making sure our hospital and medical care programs are run efficiently and without waste of money. In the health care field I should like to see more done with regard to how doctors allocate beds in hospitals. Mr. Speaker, people do not put themselves into hospital; doctors put them there. I am told that sometimes doctors refuse to reallocate beds even when there are waiting lists. It may be that a doctor has to plant his crop on his hobby farm and wants to disappear for a week, or he may want to go fishing for a day or two. Be that as it may, he will not reallocate beds. That, it seems to me, is inefficiency. I hope that Dr. Brand, the former Conservative candidate whom the hon. member quoted, will take the lead among his medical colleagues in Saskatchewan in making certain that the most efficient hospital and medical care services possible are provided.

Saskatchewan has made specific cutbacks in other programs purely on account of inflation and the necessity to hold down costs as much as possible. It is also partly because of federal government cutbacks and fear with regard to the intentions of the federal government in coming years concerning the cost-sharing of these programs. As I say, Saskatchewan has made some specific cutbacks. These were necessary for the reasons I have mentioned. The department of health's budget of $338 million is $46 million above the amount actually spent last year. However, severe cutbacks had to be made in the initial budget request.

● (1230)

The department asked for $44.3 million, which was eventually granted. This included $30 million to meet increasing costs of existing programs, and $14.3 million to finance group programs. One cutback in Saskatchewan was forgoing the $14.3 million to finance new health care programs, something that members on all sides of the House have been urging the federal government to do for the past several years. They might well want to pat themselves on the back for their cost-sharing in medicare, but they are still dragging their feet, refusing to take part in new health programs.

The federal government should be more involved in assisting the provinces and territories in the matter of air ambulance service. This should involve a very nominal fee for the patient, with the major part of the cost being shared by the federal government and provincial governments. Instead of this, the federal government has been cutting back. There should be new programs, or present programs should be extended, with regard to home care, nutrition education and better diets, all of which are part of health care.

We have a situation where the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) is up to his eyes in milk, when literally hundreds of thousands of people in this country are not getting the amount of milk they need. I do not understand why that minister cannot persuade the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Finance to start up a school milk program in the provinces and territories. I find it appalling that in almost every school there is a Coke machine but no milk machine. That might keep the dentists busy, but it does not do much for the children. The federal government should assist with a provincial school milk program and should pay the major part of the costs in the case of the territories.

There are many new programs that should be begun. The federal government should follow the lead of Saskatchewan with regard to pharmacare, hearing aids, dental care for children, which Saskatchewan pays for on its own. The federal government should be moving into these areas. Instead of that, they have put the provinces in the position where they must cut back on their health care budgets. I find that alarming.

The government of Saskatchewan had to carefully assess and make selective reductions in those programs where it was felt they could be absorbed without significantly limiting benefits to the public. That was not easy to do. One such cut involved the number of patient days for which hospitals will be reimbursed by the Saskatchewan hospital services plan. The government has been working with the hospitals to reappraise the personnel and budget for each. It has made some tough decisions which have resulted in some cost efficiencies.

The government has decided that further restraints must be applied to hospital spending. They have decided upon a general reduction of 5 per cent in the approved number of patient days for which all hospitals will be paid. This should not cause too much difficulty in Saskatchewan, in terms of service, because for a number of years that province has had the highest number of general hospital beds per 1,000 population. Therefore, a 5 per cent reduction should not restrict hospital benefits in the province. What I find tragic is that it should even be necessary for the provinces to have to resort to this, not only because of inflation and ensuring that the programs are operating efficiently, but because of federal government cost sharing in the health field.

We oppose Bill C-68. We will do all that we can to prevent it being passed. This is not the direction for the government to move. This is not the area to which the government should be paying attention and giving priority with regard to cutting expenses. In this legislation, as well as other legislation with regard to revenue and cost-sharing programs, the federal government is reneging; they are backing out of a deal, going back on their word. If the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are somewhat nonplussed or concerned about the lack of co-operation of the provincial premiers, they should take a good look at their own actions. The activities of the federal government have done more to harm confederation and national unity, as well as causing failure at federal-provincial conferences, than anything the provinces might have done.

If there is an element of distrust and lack of faith on the part of the provinces, I submit there is some cause for that. When the federal government starts to renege on a commitment halfway through a deal—and this has cost the provinces $1 billion—naturally the premiers will be somewhat suspicious. They will look upon new proposals by the Minister of National Health and Welfare with a jaundiced eye. I do not blame them for the way they feel about these

federal proposals in the health care field and in the whole area of revenue and tax sharing.

The federal government has been less than completely open with the provinces. They have left a large number of questions unanswered about which the provinces need data. They must have these answers from the federal government before making any rational decisions with regard to federal government proposals made over the past several months. It is incumbent upon the federal government to meet them more than halfway in providing that information, as well as complete information on the intentions of the federal government. The provinces must have this before they can start with any degree of responsibility to accept proposals by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

I urge the House not to let this bill pass, so that the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Finance will have to go back to the drawing board and come up with something better to submit to this parliament and the provinces of Canada.

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a few comments from the riding of Capilano, in the province of British Columbia, on third reading of Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act. This act might be entitled "a tale of good intentions and unmanageable consequences".

● (1240)

I would not be taking part in this debate had it not been for some of the political venom spewed forth by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) using the occasion to aggravate the condition which exists in the province of Ontario. He paid high tribute to his colleague, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), and I would like to endorse that tribute. But one thing has to be put on record to correct the statements made by the hon. member for Nickel Belt and those in his party. It is this: some 15 years ago the government of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) recognized that action should be taken to reduce income barriers to adequate health care, and he appointed a royal commission to assess the situation and bring in recommendations.

There were two obvious needs at that time. A minority of the population were not in a position to afford adequate health care, and the care they did receive was subsidized by other patients through the fee structures of hospitals and the medical profession. I agree that this did interfere with the dignity of people with marginal incomes, those at the perimeter of the work force. The second was that families risked being made bankrupt by having to pay catastrophic hospital and medical costs. Many were protected against this hazard by a variety of successful private and corporate plans. In those days, many of us who were then just hard working members of the public, taxpayers of Canada, spoke out with regard to the possible consequences of a universal plan for health care. The Liberals came to power. They considered the studies of the royal commission to which I have referred, and they opted for universality despite the warnings of the provinces and the advice of many of us who were involved in this field as citizens in our communities.

This decision led to the destruction of the private plans which were looking after some 85 per cent of the people in Canada at that time. Many of us who were members of community organizations were in favour of government subsidies to look after the medical needs of those in the work force whose incomes were marginal. The day has now come when we see clearly that there is no such thing as a free lunch. What people need now is a system of cost-benefit measurements which relates to their own purchasing power. We have hidden the cost of medicare. We have created a system which is out of control. We are failing to utilize our tax resources efficiently. Hence the present debate on an act to amend the Medical Care Act.

Some of us in those days were calling for an end-user tax by means of which the taxpayer could measure the cost of the services which were being provided for him in terms of his own income. Hon. members to my left will immediately scream that such a proposal favours the rich and works against the poor. But we were also suggesting that there be increased tax exemptions at the lower level of the income scale to counter such objections. The chance of having a means of meaningful measurement of cost was thrown away. We offered free lunches all over the country. Now we have to pay the piper.

This program, which was imposed unilaterally upon the country by the Liberal government, has created bureaucracies at the federal level, at the provincial level and at the hospital level. The bureaucracy has grown to such an extent that non-medical administrators exercise more control than the doctors trying to cure patients. There is continual agitation and confrontation between doctors, patients, hospital staffs and the system.

These disputes and the runaway costs of health care are a reflection of the inflation which is causing so much hardship and is bringing our system to its knees. In my opinion, it started with the St. Lawrence Seaway settlement under the Liberal administration of that day—an ad hoc measure for which we are now paying the price. We have since seen an escalation in costs on every side, and a recklessness in the use of our tax resources for which the government in power is totally responsible. The stability of the structure to which the scheme is related is now being threatened.

Having committed the federal treasury to massive expenditures, the government finds itself short of cash, unable to generate sufficient funds to discharge the commitments it has made. In these circumstances, it is preparing to dump the worst of its financial problems on to the provinces although they are already overburdened with tasks laid upon them in Ottawa. The effect of this proposal to cap expenditures will be dislocation of services throughout the provinces. Had the Liberal government, back in the days when insurance schemes were serving 85 per cent of our population, left that structure intact and put in a scheme to assist those on marginal incomes, this dilemma would not exist today.

Members of the New Democratic Party have devoted a good deal of time to attacking the province of Ontario for the readjustments it is making to meet the changes which this bill is designed to impose. I remember that some years ago I personally presented a case for more efficient administration of health services to the NDP cabinet in

British Columbia. It arose from the fact that laboratories and X-ray facilities in British Columbia hospitals were not being used over the weekends. Nevertheless, doctors were booking patients into those hospitals on a Friday and the patients were lying in expensive chronic care beds over the weekend. Nothing could be done until Monday, when the laboratory staff and technicians arrived and the usual two-day or three-day program of tests could be carried out. Here is an obvious case of hospital accommodation being needlessly taken up.

● (1250)

I had the opportunity of pleading with the provincial NDP cabinet of British Columbia to make sure that the X-ray and laboratory facilities of the hospitals were manned over the weekend so that this waste would stop, so that we would stop building additional facilities and unnecessarily tying up expensive beds. But what did they do, Mr. Speaker? Not a thing. They were not interested in the more efficient use of existing facilities. They wanted to play the same kind of political game that we have seen from NDP members in this House today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: Years ago I used to be in the business of consulting and productivity and I studied in the early 1950s, the work study concepts that evolved from Britain and from which the European Common Market, West Germany and other European nations grew. There was a great science developing in productivity work studies, critical path studies, and so on, and I had the opportunity of hiring one of these experts from the United Kingdom, who immigrated to Canada. He was on my staff for four or five years until his function with our organization was phased out. He then moved from our organization to a similar department of the federal government in Vancouver, and I never saw a man become so frustrated by the incompetence, inefficiency and the "I don't care" attitude as this lad who worked for us for so many years and did so much for our company. One productivity study, critical path study or work study after another having to do with hospitals and other government operations was locked away in filing cabinets and never read again.

Here we are, today, at the point where we are having to amend an act which has been in force in Canada for years, because the government is not paying attention to the efficient utilization of our tax resources. They have not implemented any of the studies of task forces. We have had task force report after report presented to the government, none of which has ever been studied or implemented, having to do with health and delivery care in our national system. The minister has ignored continual references to these reports in the House of Commons. Province after province has protested, yet we have seen nothing but powerful Liberal arrogance. Today we are paying for this kind of neglect.

Even before this bill is passed the provinces are having to make cutbacks in expenditure. We have already heard about the $750 million that this government owes the government of British Columbia, reaching back to 1972. B.C. has its problems of cash flow, too. The NDP throughout this debate has made nothing but political hay at the expense of the province of Ontario, which is immersed in an unbelievable readjustment that affects the emotions of people all over the province as well as the country. The people of Ontario had better pay attention and head off the irresponsible extravagance that we have just witnessed in the last three years in British Columbia.

In British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, you never saw nests built and feathered so fast as in the three years of the NDP, B.C. sham. Our friends in the New Democratic Party talk about serving the little guy, the average man on the street. What utter nonsense! How can they do that when their vested interest and their bankroll comes from organized labour and the higher echelons of this monopoly movement? "Grab, grab, grab, and to hell with those who don't pay dues to us." They may be whining about individual cases of hardship, and so forth, but they have had their chance to serve and they missed out, particularly in the area I come from.

The waste of our tax resources by this government is one of the things that has brought this bill to this House. We have the example of $200,000 being paid for unused rooms at the Habitat conference in Vancouver. We have the example of a co-operative to which this government has some $4.5 million of commitment in the north of Vancouver Island which has been in operation only a year and is now in receivership. They had a $1.7 million guarantee on a $2.5 million Bank of Montreal loan. They have committed $2.5 million of DREE money under ARDA to these people in order to employ 75 people, two-thirds of whom were supposed to be native people. This is an unbelievable use of money since there is not a sound, solid marketing plan to back up the issuance of this kind of credit.

Over $86,000 per person has been spent by the government in trying to create jobs. This is how the tax resources of this country are being wasted all over the country, and yet we are discussing a bill like this. We have committed $16 million to Lockheed for the Orion, and we do not yet know whether we have one aeroplane. The bilingualism commissioner has for two years now been calling for a better use of our tax resources for this particular aspect of Canadian life, yet have we seen one move made in any direction which he has called for? Then we have had dredging scandals—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest the hon. member get back to the debate on Bill C-68, an act to amend the Medical Care Act.

Mr. Huntington: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to re-emphasize the fact that I am debating the bill. The reason the bill is before the House is that this government can no longer afford the unilateral commitment that it imposed upon the provinces. This government has no proper priorities for our tax resources in this land, and it is time somebody brought to light the extravagances and wasteful use of our resources which have caused this bill to come to the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: This government's priorities are from election to election, with decisions being reached by "ad hockery". Their spending is out of control, otherwise this bill would not be before the House. They are spending

beyond cash flow, and all these costs will have to be paid by tomorrow's work force. How would you feel, Mr. Speaker, if you were so extravagant in the management of your affairs that you put the cost of today's benefits and privileges on tomorrow's work force?

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

Mr. Huntington: I have still more to say when we reconvene. This brings me to a further point having to do with priorities. Research Council grants have been cut off, and I should like to take this opportunity to say a little more about the priorities of this government. A most important research project has been going on in the Vancouver General Hospital in connection with the disease of diabetes.

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

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, when my quiet, constructive dialogue was interrupted at one o'clock, I was talking about the record of wasteful use this government has made of our tax dollars, and the fact that there is no such thing as a free lunch. The government has finally found this out. This has brought us to the debate on Bill C-68.

I want to emphasize the lack of priority this government has for matters that can in the future reduce the cost of medical care in Canada. I would mention that the Medical Research Council, in its wisdom, has seen fit to dismiss the $40,000 medical grant to Dr. Wah Jun Tze who is a consultant at the Vancouver General Hospital and a director of the metabolic investigation unit at the Children's Hospital in Vancouver. I realize we are on the other side of the mountains—

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member is aware that the bill before us has nothing to do with research, which is covered in other legislation. I would respectfully suggest that he is out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I did bring this to the hon. member's attention just before lunch. I would suggest that he get back to the terms of Bill C-68, an act to amend the Medical Care Act.

Mr. Huntington: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With due respect, sir, the point I am making is very germane to the reason Bill C-68 is before the House and the lack of priorities on the part of the government regarding research which could reduce the cost of medical care. If those priorities were in a little better order, we would not be debating this bill today.

I was mentioning the fact that Dr. Tze was involved in a very important piece of research in relation to diabetes which holds tremendous potential for the reduction of the cost of medical health care. I remember from my schooling the tremendous good will that was produced for Canada by the work of Dr. Charles H. Best and Dr. Frederick G. Banting regarding insulin. Here we had a research project, which evidently has very low priority, in the final stages of establishing the fact that islet cells which produce insulin and can correct diabetes can be transplanted, without rejection, in rats. At this point in time the government, because of its lack of priorities, sees fit to remove the grant for this very important work which would result in reducing medical health care costs in Canada in the future.

● (1410)

I think the point I am making is very germane to this debate. If it had not been for the anger aroused in the Vancouver community, that very important work, as a result of which the conclusion was reached that islet cells from a related rat could remove diabetes in a diseased rat, without rejection—and islet cells from an unrelated rat cause rejection and secondary detrimental effects in rats with diabetes—would have been stopped. It is to the credit of Mr. Ed. Murphy, a former member of the press gallery in the House, who is now a "hotliner" in Vancouver, that he was able to raise some $26,000 from the public to allow this important research work to be carried on. We seemed to have a chance to reduce tomorrow's costs with today's research, but we see the government's priorities interfering with a mere $40,000 which could allow important work of this nature to be carried on.

In closing my comments in this debate on Bill C-68, may I repeat the words used by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in concluding his remarks last Wednesday, when he said, "We don't trust you". With all the unilateral action this government has taken, that is one of the constant facts with which we are faced across Canada today: people no longer trust this government. There is the example of the airline pilots, the example of Bill C-61 which is causing anguish in the maritime provinces, the example of cost-sharing for post-secondary education, which was double-dealing—particularly for my province—and now we have this unilateral action in Bill C-68. It is too bad that bills of this nature have to be brought forward at this time.

I believe that in my comments I have explained fully why this party, and I as the member for Capilano, cannot support the legislation.

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important for me to enter this debate for the second time. I spoke on the bill at second reading. I was not satisfied with it then, and I am certainly not satisfied with it now. I had the impression, when listening to the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), that he was basically opposed to medicare and that he felt many of the private medical plans back in the 1950s, such as PSI in Ontario, were far superior to the universal, present medicare legislation.

I should like to remind the hon. member that in those days there was not nearly the equality of treatment that we have today. I am not blaming the physicians for this, or the surgeons. I think the major problem in those days lay with the fact that we simply did not have sufficient hospi-

tal facilities, operating room facilities and medical people, so that 15 per cent of the population—and that is many Canadians—were not covered by any kind of medical care plan. I defy anyone in the House to stand up and say honestly that the general public is opposed to medicare. It is not. Some may complain about the increase in premiums. Sometimes the premiums jump too quickly, particularly in the province of Ontario where they jumped quite drastically in the past year.

However, there is one thing about universality which I think the hon. member may have omitted from his speech, namely, that if all people are involved in the universal program, the most vocal and powerful groups in the country, which are usually organizations of professionals, of educated people, of physicians as well as of lawyers, accountants and trade unionists, make sure that the quality of medicare under a universal program shall continue to improve, because they have the power to demand that it shall improve. The quality of the program does improve as the years go by. But there is always the possibility that when only a certain percentage of the population is involved—and usually the great majority of people are in the lower income bracket—the quality of private medicare scheme treatment may not be as high, and I emphasize the words "may not". This is why I believe in universality.

I do not believe in waste. I do not believe we should have facilities which are not necessary. I appreciate the fact that some hospitals across the country may have to be closed. We had an incident in my constituency of Brant where the people so far have made the major decision as to whether a hospital in the area will close. I think some of these basic philosophical standards should be established at the outset of any hon. member's address to the House. What we all want, regardless of political affiliation, is the best quality of medical care, at the best price. I admit that there has been abuse and that some hospitals have overspent, and I am not just referring to Ontario. The hon. member for Capilano seemed to dwell on just two provinces, British Columbia and Ontario.

I am willing to admit that in Ontario—I am not familiar with British Columbia—there has been some waste. The fundamental fact still remains that it is the sick person to whom we are addressing ourselves in this bill. If we could clean off some of the fat without reducing the quality of medicare, then most of us in the House would appreciate that universal medicare, which has been in effect for many years, is probably more desirable than private insurance plans which are sometimes very difficult to obtain for a number of Canadians.

When the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) spoke on third reading of Bill C-68, he outlined the reasons he felt it necessary to introduce the bill, and how recent events, particularly the first ministers' conference, had led him to believe that Bill C-68 would now pass without too much opposition. As he now knows, he was wrong. We in this party do not believe that anything has changed since the introduction of this bill which would cause us, as a party, to support the bill in toto. A week ago yesterday, the minister said in the House that just two days previously the government had submitted to provincial governments a new financing formula which would consist of the transfer of a certain number of tax points, as well as equalized per capita payments across the country. He went on to say that the formula met with the approval, in principle, of most provinces. He did not say "all" provinces.

This was one of the factors which prompted the minister to say that he hoped this bill could now go through all stages without delay. It seems to me that while the provinces may have agreed in principle, the fact remains that they were less enthusiastic about the proposals presented to them. This should not have come as any surprise to the federal government, in view of its attack on provincial revenues dating back to 1972.

● (1420)

If hon. members recall, in 1972, under tax reform, the provincial share of income tax growth was reduced from 28 per cent to 23.4 per cent. To make up for this a revenue guarantee formula was drawn up to protect provincial tax revenues for a five-year period. This five-year period was to have ended in 1977. Since 1972, the provinces have not received much money under the formula, and consequently they budgeted accordingly. In other words, they had to overbudget because they were not receiving what they had anticipated they would receive from the federal government. This, of course, was passed on, as in most cost-sharing programs, to the municipalities. Let me tell this House that in the province of Ontario, and no doubt in other provinces, the municipalities are now bearing the brunt of the restraints programs not only of the federal government but of the provincial governments. In other words, the buck has been passed all the way down to the local municipal councils and township councils, which are closest to the people on a day to day basis. They are the ones who are getting it in the neck by letter and by telephone, day in and day out.

In 1974, indexing was introduced by the federal government and this resulted in significant losses in provincial tax revenues. Since 1975, the federal government has placed limits on an assortment of programs; for example, limiting equalization of oil and gas revenues, limiting the growth of federal contributions to post-secondary education, and so on. In view of all these limitations, it is no wonder the provinces are extremely skeptical about any new financing formula. Based on recent past history, the provinces cannot be faulted for thinking that any new financing formula probably means a further squeezing of provincial revenues. This would most certainly be the case with respect to health costs.

On June 18, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said in this House that in the plan for the future, the country and the provinces would limit the rate of escalation of health and education programs more or less to the rate of growth of the gross national product. I think it was quite appropriate for my colleague, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare what possible relationship there is between the incidence of illness and the gross national product, especially in view of the fact that last year the cost of providing health services went up by 15 per cent and at the same time the gross national product was virtually at a standstill. How the Prime Minister worked that one out, I do not know; but according to the government, that is the formula.

Since the Prime Minister did not adequately respond to this question, except to say that there are obviously contingency plans—he did not spell them out—we can conclude that the provinces are to be left holding the bag. This would essentially leave the provinces with two choices. They could raise revenues through their own taxation powers and continue to meet these costs, or they could cut back on some of the valuable services they are presently providing. The first alternative would only be available to the wealthier provinces in Canada; the second would most likely be the end result for the majority of the provinces, and provinces like Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would suffer very much.

In view of the statement of the Minister of National Health and Welfare on June 17, that Bill C-68 would now be more palatable as a result of the first ministers' conference, I put forward the following points to the minister. The federal proposal to the provinces would entail a transfer of a certain number of tax points to the provinces. Surely the minister and the Prime Minister realize that transferring tax points, particularly if these revenues are equalized only to the national average, will mean reduced federal contributions to rich provinces such as Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

In addition, we must seriously question whether per capita contributions to the provinces will be appropriate. The minister must be aware that costs—I refer here to health costs—may be higher in some provinces as a result of any number of factors. This being the case, I can only envisage a situation whereby we shall not have any national standards in terms of health care as a result of all provinces receiving the same per capita contribution.

When medicare first came in, if I recall correctly there was an equalizing factor to it. People born anywhere in this country received an equal standard of medical care. If this bill goes through as it is—and we have a majority government; we know that we cannot block the bill indefinitely—I am convinced that there are people in outlying areas of Newfoundland, the hinterland of New Brunswick, in northern parts of Canada and in other remote parts of Canada—who are entitled to the same benefits as a child or a sick person in the cities of Toronto or Vancouver—who will not receive the same standard of medical care. In this House we legislate for the whole of the country and not just for any particular province or city.

Nothing has happened since this bill was introduced months ago which has caused me or my colleagues to lessen our opposition to it. Bill C-68 was designed to place a ceiling on the federal government's contribution to the medical care program. Essentially, it is a first step in dismantling the health insurance program of this country. Based on the little we have been able to find out about the intentions of this government with respect to replacing the current cost-sharing agreements, it seems evident that it has every intention of placing the burden of health care on the provinces.

I would like to digress without straying too far from the bill. In the United States, where they tout the great free enterprise approach to medical care, not only is the cost of professional medical care—that of physicians and hospitals—much higher than the cost in Canada, but private insurance premiums are also much higher. Are we going to revert to that kind of program in this country? I hope to God we are not.

I would like to reiterate what I said during debate on second reading of this bill. The Minister of National Health and Welfare pointed out in late January that Canadians enjoy one of the best health systems in the world. While this is true, much of the credit goes to the provinces, two of which—Saskatchewan and Manitoba—have instituted programs such as dentacare, free drugs, the provision of hearing aids and the like. While these progressive provinces are to be congratulated, in my view we must keep in mind that if Canada is to achieve a high uniform standard of health care right across the land, the federal government will have to become more involved in these programs, not less, as it is attempting with measures such as Bill C-68 and new cost-sharing agreements. I can well appreciate this government's desire to cut down on its expenditures. However—and this has been said before—if we must cut government spending, let us pinpoint those areas in which we can most afford cuts.

● (1430)

The federal government's contributions to the provinces under the Medical Care Act have, in fact, been rising in very modest proportions in the past few years. For example, in the 1972-73 fiscal year the percentage increase in federal contributions to the provinces was 7.6 per cent; in 1973-74 the increase was 8.8 per cent; and in 1974-75 it dropped to 6.6 per cent. I do not wish to suggest that these are small sums of money, but at the same time I find it incomprehensible that in times of supposed restraint, when we see the private sector spending millions of dollars building mammoth hotels and office buildings, some of which are currently not being used, we are closing hospitals in the name of restricting government expenditures.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare may say that hospital closings have nothing to do with federal measures such as Bill C-68, but I would point out to him and the government that medical care and hospitals are financed out of one budget in each of the provinces. When you combine restraint in Bill C-68 with the load of current programs not included under federal cost-sharing, and add to it the uncertainty concerning the future terms, for example respecting cost-sharing hospital costs, something in the provincial health budget has to go. Several hospitals in Ontario have either gone or are on the verge of going, although I hope some of them will not.

While it is extremely difficult to understand the reasoning behind the current round of hospital closings—if in fact there is any reason—two incidents which recently occurred in Ontario serve as examples of how federal financing priorities can affect a province. The provincial Tory government announced that two psychiatric hospitals—one in Goderich and one in northern Ontario—are to be closed and the buildings are to be used to treat the mentally retarded. Psychiatric hospitals are not included under federal cost-sharing; centres for the mentally retarded are.

These psychiatric hospitals were not closed because of a reduced need for them—in fact, all information points to their being run efficiently and usefully—but because the provincial government simply felt it could not afford them

any longer. This is ironic when we find that by closing the psychiatric hospitals and reopening them as mental retardation centres, total costs will increase by $650,000. Aside from the stupidity of this provincial action, this serves as a glaring example of the type of situation that can arise out of federal initiatives such as contained in Bill C-68.

One of the underlying assumptions of this bill—and the minister responsible for it restated it during his third reading remarks—is that the government saw a need to increase the efficiency of shared-cost programs. This bill would have the effect of forcing the provinces into steering away from expensive hospital care and toward less expensive forms of treatment. Those are not my sentiments, but those of the minister. Nothing could be more callous, if we take into account the fact that the provinces have been carrying about $1 billion in those less expensive, preventive medical programs without any assistance from the federal government. I think that is a very important point.

While I would agree that we must start to change the health delivery system, that is, get into lower-cost forms of treatment, the federal government has done virtually nothing in this regard. When the province of Ontario decided to close hospitals arbitrarily, there were no alternate plans made to take care of those who needed some form of treatment. I agree that it was wasteful and inefficient to keep people in active treatment hospitals when they should have been in lower-cost nursing homes. But no steps have been taken by the government to ensure that enough nursing homes are built to accommodate those who require them.

We could go a long way toward reducing health costs if the federal government worked hand in hand with the provinces to institute lower-cost services. This simply has not been done. Provinces which have these services have instituted them on their own. Therefore, we have a situation in this country whereby the wealthier provinces, if they so choose, can initiate these moves on their own and provide adequate health care. The poorer provinces, on the other hand, simply have to do without. This, again, is not what I call co-operative federalism. It is not the real kind of federalism that we should have in this country.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare is well aware that preventive health measures would do much to reduce our health costs. After all, it was he—according to his statement of about a week ago—who was the author of the booklet "A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians". I shall not go into some of the suggestions made in it; other members have already done so. The only point to be made here is that while he eschews the virtues of preventing various illnesses, he, through his government, will not undertake to provide adequate funds to begin programs which would do much in the way of preventive care. Again, I need only remind this government where the funds came from to initiate dentacare and pharmacare in some of the provinces.

Within the context of preventive health care, it was interesting to note that on June 15 this House discussed a motion in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) criticizing the failure of the government to give adequate priority to health research funding. That motion was very significant with regard to the bill we are debating today. I suggest that this is not out of order. If we examine the government's record of performance regarding research in general and medical research in particular, we see that there has been a slow but steady erosion of the research dollar on a pretty well continuous basis since 1971. In fact, this year, with the freeze on research funds, the total value of current dollars available for research is down considerably.

What this means in terms of our long term health costs can best be summed up by the comments made by Dr. H. Arnold Steinberg who is the chairman of Canadians for Health Research. That is what this bill is about, and it is why I say I am in order, as was the hon. member who spoke before me. Part of Dr. Steinberg's letter was read into the record on June 15, but it bears repeating during this debate. He said:

> The quantity and quality of medical research affects every Canadian in two principal ways (1) it is the only practical answer to reducing health care costs—

I repeat—

> —to reducing health care costs by finding cures to those diseases which randomly strike thousands of people necessitating government expenditures now in excess of $7 billion annually.

If the Minister of National Health and Welfare is at all serious about preventive health care, I would ask him to question his colleague, the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Drury) about his priorities. Why has he frozen research funds? The second point in Dr. Steinberg's letter, the freezing of medical research funds, was covered when he said:

> —has caused a major cutback in medical research activity . . . this will have a profound impact on hospital care and the quality of teaching medicine across the country.

Both arrangements will be adversely affected. We have in this country a situation whereby one minister—the Minister of National Health and Welfare—makes pious statements about the need for preventing health care measures, while another, the Minister of State for Science and Technology, subverts this by failing to provide the needed money, which in the long run would save us money in the whole field of health care.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major conclusions that was reached by members of the opposition during the debate on health research funding was that this government, no matter what various ministers say, has not grasped the idea that the future of hospital economics is clearly bound up with the future of medical science and technology. The Minister of National Health and Welfare showed this lack of comprehension when he said the following in a speech delivered to the annual meeting of the Canadian Nurses' Association a few days ago:

● (1440)

> The country cannot afford for very much longer the type of rise in health costs that it has experienced in recent years . . . it has been shown that pouring money into health care does not translate necessarily into better health.

He went on to suggest that quality of life is the critical factor in health as well as the avoidance of unnecessary illness and premature death. In other words, individual Canadians should assume more responsibility for their own well-being. However, as I have stated before, this is only part of the solution. Frankly, I think all individuals

should be more responsible for promoting their own personal health. Good health in itself is not the end; it is just the beginning, the prerequisite to high quality of life. Therefore, it is not enough for the government to say to Canadians, "We shall arbitrarily cut back spending on health costs and research. The onus will now be on you to become more physicially fit, that is, get more exercise, stop smoking and reduce your intake of alcohol, and so on."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Symes: What is the minister doing about it?

Mr. Blackburn: My colleague from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) asks, what the minister is doing about it. What can the government do? Can it legislate against smoking and against the consumption of alcohol? Perhaps it can, but I do not think that is the right or practical way to go. Why not end tax concessions given to those powerful, wealthy industries which produce cigarettes in particular and alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear!

Mr. Blackburn: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, who spent a considerable portion of his political life arguing for health insurance, has always maintained, correctly, that there are two phases to health insurance. The first, which for the most part has been achieved, is to remove the financial barrier between individuals providing health care and those receiving health care. The second phase is that we had to begin changing the health delivery system. In other words, if we want to reduce the cost of health insurance we will have to replace some of the high-cost services with lower-cost services. Again, it needs to be stressed that for the initial period this would necessitate an outlay of money, but in the long run savings would be realized.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will not be passed. There is every indication that members on the government side will see fit to give the bill final approval. In doing this, the government may satisfy the wishes of those who have declared that this government should curtail its expenditures. Nevertheless, if it does pass it will surely be to the detriment of all Canadians who require, and indeed deserve, the best possible health care system which can be provided.

I return to what the minister said and what others have repeated during this third reading debate. Canadians enjoy one of the best health care systems in the world. Why does the minister—who is not in his seat this afternoon—want to change it? If he boasts—accurately, I think—that we have had for several years one of the best health care systems in the world, what is the point of reducing its efficiency or of lessening its ability to deliver health care in a general sense? I quite agree about the need to trim some fat. But why must we jeopardize the established system of federal-provincial cost-sharing originally set up with the interest of the health of this country's people in mind?

Perhaps Liberal Senator David Croll best summed up my thoughts on this bill when he said:

It is wrong in concept, it is divisive in practice, and in my opinion it is wrong, wrong, wrong, a thousand times wrong.

[Mr. Blackburn.]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to participate in the closing hours, hopefully, of the debate on Bill C-68, not having participated previously in the debate at second reading stage of this fundamental bill. Many of my concerns have been ably expressed, particularly by members on the opposition side. Some concerns have been expressed by members on the government side. I wonder, on this Friday afternoon, what William Lyon Mackenzie King, looking down on us from up above, would think of Bill C-68 which represents a retreat from the flagship of the Liberal party's social program which he introduced in part.

This bill will put fundamental restrictions on something Canadians from coast to coast need, namely, medicare. The program was begun a decade ago, when I was a neophyte member of this House, under the then leader of the Liberal party, Lester Pearson. The government had proposed a formula which would interest—that is the conservative word, although "seduce" might be more appropriate—the ten provinces in joining the proposed medicare program, a program which was to be greatly to the benefit of the Canadian people. Little provinces like P.E.I. and Nova Scotia, other provinces like Ontario, and richer provinces like Alberta chose to join the program. British Columbia is in its own district category.

There were four conditions for joining. The government said to the provinces, "You do not have to participate in the program; we do not intend to trespass on your jurisdiction. However, if you abide by four conditions, we shall give you federal money with which to set up a bona fide medicare program." That program was designed to help all Canadians, particularly those who did not have money to obtain proper medical services. The formula was fair and provided for a 50-50 system of cost-sharing as between the government and participating provinces. Succumbing either to suggestion or political seduction, all ten provinces, over time, joined the program. As the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk), other members of my party and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn) speaking on behalf of the NDP, said, we have set up in this country a pretty respectable, responsible plan of medicare for all Canadian citizens.

Then something happened. Out of the blue, unilaterally, the federal government made an announcement. It decided that the ground rules would no longer provide for a 50-50 cost-sharing as between federal and provincial governments. Participation would be on the basis of provincial expenditures. We know costs have been rising. The government, in the name of responsibility in spending, wanted to control the escalation in medicare spending. That was a laudable objective, but the government's action would have been more laudable and better received if it had come about after consultation and negotiation with the provinces concerned.

Such a process would have been preferable to the unilateral statement which announced what the government intended to do. In so many words, the government said to the provinces, "You had better come along with us, boys. Now we have a majority in the House of Commons and if we want to we can change the ground rules." Perhaps that is oversimplifying the matter. All the same, this is a subject of extreme concern to all Canadians from coast to

coast. My part of Canada, which is not famed for the greatness of its financial resources, is most concerned. Even when the government shared costs on a 50-50 basis, the people of my area, which is coloquially known as an area of regional economic disparity, never enjoyed the sort of medical care services which were available in richer provinces like Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. Being richer, those provinces were able to develop a medicare system with many extras which provinces like my native Nova Scotia could not afford. Certainly, on a 50-50 basis, it is part of the problem in post-secondary education, about which I know a little, having the very illustrious Acadia University in my home town. That university surpasses most others in basketball, football and hockey, as well as being a leader in the educational field. Even though it is a small university, it has won several basketball championships. We believe in quality rather than quantity.

● (1450)

With regard to medicare, and at the same time appreciating the problem of post-secondary education, with a 50-50 program one province may have more capacity for building a medicare or education program with extras. With the federal government sharing 50-50, obviously with an expensive program it gives to the citizens and students of the richer provinces something better than can be afforded in those provinces which do not have as many economic resources. We understand that in a way; it is part of the facts of life in Canada. With a medicare program or any other social legislation, the emphasis has always been, whether it be a Liberal or Conservative government, to try to equalize opportunities. This is true with regard to medical services and education.

Also on the docket is the hospitalization program. The federal government has given notice that it wants to opt out of that program. However, when the program was brought in by a Conservative government under the leadership of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), a clause was inserted to the effect that a province or party wanting to opt out must give five years' notice. That is why in this bill the government is giving five years' notice.

Hopefully, within the five years the provinces and the federal government will be able to work out a suitable substitute program for hospitalization. It would be anarchy if the federal government pulled out of this hospital plan without having something to fill the vacuum. I do not think this government would want to stumble, as we will be stumbling into the July 1 weekend next week, and God knows how many weeks after that, into that type of quagmire with regard to medical services in this country.

In the hospitalization program put into place by the Conservative government of the day, the five-year notice requirement before any province or party could opt out was a very constructive proposal. However, as I said earlier, under a Conservative or Liberal government the emphasis has always been to try to equalize medical services and educational opportunities. We are debating the medicare bill today. It does not have the five-year notice provision. That is why we had unilateral action about a year ago, and why there has not been very much consultation or negotiation as the government moves on with this bill, and I might point out that we are in the dying stages of the bill.

As I pointed out earlier, even a 50-50 program mitigates against a program that does not have fundamental economic wealth. On a 50-50 basis, the richer provinces are able to have a better type of medicare scheme than the poorer provinces. I know several cases in my constituency where people have told me they would benefit from a medical care program if they lived in Ontario, because the provisions cover that here, whereas in Nova Scotia they do not. We are always a little reluctant about a 50-50 basis, but at least we know it is a start toward equalized opportunity.

I have read most of the debate on Bill C-68. I have talked to the chairman of our committee, the hon. member for Athabasca. For some strange reason, the government will, out of the blue, be putting a limit on future increases in medical care payments which it will make. This will be done even before the final cutoff. It gives me a great deal of concern.

There is nobody in this House who does not appreciate that medical costs, along with gasoline costs, energy costs, food costs, and so on, have gone up and will continue to do so, hopefully on a reducing scale. However, under Bill C-68 the 50-50 provision is being changed. In the first year the federal government will pay only 13 per cent of any increase in their 50 per cent. The second year they will only pay an increased 10 per cent of their 50 per cent, regardless of whether the costs go up by 90 per cent or 40 per cent. The limit on federal government involvement will be 15 per cent next year and 10 per cent the year after, regardless of the inflation factor.

In my province, which does not have the fundamental economic resources of others and therefore cannot afford even a modified medicare program, there is great concern about what this restriction will do to basic medical coverage, let alone any so-called rich plan. I have not yet heard the justification for the 13 per cent and 10 per cent. We then get to the third year, the real nigger in the woodpile. The restriction on government involvement will be done by order in council. That is the cabinet, meeting in the East Block, perhaps having time to think in a constructive way, but more often meeting in a crisis situation at the end of the session or at 11 o'clock at night, not able to give full ventilation to something so fundamental. Who knows what figure they will come up with for the third year? It will not just be a damper but a blanket on medical care payments to all Canadians.

Through the work of the standing committee that reviewed this bill, as well as the work of the hon. member for Athabasca, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), and the co-operation of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde)—at least at that stage—the third year kicker will have some ventilation because of an amendment introduced by the minister through the persuasion of opposition members. It will not be changed, but at least there will be two days' debate in the House of Commons with regard to the order in council. The effect of the 13 per cent limit next year and the 10 per cent limit the second year might already have put medical care programs, in all provinces, in such a state of chaos that I do not know if a two-day debate will be sufficient to point out to the government all that will be necessary. Hopefully, there

will be an election before that time and this proposal can be looked at in a much more constructive way.

● (1500)

Bearing in mind that the medical care program, having seduced or by mental enticement got all the provinces involved, some against their will, more than ten years ago, the government's unilateral withdrawal has done a great disservice to federal-provincial relations. This is one of the reasons why there is great reluctance in many provincial capitals about approving the Prime Minister's pet project of patriating the constitution and bringing back the BNA Act so that Canada can finally be a full-fledged nation in his eyes.

I do not think the Prime Minister fully appreciates the fundamental lack of faith or confidence that Canadians have, extending even to provincial governments of the same political stripe, and there are a few of those left across the country, a couple in Atlantic Canada, and they will rue the day down there; you do not have to be in Atlantic Canada very long before turning on the TV and finding the Liberal premier of Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia saying things that might have come right from the front benches of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. That is the type of thing which is going on because of that unilateral approach, quite apart from the details of this bill and how they will affect a program as fundamental as medicare.

I do not want to take too much of the time of the House right now. I can understand very well any admonition that we should move on to the point. All I can do is to conclude more or less where I began. A fellow called the right hon. Wee Willie Mackenzie King who used to look at crystal balls for guidance, so we are told, did lead this country into some very emancipated social legislation of which Liberals have every right to be proud, notwithstanding the very genial Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fleming). Long before he was born, the Liberal party, like the Conservative party, had in its platform something called medicare, which the Liberals supposedly first put forward in 1914.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It was 1919.

Mr. Nowlan: I don't want to go back that far. I was not even born then. The fact is that some time thereafter Mackenzie King, looking in his crystal ball and getting advice from all sources, did talk about a medicare program, and the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), as a Liberal member and a sincere one at that, must really wonder whether this is true liberalism in the true sense of the word, with a small "l", when you go back on a program you said you believed in since 1919, one you talked about at election after election. Mackenzie King, looking down here from above through the crystal ball on another one-way mirror would be shaking his head in shame at what the present so-called Liberal party is doing.

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-68 has many lessons for the Canadian people. One of them surely must be that you cannot trust a Liberal.

In the 1974 general election many workers voted Liberal because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) swore up and down and across the country that wage and price controls were wrong, discriminatory, and ineffective. A few months after he was re-elected he went back on his word and introduced a wage and wage control program—it was not a wage and price control program. And the people were betrayed. In this bill the provinces, and ultimately the people, will be betrayed in another fundamental way. The provinces are betrayed because the federal government has gone back on a solemn pledge to pay half the cost of medicare, and the people are betrayed because if and when this bill passes they will receive a kind of medicare inferior to that to which they have been accustomed. It is a backward step, but it is consistent with the actions of a government which lacks commitment to the legislation it undertakes.

The Liberals sniff the wind, discover which way it is going, and then jump on the bandwagon. In this case the bandwagon is one which will strike a sour note as the Canadian people realize what is being done to the standard of health care they have enjoyed in the past.

We in this party have fought tooth and nail against this legislation because of its discriminatory, negative implications not only for Confederation and the principle of equality of treatment from east to west, but because of what it will do to standards of health care especially as they apply to low-income Canadians. For years and years this party and its predecessor, the CCF, fought to bring about a program of universal hospital and medical care so that Canadians, irrespective of their financial situation, could have access to one of the most fundamental human rights, the right to good health care. Surely this is the measure of any civilized society; we do not say there shall be one standard of health care for those who can afford it and another for those who cannot.

It was a premier of Saskatchewan, my hon. friend from Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, who led the fight for this principle. First they had universal free hospital care across the province, and then medicare. He fought against tremendous odds, tremendous pressures by medical lobbies and others. He even faced personal defeat believing that his cause was right. We carry on that fight today because we believe the principle of medicare, having taken so long to become established, ought not now to be undermined by the government with its lack of commitment to human rights.

I was proud to say I was a Canadian and to point to our medicare program and say to any visitor that it was one of the finest in the world. If this bill passes I shall no longer be able to do that; I shall no longer be able to say to the five million people in this country who live below the poverty line that they can expect adequate health care. The result of this bill will be that provinces will no longer be able to staff and maintain the system of health and medical care to which we are accustomed without implementing fees to be imposed every time a person visits a doctor, or, on the other hand, raising taxes to maintain the standard of the program at its present level. It is an indication to me that the government, when it comes down to the crunch, always puts the dollar sign before the welfare of the ordinary Canadian.

● (1510)

In this legislation the federal government is going back on a solemn assurance that it gave the provinces that it would pay half the cost of medicare in this country. The minister of health has been arguing that medicare costs have been escalating and that the only way he can bring them down is to change the funding formula. I dispute that claim. There are other ways to reduce the costs than arbitrarily changing the basic formula of the program. The minister of health has struck a severe blow at those poorer provinces which were reluctant to join the program in the first place because they knew that it would be very difficult to pay the costs. They are now left out on a limb because the federal government has gone back on its word.

Of course health care costs have been increasing. Anyone who was naive enough at the beginning of the program to expect these costs not to increase surely does not deserve to be in elected office. The whole point of a universal program is to get people to a doctor or to a hospital at the onset of an illness so that they may be given adequate treatment which will prevent the illness from becoming more severe, with consequently less chance of curing the illness. In the past all too often the tendency was, especially among low income people, not to visit a doctor if they felt ill but to try to hang on in the hope that things would improve. These people could not afford to go to a doctor or a hospital; hence in the majority of cases they waited too long, the illness became more complicated, and the chance of recovery was less.

It seems to me that one of the fundamental principles of the medicare program was that of prevention; that a person would see a doctor early enough before the illness became complicated. Many Canadians have taken advantage of this opportunity and have been seeing doctors regularly. As a result we have a higher standard of health in this country than we had prior to the introduction of this program, so the government cannot use the argument that this increase in cost has taken it by surprise. The increase in cost is due, in part, to greater usage of the program, which was one of the fundamental goals of the program, a very laudable goal at that.

The problem has been that, with increased use of the program, our institutions have not adapted to the changing situation. Far too many of our expensive, regular treatment hospital beds are being used to care for people who should be handled in less expensive, chronic care or outpatient facilities. Part of the rise in the cost of the program, besides greater use of the program, has surely been the failure of provincial governments, hospital boards, and the medical profession to adapt to changing circumstances and to look for cost saving measures in areas other than the traditional treatment of illness. This is something I want to come back to later because I think it is an avenue for saving that can be vigorously pursued by provincial health care programs and which would eliminate this kind of arbitrary action on the part of the federal government in changing the funding formula.

What worries me at this point, Mr. Speaker, is the formula that the federal government seems to be coming up with. Instead of saying that, no matter what the escalation in cost is, the federal government will pay half, it has put forward the proposal that it will keep its contributions in line with the annual growth in the Gross National Product in this country. I cannot for the life of me figure out the reasoning of the bureaucrat who dreamt that one up. In other words what the government is saying is this, that in times of recession, such as now, if the economy is growing at a slower rate, then Canadians must be sick less. What an absurd proposition. As if viruses will stop at the border of this country and we can say that, because our economy is stagnant, we must not have any increased incidence of 'flu, polio, or what have you. How ludicrous, how absolutely absurd, to tie health care costs to the growth in the gross national quotient! I just do not understand the reasoning behind this proposition. However, all this may make sense if the House accepts my original premise that it is the dollar sign, not the health of Canadians, that concerns the government most.

I do not want to see this country go back to the situation that obtains with our neighbour to the south which does not have a universal medicare program. In the United States private insurance plans call for very high premiums, higher than any premiums that Canadians are paying for their nation-wide health program administered by the provinces. I do not want to see Canadians face the situation that one Canadian faced when he was visiting New York and his daughter became ill. She was taken to a United States hospital, but before they would admit the girl for treatment the admitting desk told them, since they did not belong to any American program, that until they could investigate the Canadian plan to which the father belonged he would have to deposit a $1,500 cheque.

We cannot go backwards, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think that Canadians want to go backwards. I fear that most Canadians do not understand the implications of this legislation which surely will mean a return in some form or another to those days when the kind of health care treatment you got depended on the size of your pay cheque, when the kind of doctor or specialist you engaged was contingent upon your own personal wealth. In a way, Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of thing that is going to happen now.

Since the federal government is not going to maintain its share of the cost, the provinces will have to cut back on the services that they have been providing, or being to implement deterrent fees, or raise taxes, or pass other kinds of punitive measures that will affect the ordinary individual as surely as if he had to pay directly every time he or a member of his family goes to a hospital.

● (1520)

The implications of this change in funding are very far reaching, and it seems that medicare is to be the first victim. I have warned Canadians that once this occurs in respect of medicare it will not stop there. We are going to see cutbacks in federal shared-cost agreements not only in medicare but in university funding, in equalization payments, and in other things, which surely is what Confederation is all about, that is, providing a standard of living and a standard of service that are not discriminatory because you live in Newfoundland as opposed to Ontario, or Manitoba as opposed to British Columbia.

We can begin to see what is taking place if we look at medicare legislation and other statements that have been

coming out of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau's) office. One just has to look back to the June, 1975, budget to begin to see what I mean when I say the federal government is starting to back off from its cost sharing programs. We find since that budget that the government has put ceilings on federal contributions to cost sharing programs as part of its over-all restraint program and is forcing the provincial governments to pick up more and more of the costs of these programs.

We can trace the beginning of this to earlier than the 1975 budget. In 1972 under tax reform the provincial share of income tax growth was reduced from 28 per cent to 23.4 per cent. To make up for this the revenue guarantee formula was drawn up. It was designed to protect provincial tax revenues for the five-year period from 1972 to 1977. At the most recent finance ministers' conference back in April the federal government announced it was changing this guarantee.

The estimates projected a loss to the provinces of some $800 million to $900 million as a result of the change in the formula. In fact we find that in 1975-76, and that was the first year any funds were actually paid out, the provinces estimated how much money they would receive under the revenue guarantee and budgeted accordingly. In 1974 indexing was unilaterally introduced by the federal government. This measure cut significantly into provincial as well as federal income tax revenue.

Since June, 1975, we have seen a limit placed on the equalization of oil and gas revenues, a 15 per cent limit in the growth of federal contributions for post-secondary education, limits in this bill on medicare, withdrawals from services to treaty Indians, cutbacks in funds for police protection, and in manpower training and regional economic development.

This bill is not just one isolated example; it is part of a growing pattern of federal cutbacks in cost sharing with the provinces. Every Canadian living in each of the provinces across Canada is going to suffer in one way or another. If this bill passes, the provinces will not only lose money in the medicare field they will be losing money in other cost sharing programs as well. This will be an added pressure and burden on the provincial governments if they want to maintain medicare at the same level as it has existed in the past, because they will be required to make some choices.

The federal government is cutting back in the area of equalization payments, in manpower training, and the provinces have to make up that difference with limited revenue, especially under the new tax sharing formulae. They have to get that money from somewhere, and the temptation may well be to get it from the budgets allotted to medicare.

It is shocking to realize that at the recent finance minister's conference of 1975-76 the ten provinces lost $1 billion in potential revenue as a result of just three of the federal government's actions; limiting equalization of oil-gas revenues, indexing, and changes in the revenue guarantee formula. This figure is expected to increase to $1,250 million or $1,500 million in the years 1976-77. Any province faced with that kind of cutback in revenue will be in a precarious state.

[Mr. Symes.]

The only way the provinces can raise revenue, if the federal government is not going to provide it, is by increasing the taxes on the citizens of the provinces. That will hurt those people living in the provinces that are less wealthy than others. I think particularly of the maritime provinces, Quebec, some areas of northern Ontario, northern Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan. These provinces have a limited potential for raising revenue and they can only squeeze so much out of the people. The only alternative left to them is to cut back on the programs, and that will mean we will have gone back on those great recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois Royal Commission in the early 1940's. That commission said we must have equalization of services and standards of living for Canadians from one end of the country to the other.

If this bill passes, with the changes in revenue sharing the federal government proposed at the recent first ministers' conference, it can only lead to a balkanization of Canada, dividing it up into first, second, and third class regions, and first, second, and third class citizens. Surely that is a backward step and a negation of the whole principle of co-operative federalism which is what this country should be all about.

If the bill passes I am certain we are going to see deterrent fees levied by provinces. How else can they raise the money to meet increased costs? This will mean to the average citizen that any time he visits the doctor there will be an extra fee charged, maybe $5, or maybe $10. Everytime he gets an X-ray there will likewise be an additional fee charged. Every kind of service will have a price tag with the cost coming out of the individual's pocket, no matter what his or her ability to pay.

The beauty of the medicare system was that the revenue came from general taxation, or personal income tax which is based on the ability to pay. The deterrent fee, just like sales tax, is a negative cost not based on that principle. The deterrent fee to someone at the poverty level, with a family of four, which is about $7,600 per year, is a much more severe penalty than it is to a family with an income in the range of $15,000 to $50,000.

● (1530)

If we move to deterrent fees—and I regret to say that the provinces will probably go that way—then we are back to the stage at which we were prior to the introduction of these health care schemes, that is, health treatment based on the pocket books, not on the universal principle of equal treatment. Surely we have fought too long to go back to that situation. If the provinces do not move to deterrent fees then the only other way they can increase revenue is to increase the premiums for medicare, and that means that the annual premium will have to go up, and for certain provinces, such as Ontario which do not take medicare costs out of general income tax revenue but levy a premium on each individual or each family, which is regressive, those costs of course will go up. It will mean an added hardship to those residents in the province who have to pay increased premiums by the direct premium method at a time when inflation is continuing to rise and at the same time as people's wages are controlled by the anti-inflation program.

We can have deterrent fees, or we can have increased premiums for medicare, or provinces can choose the third route, that is, to cut back on services. Of course that is the most arbitrary and cruel method of all. We have had a foretaste of that in my province of Ontario where the government, faced with escalating costs, rather than initiate a study to look at ways of becoming more efficient, to look at ways of taking people out of expensive regular hospital beds and putting them in out-patient clinics, arbitrarily decided that it would close down small community hospitals or reduce the number of beds available in larger urban hospitals as a means of saving money in its health care system. This was done in Ontario before the passing of this bill and the change in the funding formula. If we see the province under that kind of pressure at this stage, how much more drastic will those cut-backs be a few years down the road when the effects of this act come into force?

Again I say this Liberal government is undoing what the provincial governments, especially in Saskatchewan, have struggled to achieve for so many years. But there is a way around the arbitrary cut-back and change of the federal funding formula. This government can be a leader in promoting preventive medicine if it wanted to, in developing programs that could be a model for provincial governments to follow, and in improving the standard of health of Canadians across the country. But we only see tokenism on the part of the federal government when it comes to initiating preventive medicine.

I refer to what has happened in a community outside my riding, nearby in northern Ontario at Elliot Lake, where the uranium mines are located, and where evidence has now come to light of serious problems among the miners due to silicosis because of the lack of federal leadership. It is a mine which comes under the control of the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada, a federal agency. I am referring to the lack of leadership of the government in ensuring that proper safety and environmental standards are adhered to in that mine.

If the federal government is serious about demonstrating its commitment to preventive medicine, why has it not revised and upgraded the standards of health and environment in uranium mines across this country? Elliot Lake is now undergoing a tremendous expansion. The steelworkers' union there has submitted proposals to the Atomic Energy Control Board outlining its concerns about the same kind of environmental mistakes and health hazards being repeated because the company, in its expansion, is not required to put in adequate and proper ventilation systems, to recycle polluted water, and to bury contaminated waste.

We see growing evidence of industrial cancers across the land in many occupations, not only in uranium mining but in asbestos plants and in work places where dust is high. Dr. Selikoff, a renowned American doctor, has documented this in case studies. He states that as little as two weeks' exposure to high dust levels in asbestos plants and certain other mines, even for people conducting roofing with hot tar, can lead to the development of cancers some 20 years later after the dormant period takes place. Yet we do not have national standards, proper environmental standards in the work place, nor do we have a government which seems to be serious about the proliferation of alcohol and tobacco advertising, which creates a demand for these products which have been shown to lead to great health problems throughout the country.

The incidence of lung cancer and alcoholism is growing, and yet the federal government still allows advertisers of these products to deduct the costs of advertising for income tax purposes. If this government were serious about reducing the incidence of lung cancer and alcoholism, it could easily amend the Income Tax Act to make it less attractive for these industries to carry out the kind of advertising that promotes excessive consumption of these items.

If this government were serious about reducing health care costs, it would not be cutting back its funding of medical research programs. Example after example can be shown of this Liberal government's policy saying "Do as I say, not as I do." It has not demonstrated its serious commitment to preventive medicine. It has taken the easier route of arbitrarily reneging on the solemn commitment that it has to medicare and sloughing off the burden on to the provinces, which of course have less room in which to manoeuvre so far as revenue is concerned.

I say again and again that this bill is a backward, regressive step. All Canadians will suffer as a result. We will have a lower standard of health care. We will have a system of health care that becomes increasingly geared to one's ability to pay rather than to the fact that one is a citizen of Canada and, as such, deserves adequate and affordable health care. I think this is a regressive and backward bill, as I said, and I wish that some of the Liberal backbenchers who represent constituents from different parts of the country would be honest enough to admit to them that a few years down the road they will suffer because their Liberal majority will force this inequitous piece of legislation through the House.

● (1540)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been some discussions among the House leaders

about the undesirability of having votes on Friday, and it has been agreed that the vote will be called at a time to be decided after consultation among the House leaders.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Paproski: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the vote will be taken at a later time after agreement between the House leaders?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so ordered.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Like six months later.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (for the Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-88, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2), be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, as I rise at third reading of this bill I point out that we intend to allow the bill to go through, but I do not think it should go through without making some comments.

The purpose of the legislation is to set up a committee to advise the Canadian Wheat Board, with which I agree, and there is a provision in the bill which stipulates what the advisory committee can do. There are also certain regulations established by the governor in council. One error in this bill is that it allows too much control to be retained by the governor in council and not enough control is given to the advisory committee.

After all, the advisory committee is made up of producers, and it is in their interest to be on the committee. I think it was brought forcibly to our attention in the standing committee that when members of parliament from the area served by the Canadian Wheat Board, that is, the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Peace River area of British Columbia, wished to bring in legislation, it was agreed to by the minister, but it was turned down by other hon. members not from that area. This raises the very fundamental point that it is dangerous to allow politics to become involved in the operation of a board such as the Canadian Wheat Board. We have seen that happen in the past. We have seen manipulation of pay-outs prior to the end of the year.

Mr. Goodale: Nonsense.

Mr. Towers: The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) says that is nonsense. He has not been around here very long. He does not remember that the Senate had to bring in a bill which curtailed the actions of the manipulators. If all control of the Canadian Wheat Board were given to the board and its advisers, there would be very little reason for the governor in council to have that control. I would far rather have the chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board or the chairman of the advisory committee stating what the initial payments are to be and what the final payments are to be. I think it would be better if they were doing it rather than the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board.

I feel that there is a misconception of what actually takes place within the operation of that board. I should stress that the Wheat Board pays its own way. It pays its own expenses, and I am sure that the consumers and taxpayers of Canada feel that the final or initial payments come out of the federal treasury, which is not the case. I am sure the hon. member for Assiniboia would agree with me that it comes out of the farmers' own money.

We must never underestimate the value of this income to the Canadian economy. The other day at report state I stressed that it gives great assistance to our economic well-being in counteracting our deficit balance of payments, which must never be overlooked, but also must not be taken for granted because inclement weather can have a great deal to do with the income of the prairie grain producer. Perhaps many Canadian taxpayers have to contend only with the Canadian government, but the western grain producer has to contend with the weather as well as the Canadian government. This has proven to be of fundamental importance. Reports coming out of central Europe and England indicate that that part of the world is undergoing a severe drought which is having a devastating impact on its economic well-being. That could well be the case in Canada if this happened to us, so therefore we must consider as carefully as we can the economic outlook of the western grain producer and afford him the opportunity of participating to the greatest extent possible in the handling of his business.

As the years go by the prairie grain producer is becoming better informed, better educated, and better able to look after himself, as long as he does not run into too much government interference. I fear that there is a tendency in the present administration to interfere to a great degree with the Canadian Wheat Board as a selling agency. The board was initially set up as a selling agency.

I think there are few in this House who remember the years when producers who were not very well off had to sell their grain in the fall at a low price because they had to have money to pay their debts. This was the reason the Canadian Wheat Board came into existence under the administration of the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett. The bad things about his administration are remembered, but seldom is he given credit for the good things he did, and establishing the Canadian Wheat Board was one of them. In those years the person who was able to hold his grain until the spring or the following summer sometimes was able to get two or three times as much for it, and that increased the deficit balance which then existed between one producer and another. However, through the marketing agency of the Canadian Wheat Board all producers now receive pretty well the same amount, provided the grade and quality are the same.

● (1550)

One of the benefits of this bill is that it will allow for the governor in council to set up a pool primarily of malting barley. There has been a great discrepancy in the past year with relation to grades in malting barley and it has caused confusion among producers. It was not fair for those who had No. 3CW to receive 80 cents more than the person who had No. 1 Feed. We all realize that the margin was very narrow—perhaps a half pound per bushel differential between one grade and another. This has caused a problem for a lot of producers, some of whom lose $2,000 on a carload of barley. This is not fair. This protection is one of the good aspects of the bill.

If the bill had gone further and given more control to the advisory board I could certainly have given it my full support. As it is I feel the governor in council is retaining too much control and that the Canadian Wheat Board is still open to manipulation by either the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan).

Just this week the Minister of Agriculture was in Red Deer, and I should like to read a little bit of the speech he made there.

An hon. Member: Where is that?

Mr. Towers: Red Deer is in the very heart of Alberta—far western Canada. It is the heart. Here is a portion of the speech made by the Minister of Agriculture:

> Another federal policy with implication for Alberta hog producers is the domestic feed grain policy. We announced some changes in this policy three weeks ago.

When the minister said "we" I presume he was referring to the announcement made in this House by himself and the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. He went on:

> Effective August 1, the Canadian Wheat Board will be offering feed grains at corn-competitive prices worked back from Montreal. And, feed freight assistance is being reduced or eliminated to British Columbia, Ontario and western Quebec.

When the Minister of Agriculture and the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board made this announcement they said it was going to do away with the inequity that existed between feeding in eastern Canada and western Canada. Feeders in western Canada are now beginning to realize that such is not the case. This is not working out that way, and we on this side of the House said at the time that it would not work. What is happening is that western grain producers are going to receive 50 cents per bushel less for the grain that goes to the eastern market; yet it is not going to make the grain any cheaper to the western feeder—not a penny.

I would be prepared to debate this issue with the hon. member for Assiniboia or either minister on the figures available, because we have worked it out. Mr. Turner, the President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, agrees that the only thing it is going to do is give western grain producers 50 cents per bushel less for the grain that is fed to the eastern market.

I feel that unless a great deal of caution is exercised there is danger that the Canadian Wheat Board could become an agency of provision rather than a selling agency. If it is going to serve its purpose in the best interests of the producer, those people who are commissioners and those who are members of the advisory committee must have complete freedom.

I really have no quarrel with western grain filling the requirements of the eastern feeder—not at all. I realize and recognize the value of the feeding industry in Canada; nevertheless I have a concern that the advisory committee of the Canadian Wheat Board as well as the commissioners could hamstring this policy which has been announced by the Minister of Agriculture and the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board because it is tied to corn. The price of western grain is tied to corn f.o.b. Montreal.

I have no quarrel whatsoever with the element of competition, but if eastern feeders can buy United States corn from Chicago cheaper than they can buy western grain—at less money than the western producer can get if he ships it to the west coast or through the port of Churchill—I have to question the economics of it. It is not taking anything away from the eastern feeder as long as his requirements are met, but I do not see why we should throw money down the drain to fill a market that could adequately be filled from some other source.

I am sure the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board recognizes that you can put corn on the Montreal market cheaper and with less freight involved than that which comes from western Canada. It takes $11 a ton to move it from Thunder Bay to Montreal, but only $9 a ton from Toledo to Montreal, and that adds up to a lot of money.

Another thing we have to deal with is the St. Lawrence Seaway charges. There is no doubt that the St. Lawrence Seaway is going to try to increase those charges. At the present time the Canadian taxpayer is picking up those charges that were created by the movement of freight—not necessarily grain but also ore and all other freight that goes through the system. If the total cost were charged to the grain, instead of paying one and a half cents per bushel for Seaway charges alone, we would be paying five cents per bushel. That is just the lock charges and not the freight charges because the latter run at 27 cents a bushel. However, an increase would be required to compensate for the differential.

I feel therefore that much greater consideration should be given to the advisory committee and that their terms of reference should be enlarged. I think they could have a greater input into the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board than can the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board or the governor in council. After all, that is the reason they are elected. They have the confidence of the producers and this is their sole purpose in being there. It is not so with the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board because he operates in a dual capacity. As Minister of Transport he is trying to do away with the Crowsnest freight rates which the grain producers want to retain. No minister can serve two parties, and I am sure he would be the first to realize that.

The other day I tried to find out from the minister what he meant when he spoke of doing away with the Crowsnest freight rates—what he meant by "some other way". He relied on a speech he made in Edmonton a year and a half ago. Actually he is just living in the past. He has had

his day and he is not resolving the problems; in fact with what is happening in the air at the present time I think he is creating more problems than he is solving.

I think this bill errs in that it is definitely not giving enough power to the advisory committee. After all these people are wise; they are smart; they are producers, and should have considerable input with regard to the well-being of the Canadian Wheat Board.

● (1600)

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to take the floor after the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) who made such wise remarks. He showed clearly the problem relating to Bill C-88. It is a surprising bill because in many ways it is pretty good, which is the surprising part. What a surprise that the Liberals should introduce a good bill! But that surprise tends to disappear when one realizes that all the good parts of the bill are the result of comments made by members of the opposition.

Mr. Paproski: Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: But the Liberals who are known as humanitarians did not want to surprise anyone too severely; therefore they included certain inequities in the bill to make it seem normal.

I want to focus attention on these inequities, and focus attention on the motion proposed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) with respect to the advisory committee to the Wheat Board. Basically the hon. member's suggestion proposed a guarantee in legislation that the advisory committee shall be made up of farmers or producers.

I challenge government members, especially the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), to tell the House what they have against farmers exercising influence on farming business. Was not the Canadian Wheat Board set up in order to sell our grain on foreign markets? Does it not sell the product of the farmer? Therefore, why should not the farmer expect a guarantee in legislation to the effect that the advisory board will be made up of farm producers? It is only normal that the members of an industry want to look after themselves. The legislation ought to provide for the advisory board to be made up only of farmers and that ought to be spelled out.

It is interesting to note what has happened in this country with regard to the input of farmers into Canadian society. When Canada first became a confederate nation, 95 per cent of its people were rural; in essence, most of them were farm people. Today the reverse is the case. Approximately 85 per cent of all Canadians live in cities; that percentage, according to the Lithwick report, will become even larger by the year 2000. In the past decade we lost from the land 170,000 farm people. This means that, at this time in our history, the input into our society of the farming industry is becoming progressively smaller.

It is important to recognize that while the proportion of farmers in Canadian society is becoming progressively smaller, farming is still the most important industry, both in terms of economics and in terms of social well-being. At no time has an advanced culture not been preceded by advanced agriculture. No society in the world has ever developed and advanced without a firm agricultural foundation. All societies depend on a well developed agricultural system. Despite this, the present government is unwilling to guarantee in legislation the right of the farmer to have some say in matters pertaining to the administration of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Farming is a business; the farmer is in the business of food production. Food comes from two sources, soil and water. There are no others. According to United Nations standards, 20 per cent of all Canadians are poor. On the international scene, of course, the incidence of total poverty is much more severe. With regard to the international scene, every day 12,000 children under the age of five die of starvation. Four fifths of this world suffers from malnutrition. In most countries of the world the individual daily calory intake of the people is less than one fifth of the normal intake of the individual Canadian. Therefore the business of food production is one of our most important businesses. Agriculture is our most important industry. There is no advanced society which does not have access to a well developed, progressive agricultural industry.

This piece of legislation purports to make certain adjustments with regard to the Canadian Wheat Board. While I commend some clauses in the bill, I suggest that it is folly not to broaden the scope of the legislation in order to permit farmers to exercise power through the advisory committee. I suggest that enshrined in the legislation should be the provision calling for members of the advisory committee to be farm producers.

It is important that farm producers throughout the Canadian Wheat Board growing area should have confidence in the institution to which they sell their grain and some powers with which to direct and manage their own affairs. But that apparently is not how the government proceeds traditionally; it is not concerned about the rights of individuals. It is concerned about imposing management. In other words, it puts a society based on structure ahead of one based on people's choices. That is why farmers and certain organizations have resisted legislation of this type so strongly.

An order in council does not allow farmers to put their case before a standing committee. I ask the government, why is it afraid to have farm people appear before the standing committee in case changes are to be made in the legislation?

Mr. Paproski: They don't like farmers.

Mr. Malone: If they were willing to guarantee with legislation that farm people have the right to run their own affairs, they would have nothing to fear.

It is evident that this bill shows a distrust on the part of the government of the farm people of this country. Apparently the government thinks farmers do not have the wherewithal to run their own affairs. That should not be the government's attitude. It should adopt a more trusting attitude to those who have so capably allowed us to achieve our present high standard of living.

Mr. Paproski: The way the government treats farmers is shameful.

Mr. Malone: The minister in charge of the Wheat Board agreed, when appearing before the Standing Committee on Agriculture, that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Moose Jaw was acceptable. Actually he said that he agreed with the spirit of that amendment, agreed that there should be some guarantee that farmers would be on the advisory board. Unfortunately, ten government members, not one of whom represents ridings within the Canadian Wheat Board growing area, at a later date, not knowing the minister's position, chose to vote against the amendment. That was unfortunate. Farm people again are being jeopardized because people from outside the Canadian Wheat Board growing area have made a decision without understanding the agricultural industry. They did not extend their trust to those in that industry. Really it is not a matter of whether farm people should be on the board; it is a matter of whether the government is willing to extend trust to farmers. The other part of the question is, why is the government so distrustful? Why is it not willing to let farmers have some persuasive say in the management of their own affairs?

We need to reverse trends in this country. Instead of building structures and institutions and imposing them on people, it is high time we encouraged Canadians to take a more active and responsible role in the administration of their own lives.

I conclude by saying that while I think most of this bill is satisfactory, I wish the government would see fit to extend more trust and responsibility to farmers within the Canadian Wheat Board growing area.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like for a few moments this afternoon to speak generally on Bill C-88, but before I do that may I deal with the arguments advanced earlier by the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken.

In particular I refer to the argument they are making about the amendment which was proposed in committee and later at report stage by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) having to do with the restrictions which that particular member wanted to place in this legislation. It is interesting to note the contrast between what the hon. member for Moose Jaw was in fact proposing and the rhetoric of the two hon. members who have just spoken.

● (1610)

The point is that that amendment would have restricted the range of choice of farmers in selecting people to represent them upon the advisory committee of the Canadian Wheat Board. The amendment would have restricted their freedom of choice. It would cut down their range of choice. The argument presented to the House in opposition to that amendment, the argument which persuaded itself to the House, was that we should leave the range of options broad and general for farmers when making their selection of producers or others to represent them.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) a question. Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Goodale: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Towers: If it was a bad amendment, why did the minister in charge of the wheat board agree with it in committee?

Mr. Malone: That was my question too.

Mr. Goodale: In the committee hearings that were cited in this House when the bill was debated at the report stage, hon. members opposite chose only to read those selected portions of the committee minutes which supported their case. They stopped short of reading the full context of what was said.

Mr. Malone: You were not there.

Mr. Goodale: When you read all of those minutes, as I have read them very carefully word for word, you find out very clearly what transpired in the committee. The members of that committee drew to the attention of the committee certain aspects that were being overlooked in the amendment being proposed by the hon. member for Moose Jaw.

The point is this. The amendment would have restricted the freedom of choice and the range of options of producers. The committee, and later this House, opted at the initial stage of establishing this new election procedure, for a broad range of choice for farmers. The ultimate protection is in the legislation. When an election is held to select the advisers to the Canadian Wheat Board, that election is squarely, fully, and solely in the hands of producers. They are the ones who have the franchise. They are the ones who will make the ultimate decision. I have every confidence in the ability, capacity, and good judgment of farmers that when they exercise their franchise they will make the right decision in their own best interest. They do not need this kind of artificial protection which would limit the freedom and range of choice they would otherwise have.

In Bill C-88 this House of Commons is being called upon to amend in two specific and postive respects the legislation which forms the foundation of the system of marketing for most of our western Canadian grain production, namely, the Canadian Wheat Board Act. It is clearly understood that these changes are being proposed in direct response to the clear expression of opinion of prairie farmers.

Primarily this bill seeks to achieve two quite separate objectives. First, clauses 1 and 3 of Bill C-88 deal essentially with the provision of a permanent basis for the election of advisers by prairie grain producers to the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee.

Second, clause 4 of the bill makes provision for the establishment of separate marketing pools, within the wheat board structure, for certain selected and accepted grains, such as malting barley.

The remaining sections of the bill, namely clauses 2 and 5, are of a technical housekeeping nature, unrelated to the two major amendments I have just mentioned, which correct errors in wording or minor anomalies which presently appear in the act.

As we conclude this debate, may I comment just briefly on the two essential highlights contained in Bill C-88; first, the matter of a separate CWB marketing pool for malting

barley, and so on. Presently the Canadian Wheat Board Act requires the pooling of proceeds from all sales of wheat, oats, and barley in their respective pool accounts, the deduction of all expenses incurred in marketing each grain, and the same payment per grade to all producers. For example, the sales revenue for No. 1 feed barley which is selected and accepted for malting must be pooled by the board with the revenue from all sales of No. 1 feed barley irrespective of its end use. That is how the bill reads now. That gives a nutshell explanation of the problem which farmers saw and the government recognized in bringing forth this amendment.

Under the amendment, a separate pool for barley that has been selected and accepted for malting purposes will ensure that only those costs incurred in marketing malting barley are charged to that pool. With a separate pool, those producers who deliver selected grains such as malting barley will receive the full benefit of any premiums obtained by the board for it. That is the gist of the amendment dealing with the separate pool. Naturally enough, in recent months at least, western producers have been anxious to see the wheat board begin to keep separate accounts. The government, through the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, committed itself to respond to that concern. Accordingly we have this amendment. Under its terms, and as a result of preparatory accounting work already done by the wheat board, it will be possible to treat deliveries of malting barley in this current 1975-76 crop year as a separate pool account, that is, the amendment, when it receives parliamentary approval, is intended to be retroactive to the beginning of this crop year, August 1, 1975.

The second major amendment in Bill C-88, that dealing with the wheat board advisory committee election, follows upon a very successful experiment conducted last year in which the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board provided prairie producers with a first opportunity to elect for themselves this most important advisory group to the board. This, of course, is the aspect of the legislation which was dealt with in the form of amendments at the report stage.

Under the present terms of the Wheat Board Act, the members of the advisory committee are in fact appointed by the governor in council with no provision for their direct selection by producers.

The minister, the Government of Canada, and many prairie producers have believed for some considerable time that the 11 member advisory committee should be chosen by farmers themselves having a direct vote. It was with this thought in mind that the minister authorized the first election of the members of the advisory committee in 1975. The widespread interest of producers in the process is illustrated by the fact that 67 individuals were nominated to seek election in the 11 electoral districts. The campaigns were vigorous and enthusiastic. The successful candidates in that election were subsequently appointed to the committee by the governor in council as technically required by the act.

The new bill will establish and guarantee the electoral process for the advisory committee in the Canadian Wheat Board Act itself. Under the amendment the board will exercise the direction and supervision of the administrative process in all future elections. The governor in council will be empowered to enact regulations prescribing the procedural and electoral rules for the election, and the rates of remuneration for expenses incurred by the members in the proper discharge of their duties.

The next election of the advisory committee will be in 1978, and every fourth year thereafter, according to the new amendment.

As I mentioned at the outset, Mr. Speaker, these amendments have been presented to the House in direct response to the representations of producers and producer organizations which have indicated a genuine desire to see the electoral process for the advisory committee enshrined in the statute itself, and to see in the interests of equity a separate pool for selected grades of grains such as malting barley.

May I close, Mr. Speaker, by taking a moment or two to put these latest amendments to the Wheat Board Act into context, into the context of the exciting and impressive development of the grains industry and relevant Government of Canada grains policy over the past six or seven years under the leadership of the present responsible minister who has carried, since 1969, the fundamental responsibility for the development and co-ordination of all policies and programs of the Government of Canada relating to western grain.

For the record, here is a partial list of some of the things which have been achieved since the early difficult days in 1969 and 1970 when prairie grain producers were facing one of their most depressing periods, certainly the most difficult era in recent decades.

● (1620)

For example, we have seen the introduction of expanded credit facilities and long term government guarantees to enable the Wheat Board to pursue new markets. Vigorous efforts have been made for the first time, to break into the world barley market where we had never seriously been before 1970. There was the annual commitment of $10 million toward a new market development fund to enhance grain marketing opportunities. New research facilities have been established through the Canada Department of Agriculture, a new crop science division at the University of Saskatchewan, and a "protein-oil-starch" pilot plant in Saskatoon to help find news way of processing grain and oil seeds.

I would remind hon. members of the establishment of the two-price wheat program, of the substantial increases in the level of available cash advances together with provisions for more flexible repayment arrangements. I would also call attention to improvements in the timing of Wheat Board final payments and adjustment cheques, to the implementation of the deferred cash ticket option on grain deliveries, and to the arrangement for putting reliable production and marketing information into the hands of producers regularly each year well in advance of seeding.

Determined efforts have been made to remove old inequities in our system of domestic feed grains marketing. The House will recall measures to bring about an upgraded crop insurance program, the premiums for which the Government of Canada shares 50-50 with farmers. In addition,

the terms upon which Farm Credit Corporation loans are made have been substantially improved.

Further measures for the strengthening of the western grains industry include: a poll among producers on rapeseed marketing; the experimental producer election of an advisory committee to the Wheat Board a year ago; a new quota system; the block shipping system; the purchase of 6,000 grain hopper cars; a boxcar repair program; the Mants Report on boxcar allocation procedures; the appointment of port co-ordinators for Thunder Bay and Vancouver; the Snavely Commission on the cost of transporting grain by rail, and the Hall Commission on grain handling and transportation. Finally I must mention, of course, the western grain stabilization plan which will bring a new and unprecedented measure of strength and stability to the western grains industry, to individual producers, and to the western economy generally.

That is just a partial list of achievements but it will give the House an idea of the important and impressive advances which have assisted the western grains industry to rise to the unprecedented state of strength and health which it has enjoyed in recent years. Also important, indeed I would say crucial to this improved state of affairs for western producers, is the unparalleled ability, capacity, and good judgment of prairie farmers themselves as producers and marketers which places them in the ranks of the world's most resourceful and productive people. The bill now before us is another progressive step forward on two fronts for the Western grains industry. I commend it to the House for speedy final passage in the interests of prairie grain farmers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Five o'clock!

Mr. Sharp: We have completed the government business before the House today, but before asking Your Honour to call it five o'clock might I indicate the order of business for Monday? We shall call Bill C-61 for third reading. This will be followed by Bill C-83 and discussion will continue until the House can resume consideration of Bill C-84 which will be at the report stage when the committee reports on Monday evening.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): There was some discussion earlier today about the possibility of the House passing a resolution in connection with the air traffic control and airline pilot situation. Has anything been done on that matter?

Mr. Sharp: I had some discussion with the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) and with the House Leader of that party, as well as with the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). The minister concerned held discussions today with the air traffic controllers and these talks have now been adjourned.

There have been some very preliminary discussions here and it may be that on Monday we shall want to consider a resolution. However, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicated during the question period, the terms of the resolution would of course be negotiated with the other parties before being presented to the House; so there will be no action today, though there may be on Monday.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): If I understood the government House leader correctly he mentioned Bill C-61 which, as far as I know, had been left out of the package which was to be completed by June 30. I take it this is just a filler—that we shall just have a discussion on the subject and continue when we resume in the fall.

Mr. Sharp: When I announced the business the government insisted be completed before we adjourn, I did not include Bill C-61. However, this did not mean we would not want to discuss Bill C-61, and if the House is prepared to approve third reading, that would not be contrary to any undertaking I have given. But we are not insisting on the approval of Bill C-61 before we adjourn.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): And that, I understand, is to be the first order of business on Monday. May I ask for how long we will be discussing that measure before we go on to Bill C-84? Is a certain period of time to be allocated?

Mr. Sharp: I would be prepared to devote the whole of Monday to Bill C-61. If the House were able to agree to approve it, we would be very pleased. But if the House decided not to do so, we would accept that situation. We would then proceed to Bill C-83. Also, if Bill C-61 is approved of some time on Monday we would turn to Bill C-83, but in any event Bill C-83 would be taken up until we go back to consideration of the report stage of Bill C-84.

Mr. Stanfield: My understanding was that at the time the House agreed to extend hours it was also agreed that only a very limited legislative package would be considered, for example, the bill relating to government expenditures was not included—Bill C-87.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Don't bring that back.

Mr. Stanfield: No, I don't want to do that. But my impression as to what was agreed to differs from that of the government House leader. I am subject to correction, but my impression was that when we agreed to extended hours part of that agreement was that a list of certain bills was to be considered, and that Bill C-61 was not one of those. I think there is something more involved in this than the government House leader simply saying that he never agreed to more than that the government would not insist on certain bills being considered before the House adjourned. My impression is that the government House leader agreed that only certain bills would be considered as part of the package of extended hours.

● (1630)

I am not accusing the government House leader of bad faith—I do not think he would be guilty of such a thing—but it seems to me that there should be some consultation

in regard to the government House leader bringing forward some bill that is not in the package. Otherwise there might be quite a widespread feeling in some parts of the House that there has been a breach of good faith by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Sharp: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the extended hours were introduced in order to enable us basically to get ahead with Bill C-84. However, I would indicate—and I think this will support the position I have taken—that while we would not insist upon the passage of C-83, for example, it would be discussed as long as the House was in session and progress could be made. I think we are in very much the same position on Bill C-61, that the government would like to see it approved but would not keep the House in session for the purpose of discussing Bill C-61. Moreover, we would not be discussing Bill C-61 during any of the extended hours.

Mr. Paproski: Are we going to have extended hours on Tuesday and Thursday of next week? We agreed that once Bill C-84 was passed that was it, or did it relate to all government business?

Mr. Sharp: The order speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker. At one time at an earlier stage we negotiated for extended hours only for the purpose of considering the second reading of Bill C-84. Then at a later stage the negotiations were changed and there was a clear understanding, which is expressed in the order, that the extended hours and the end of private members' hours extend until the adjournment.

Mr. Towers: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, would the government House leader give us his word that he will not bring Bill C-83 on until the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who is leading the discussion at the present time in committee on Bill C-84, has at least had an opportunity to debate it? Also in view of the fact that the justice committee is going to be sitting all day Monday, and that it sat this morning and this afternoon, surely to goodness the government House leader will not bring Bill C-83 on and debate it in the House at the same time as the justice committee is sitting. Could we have a promise from the House leader that he will not bring Bill C-83 on without at least our having an opportunity to debate the issue, or until Bill C-84 is reported to the House?

Mr. Sharp: I understand the concern of the hon. member and this is the reason, for example, that I did not call Bill C-83 today or call it as the first order of business on Monday. However, I do want to make it clear that on Tuesday we would resume consideration of Bill C-83, because by that time, by its own order, the committee would have reported. I am prepared to say that if the House does approve Bill C-61 during Monday I would adjourn the House and not call Bill C-83 if at that time the committee is still sitting. When the committee has reported, I think it would be proper to bring Bill C-83 into the House. I quite understand the hon. member's concern, and it is the reason I did not call Bill C-83 today.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I assure my good friend from Edmonton Centre that there will be no extended hours on Thursday. Thursday is a holiday.

Mr. Paproski: I should like to ask the government House leader what it is we shall be doing on Friday. If he has a program all set up for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, what about Friday?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the situation is this, as I understand it. The Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs has an order which requires that the bill be reported before some time on the evening of Monday. It would require the unanimous consent of the House for the report to be received at that time. If that consent is denied, which I hope will not be the case—I hope everyone is interested in disposing of the matter and in allowing the debate to proceed without unnecessary delay—if someone does object, and it only takes one voice to object, then the report would be made on Tuesday at two o'clock. That would require 48 hours' notice before we could take up report stage, which would take us to Friday, so we will be sitting on Friday to take up consideration of the report stage of Bill C-84.

Some hon. Members: Five o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we call it five o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock this House stands adjourned until Monday next at two o'clock p.m.

At 4.38 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 28, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON WEEKEND PRISON SENTENCES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43 to present a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the statements made by Superintendent J. M. Gillingham of the Headingley Correctional Institute in Manitoba, that the four-year old federal program of weekend jail sentences is an administrative nightmare, and one-third of those serving weekend jail terms are not showing up and also many of the prisoners arrive drunk or under the influence of drugs, and as the Chief Judge of the Manitoba Provincial Judges Court has called on magistrates to stop handing out weekend prison sentences, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers):

That this House direct the Minister of Justice to prepare a report on weekend prison sentences and, if necessary, rescind the legislation allowing weekend sentences.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS TO EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave under Standing Order 43 to present a motion of some urgency. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That this House urges the government to bring in legislation to implement the recommendation of the Special Joint Committee on the Public Service, made on February 3, 1967, to the effect that employees of the Senate, the House of Commons and the Library of Parliament should be accorded the same collective bargaining and other rights that are accorded to federal public servants under the terms of the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

SUGGESTION THAT FINAL STAGES OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL BE DELAYED UNTIL FALL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I move, seconded by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle):

That once Bill C-84 for abolition of the death penalty is reported to the House that this House do adjourn for the summer recess and that report stage and third reading be allotted five days debate in the fall with a vote to come at the end of the fifth day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43, cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR REVISION OF EXTERNAL AID POLICY TO MAKE IT MORE EFFICIENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion dealing with a question of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the fact that Mr. Fernand Séguin has just resigned from the important position he held at the Science Council of Canada because of the content of the advice next to be presented to the government by the council concerning the attitude it should take toward the Third World and the imminent world food crisis, and that this disagreement underlines the possibility for Canada to adopt a policy of food imperialism toward the starving countries, as was pointed out by Mr. Omond Solandt, former president of the Council, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House of Commons review the entire Canadian aid policy towards the Third World in light of the advice of the Science Council of Canada, in order for such aid policy to be realistic, taking in account our surpluses and our production capacities, instead of becoming a disguised form of pressure on nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the hon. member's motion. Under the provisions of Standing

Order 43, such motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

PROPOSED EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION OF MINISTER'S EFFORTS IN SETTLING DISPUTE WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ross Milne (Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, to seek the unanimous consent of this House to move a motion. Given today's announcement of an agreement resolving the work disruption in Canada's commercial aviation sector, and given the attendant prospect of a full and complete investigation into the relationship between safety and bilingual air traffic control, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme):

That this House do express its appreciation to the Minister of Transport for his efforts in securing a resolution of the current air traffic situation in Canada by involving the major parties in the aviation industry and commend his commitment that the maintenance of Canada's high aviation safety standards will be the key consideration of the study.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Worthy though that objective may be, it is not the proper subject for a motion under Standing Order 43.

Mr. Nowlan: Make sure you mail a copy of the motion to Pierre.

* * *

HEALTH

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF STUDIES ON WHICH WARNING LABELS ON ALCOHOLIC PRODUCTS BASED—MOTION ORDER S.O. 43

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the stated intention of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) to compel distilleries to label alcoholic products as dangerous to health, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan):

That the minister table all studies and other information which show the basis for this move by the minister.

[Mr. Speaker.]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning the procedure which we will follow in the question period. The matter pertains directly to the difficulty of asking questions in the House following news reports that there has been a settlement of the air dispute. My point of order concerns the procedure which is to be followed by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) with regard to this important issue.

The understanding I have from his office is that he does not intend to make a statement in the House today but, rather, intends simply to table the order in council establishing the terms of reference which have been agreed upon by all parties, I take it, and which are to be followed by the commission.

My point of order is this: if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), I and other members of the House are to ask questions on this important dispute, if our questions are to make sense, we have a right to know the terms agreed on by the minister. But if the minister intends to follow the procedure his office has indicated, he will not be making a statement; he will simply table the document later in today's proceedings. In that case, the opposition parties will not be able to ask questions on this important issue.

I doubt if Your Honour will consider that I have raised a prima facie point of order. Really, I am trying to appeal through Your Honour to the Minister of Transport to please not foul up this procedure, to change his mind and tell the House that he intends after the question period to make a statement on this important question, so that members of the opposition will be able to ask sensible questions following that statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CONDITIONS OF SETTLEMENT OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS' DISPUTE AND THAT ALL PARTIES ACCEPT IT

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, following the point of order raised by the leader of the NDP, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport? The first part of my question is simple: is the minister going to make a statement on motions, so that we will all understand clearly the exact conditions of the settlement? Second, can he assure the House and country that all parties, direct and indirect, have accepted the settlement?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: I am not sure how broad the hon. member meant to make his question by referring to everyone "direct and indirect;" therefore I will not even try to grapple with that part of his question. I had not intended to make a statement on motions because I had nothing in the way of principle or policy to add to what was said in the course of the debate on motions last week where the principles were very clearly set out.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: I am in the situation where the rules allow for the tabling of documents at three o'clock and I propose to do that, at which time the documents will become available to all members of this House. That is probably an important consideration as well. I did have the agreement of the parties which had worked on these various documents that we would not make them public at the time of indicating to the public that we had reached an agreement; that we would speak broadly about them but not make them public so that they could indeed be tabled in the House in order that all members might see them. A day of reflection on what is in the documents may be of benefit to members opposite. I will be glad to be here tomorrow to answer questions on them. As I say, if I felt that there was any important change in any policy or principle involved in the documents, I would have made a statement. However, as hon. members will see, the basic principles to which we really all agreed last week stand very firm, so this is simply a matter of settling a dispute at this time and having the airlines fly again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: The minister concluded his remarks by saying that it was simply a matter of getting the airlines flying again. We on this side of the House want the airlines to fly again. However, we feel that in some ways the minister's inflammatory statements and the Prime Minister's inflammatory statements—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should put his supplementary question.

Mr. Horner: —have in fact in some ways delayed a fruitful settlement.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: My question to the minister is quite simple. Can he assure the House that all factions in this dispute have in fact agreed to the settlement? In other words, will he proceed with his legal cases? If someone is sentenced to jail, are we to expect another walkout? These are matters still in the minds of the public and I wish the minister would clear them up.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would hate to say to the hon. member that those suggestions almost smack of something inflammatory. However, I would only say that matters before the courts are still before the courts. It was very clear in these discussions that we could not bargain or discuss those matters in any way, but let them pursue their ordinary course. We believe that in this regard the law must be obeyed and pursued. I have some confidence that the air controllers and pilots in this country will be back at work in a full way as a result of this agreement. If the hon. member wants me to assure him that will be true of every pilot and controller in this country, I cannot do so. We have done our very best to give the various assurances that should quiet the fears of almost everyone. I know there are some other people who would like to create additional fear, but I do not think that should be done.

Mr. Horner: With regard to the minister's last remark, we on this side of the House are particularly pleased that he accepted a recommendation made in this House last week that a third party satisfactory to the other side of the dispute be appointed. We graciously gave the minister that advice and we are thankful that he has accepted it. However, his evasion and non-statement today do not help to assure the country—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

POSSIBILITY OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—DATE OF RESTORATION OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering about some of the legal procedures. For example, a number of public servants have been suspended or had penalties assessed against them. Will the minister make a statement as to whether these will be proceeded with in the normal course of events or whether they will be waived?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member knows of some suspensions or actions of this kind, I would be glad to know about them. I do not have any in mind at this point.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, can the minister advise the House and the country when he expects domestic service to be restored to normal?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, just as soon as that can be done mechanically. Upon arriving at a firm understanding, I am told by the pilots, their various members told the various airline managements at that point that a firm arrangement was in prospect and that shaping of the operation could begin. They felt that some planes might be flying by this very hour and just as fast as normal operations can be resumed, they will be resumed. There are always, of course, technical difficulties in connection with making sure that aircraft are in the right places and that crews are in the right places after a period of disruption such as we have just come through. However, it will only be a matter of a number of hours before fairly normal service is resumed.

● (1420)

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I assure the minister that I do have special cases to tell him about but I do not intend to mention names in the House. My further question refers to foreign airlines services. Has the hon. gentleman or his officials had any conversation with foreign airlines to ascertain when their services will return to normal?

Mr. Lang: It was quite clear why certain foreign services were being suspended from Canadian operations and this happened only in certain cases. There were at all times a significant number of foreign services flying into Canada. I take it the reasons for the suspension of services by some airlines have now disappeared and I anticipate seeing an early resumption of those services, too.

FORM OF RECOMMENDATION TO PARLIAMENT FOLLOWING REPORT OF COMMISSION ON SAFETY OF BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): My question is also to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Having had to change his mind on a number of crucial items in the past 48 hours, it is delightful to see the minister has regained his traditional modesty.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Broadbent: Would the minister say whether in the order in council which we are to see later today it is clear as to the form of parliamentary agreement which will be necessary to implement recommendations from the Commission? More specifically, will the minister tell us what form the recommendation to parliament will take following the Commission's recommendations? Will it be a detailed recommendation submitted to parliament to be voted on, or will the vote be more on a question of principle as it applies to air traffic control?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I am happy to note that the hon. member is finding it a little difficult to keep on talking about rigidity in the face of flexibility, but that will not take him too long to get over. I will not try to predict the exact form of the resolution because that will no doubt be decided at the time we receive the report of the commission. But the gist of what we are proposing is that at that time the Commission, in order for the report to be before us at all, has indicated that certain additional air traffic services in a bilingual way are fully consistent with safety in the Province of Quebec. This report will be put before the House in a way which will allow the House likewise to endorse the view that safety is indeed consistently satisfied by the changes in procedure and implementation which would follow from them.

I say most emphatically to the hon. member that this is not in any way a proposal that the House in any way question the bilingual policy or indeed the broad proposition that to the extent safety is not degraded or in any way jeopardized we shall propose to move forward with bilingual aircraft services in the Province of Quebec. That is a principle for which I believe this House stands firmly now and needs no further resolution. It will be only a question of the actual report and the adoption of certain implementation measures as being consistent with safety. This is a further triple, quadruple assurance we are seeking to give to any who doubted that, indeed, safety did come first and that no steps will be taken to jeopardize safety. I will be glad to put that proposition before the House and before going forward, therefore, the majority of members of the House will also have to say that safety was not being jeopardized.

[Mr. Lang.]

REINSTATEMENT OF COST IN TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I believe in the House on Friday, and certainly outside the House, the minister indicated that the government would be prepared to reinstate cost as one of the three principal elements of the investigation of the commission, in addition to the crucial element of safety and the element of efficiency. Would the minister tell the House whether cost has now been reinstated as one of the three principal areas of investigation for the commission?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated in the House when we were last discussing this matter, while there had been no great interest in or question about this matter on the part of the controllers, I was prepared to reintroduce it into our discussions to see whether it would sit well with the controllers. I did do so and they were agreeable to it, and as a result the implementation cost is an item specifically mentioned in the document, as it had been in the draft we had worked on earlier.

POSSIBILITY OF FREE VOTE ON REPORT OF COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, having to do with the important area of what has been described in the news media as the government's decision to have a free vote on this issue. May I ask the minister whether, once the commission makes its recommendation, it is the government's intention simply to bring a motion before the House that will not have the specific endorsation of the government but will be left to government backbenchers as a free vote on the issue—that is to say, it is not a matter of government policy—or is it the government's intention to bring forward a specific recommendation which it is prepared to support as a party in the House of Commons?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, so far as this part of the policy is concerned I can only think in terms of the government side, there having to be some decisions on the other side in order to have it work in full. The position as described by whatever words were used is that we really wanted a general attitude that would reflect sufficient consensus, and I was saying that even among opposition members there would be found to be some reasonable people who were willing to support the position of safety being met. That is the approach we are taking in this matter, though in the end, of course, it will be the majority in this parliament who will decide the issue as to whether the report shall be approved.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT REAL CAUSES OF AIR CONTROLLERS' DISPUTE BE IDENTIFIED

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

The Minister having gone to France where he found out that it was possible to fly in French and English, and given the statements made Friday night by the Prime Minister concerning that matter, can he tell the House whether that question of bilingualism, which seems to be exaggerated by the parties involved in the conflict, is as serious as it seems to be? Does it have to do only with bilingualism or is there anything deeper than that?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Well, Mr. Speaker, there are some very complex issues that can combine together, and I think in this case they did. I do not think that any good purpose would be served by my trying to analyse the exact nature of the issues at this stage; I do not think the rules of the House would give me the time that may be required to do that.

[*Translation*]

SUGGESTION COMMISSION STUDY ASPECTS OF BILINGUALISM OTHER THAN THOSE RELATED TO CONTROLLERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary.

In view of his answer, can the minister tell us, with respect to the commissioners who will be responsible for the inquiry on that matter which so far seems to be limited to bilingualism whether the commission will deal with other problems which are related to the question of bilingualism and of which practically everybody is aware?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the terms of reference will speak for themselves.

* * *

● (1430)

PENITENTIARIES

CONSULTATION WITH PRISON GUARDS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL—NUMBER OF GUARDS RESIGNING IF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT ABOLISHED

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, will the Solicitor General advise whether there was any meaningful consultation with prison guards or other correctional officers in reference to Bill C-84 prior to it being introduced in the House, and prior to the vote being held on second reading, other than ad hoc discussions with various officers at various institutions from time to time? In other words, was there collective consultation and did the minister discuss with officers of the union whether they would continue to work?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, before we introduced the peace and security program we met with officials of the correctional officers' union and told them the different items we had in mind, including the abolition of capital punishment. I must say there was considerable disagreement with us on that point and there was not much room for discussion. The same opinion was conveyed to me on other occasions that I met with the executive of the union, and of locals of the union at different prisons throughout Canada.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I would ask a supplementary question because this is a very serious matter. Did the minister determine from any of these ad hoc discussions that the personnel in federal institutions, whose grave and grim responsibility and duty it is to see that society is protected against escapes and, indeed, to protect inmates against homicide by violent, incarcerated criminals, particularly in light of the fact that 15 inmates have been killed from 1971 to 1976, will continue their jobs, or how many will quit or resign if the bill becomes law immediately?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall on the occasions that I did meet with the union that they ever threatened to withdraw their services or quit if the bill were passed. I must point out also that I have met with other people who work in the prisons, such as classification officers, parole officers and so on, who also work in close contact with dangerous inmates and they do not hold the same opinion as correctional officers. I might say that in other countries where they have abolished capital punishment, and in many states of the United States, the correctional officers have carried on quite successfully after abolition of capital punishment.

CONTINGENCY PLANS IF PRISON GUARDS RESIGN

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that those in the administrative branch would take a different position. May I put this question to the Solicitor General. What contingency measures has he set up, in light of his statement today in committee that if guards and correctional officers wish to resign because of the law they will have to do so? Therefore, the penitentiary would be left with a dangerous situation in relation to the protection of society and other inmates who are serving terms for various offences, and whose disposition and character, irrespective of the offence for which they were convicted, make them ideal prisoners, and as such they are entitled to the same protection as if they were free persons in society and not incarcerated?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. member this morning at the committee meeting, or the commissioner of penitentiaries told him, that following the vote so far only three persons have resigned and those were in the Quebec region. We have no indication that there will be mass resignations or a strike. If there were to be a strike we do have a contingency plan similar to the one we had last year when there was a one day walk-out in Quebec. We had people to man the prisons on that occasion.

Oral Questions

HEALTH

REASON FOR REFUSAL TO REVEAL CONTENTS OF DRUGS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is not supplementary but has regard to a matter which is more mundane. It is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare who, through his official position, at least qualifies as an expert. I have received a letter from a correspondent who says that following recent reports in the press about the effects of estrogen used in a contraceptive pill she made certain inquiries of the Department of National Welfare, to which an answer came back in a stereotype form letter stating:

> With the new government regulations, we cannot distribute material which shows the contents of drugs.
>
> Please contact your doctor for further information on the pill.

I would ask the minister if there are such instructions on what they are based, and the reason behind refusing people of this country information of this sort.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to investigate the particular incident to which the hon. member is referring. But I believe there is, indeed, a standard regulation to the effect that the composition of drugs coming under the patent laws of Canada cannot be revealed by the government to competitors or to the general public at large. I think this is the situation, but I will investigate it further and report to the hon. member.

* * *

AIRPORTS

TORONTO INTERNATIONAL—REASON EMPLOYEES NOT GIVEN SECURITY CLEARANCE ALLOWED IN SECURE AREAS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, now that the airlines will once again be operating I should like to repeat my question to the Minister of Transport regarding airport security, specifically at the Toronto international airport. In an answer to a question on May 28 the minister said that those who have access to security situations are processed for security clearance. Would the minister advise this House whether Air Canada computers and immigration offices in Canada are classified as security areas and, if they are, would he explain why members of the cleaning staff at the Toronto airport who, as he knows, have not been processed for security clearance, continue to have access to those areas, thereby creating a potential break in the security system at that airport?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, obviously if the hon. member wants information about specific employees or groups of employees I would want to check before answering him.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, I realize it is a known fact that security for the Olympics, including passenger areas, at our major international airports is indeed excellent. However, because potential dangers continue to exist as far as security is concerned, in respect of employees working at these airports, be it because of illegal immigrants or the lack of appropriate security clearance of employees, would the minister undertake to initiate an investigation into this specific matter prior to the start of the Olympic games to assure Canadians the absolute safety they deserve during this potentially explosive period of time?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member knows that very special steps have been taken to assure security, and I think he may be satisfied that that is the case.

* * *

ENERGY

INQUIRY AS TO CONTINGENCY PLAN IN CASE OF NUCLEAR ACCIDENT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister and relates to recent reports that the United States government is developing a disaster plan to cope with the casualties, property damage and loss of civil control which might be caused by a serious accident at a nuclear plant or by the explosion of a nuclear device by a terrorist group. Will the Acting Prime Minister tell the House whether similar contingency planning is being done by the Canadian government and, if so, which government departments are involved and what minister is responsible for the co-ordination of this planning?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not been aware of any such discussions going on, but I thank the hon. lady for putting this idea in our minds. Perhaps it is something to which we should be turning our attention.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGE IN INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of National Defence in a position to indicate that by the end of this week, or if parliament should be sitting at the end of next week, he will announce changes in the defence infrastructure in Canada having regard to the closing of certain bases and the possible reduction of the reserve strength of certain units?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I do not anticipate making any announcement concerning changes in the infrastructure before the House rises.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there is considerable interest and a great deal of unrest in certain communities, is the minister able to give us the target date at which he is aiming in this regard, bearing in mind the fact that he told several members of this House, including myself, that the decision could be expected first of all in April, then in May, and now we are at the end of June, so presumably he is taking us into the middle of July? Is there any particular date by which he

thinks he can make this announcement, or is this to be another one of those things that is to be ducked?

Mr. Richardson: No, Mr. Speaker, the matter is under study but I do not want to set a date for an announcement at this time.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

POSSIBLE DATE WHEN COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL WILL COMPLETE WORK

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport and is basically supplementary to those questions asked earlier by the hon. member for Crowfoot. My question is in connection with the timing of the commission which is on everybody's mind today. Can the minister indicate when the three man commission will start its work or deliberations, and will he inform the House whether the government has set a deadline on when the commission is to report back, or is the work of this commission to in fact be open-ended?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the commission will begin its work in terms of assembling its advisers and staff as soon as it can get together. The procedure to be followed is that the expert staff of the commission will be expected to work alongside the other experts from the department and the various associations through the development of the procedures in the simulation exercise which at all times was a contemplated requirement to develop a satisfaction about safety. The work will go forward to a point where my own safety advisors are satisfied with the procedures which have been developed and at that point in time they will say so and, according to the terms of reference, the commission must report within 90 days of that exact moment. That report will then be laid before Parliament.

● (1440)

STATUS OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL IN QUEBEC DURING COMMISSION INVESTIGATION

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether he could inform the House if there will be any change, I suppose of status for lack of a better word, of air traffic control in the province of Quebec while the commission is investigating this matter or will we have a situation in which nothing will move ahead so far as the two major airports are concerned until after a recommendation has been made by the three-man commission.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the most recent attitude, a good deal has been accomplished over time in respect of a general agreement. That may still be possible. In addition there is a provision in the terms of reference for interim reports by the commission so that if a specific item we found where traffic in a bilingual way should be advanced or put in place because it is clearly and fully consistent with safety, then there is the possibility of that happening on the basis of an interim report before the elaborate work of the commission has been completed.

MANPOWER

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO LABOUR COSTS OF REBUILDING HOUSES AT MAIN À DIEU

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower. In view of the fact that Nova Scotia's provincial government has announced that it will make available $125,000 for materials to rebuild the houses lost by fire in Main à Dieu, can the minister give a general figure on what his department will offer toward the labour costs of rebuilding the houses.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Well, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the House the other day we are making special local initiative program funds available to Main à Dieu in view of the disaster which hit that community. Program officials have visited that community. There have been meetings on the problems. I cannot say specifically the amount of money that will be decided on. We want to stay flexible. I expect to see the projects and be able to judge them in a matter of a very few days. There will be substantial funding for that. The exact amount will have to wait until we assess all the projects.

* * *

FISHERIES

EXTENSION OF BREAKWATER AT MAIN À DIEU—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, although the main thing is housing, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Fisheries. I hope the minister will not feel I am bugging him too much on this matter. I wonder if he has made up his mind regarding our request for an extension of the breakwater in Main à Dieu, as a means of giving the small fishing community a needed lift at a very trying time?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I well understand the words the hon. member used in the interest of his constituents. I certainly recognize his efforts. The decision as to the possibility of reorganizing our schedule of work still has to be taken because most of the money which was committed for this present fiscal year involves contracts for which tenders have already been called. But we are trying to gather enough funds to advance this project. If I succeed I will let the hon. member know.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED MEASURES TO ENSURE EFFICIENCY OF COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport.

In view of the statement made this morning by the president of the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association

before the Minister of Transport that CATCA will not commit itself to accepting the recommendations of the commission of inquiry even if they are unanimous, if they support the use of French as a factor of air safety, will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the measure he intends to take to make sure that we shall not find ourselves at the end of the commission's meetings in the same situation that has prevailed over the last two weeks?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With the greatest respect may I say that question has a largely hypothetical element in it.

* * *

HEALTH

REASON FOR LABELLING ALCOHOLIC PRODUCTS AS DANGEROUS—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF RESEARCH STUDIES

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the skepticism with which spokesmen for several distilleries have greeted his department's plans to force beer, wine and liquor companies to label their products as dangerous, and in view of the conspicuous lack of success which a similar warning printed on cigarette packaging material has had in regard to smoking, I wonder if the minister could explain why he thinks such labelling will be useful in the case of alcoholic beverages?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I shall refer the hon. member to the statistics which were made public concerning tobacco consumption in Canada over the last few years. He will realize that his statement is, as usual, unfounded.

[*English*]

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, in view of the intention of the minister to expend public funds on this program in an effort to reduce the excessive consumption of alcohol, could the minister say whether the sociological, economic, political and philosophical implications of this program have been thoroughly researched and if so would he table the reports in the House?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lalonde: In answer to the hon. member's questions, I shall say that even spiritual studies have been made on this subject.

* * *

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

GOVERNMENT INTENTIONS WITH REGARD TO PERMITTING SENTENCES TO BE SERVED ON WEEKENDS

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. It is with regard to weekend jail sentences and prisoners not showing up. Superintendent J. M. Gillingham of the Headingley Correctional Institute, Manitoba stated that the four-year old federal program is a nightmare. Harold Gyles, Chief Judge of the Manitoba Provincial Judges Court has called on magistrates to stop handing out weekend prison sentences because they are impossible to administer. Has the Minister of Justice any plan to renew the weekend sentences program or is he preparing any legislation to rescind weekend sentences?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I understand there are press reports along the lines of the hon. member's question. I can say we have not received any complaints from officials about the operation of serving sentences on weekends. I have recently completed a meeting with the ten provincial attorneys-general at which sentencing was discussed as a specific topic on the agenda. This matter was not discussed or complained about at that meeting. Of course, if there have been complaints made from Winnipeg I will examine those complaints, but I think there generally have not been complaints. Such a technique where appropriate is a desirable one.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the Minister that the Winnipeg *Free Press* has conducted a study across Canada in consultation with the provinces. They all have the same complaint. The deputy director of the B.C. Correctional Institute stated he had been complaining for four years. Perhaps the minister would investigate this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

INDUSTRY

SHIPBUILDING—REQUEST FOR FLEXIBILITY IN SUBSIDY PROGRAM

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. There has been some criticism of the government's federal shipbuilding subsidy program by the president of the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association. Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce indicate what active consideration is being given to the proposals of the association in order to achieve a more flexible subsidy program, while at the same time providing much needed employment opportunities for some of Canada's unemployed.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I met last week with some of the authors of the particular submission to which the hon. member referred and indicated to them, and indeed as recently as this morning, that I was prepared to sit down with them again to try to figure out the kind of flexible program to which the hon. member has referred. In the meantime, I think it is fair to say that some accommodation has been reached with the shipbuilding industry, not entirely satisfactory, but nevertheless an improvement over the previous situation with regard to the disposition of the funds as provided in the current year's estimates, that is construction programs which are presently underway. The short answer is that we are in constant touch

with the association and its members and I feel the atmosphere is good. Certainly, my own commitment is to give them all the assistance we possibly can under the present circumstances.

* * *

INCOME TAX

LOSS ON EXCHANGE TRANSACTION BY CAMPEAU CORPORATION—INQUIRY WHETHER ARM'S LENGTH DEAL

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue of which I have given notice. In view of the fact that Campeau Corporation has either paid or reserved a $13.8 million exchange transaction loss on a 1972 $27 million loan from a Swiss lender, has the minister satisfied himself that this loan arrangement causing a potential loss of tax revenue to the Receiver General was and is an arm's length deal?

● (1450)

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in the interests of confidentiality we do not discuss individual taxpayer's situations or investigations which may or may not be taking place. I can only say to the hon. member that when we see transactions which are not at arms length, we consider them very carefully, but I do not think the hon. member would want me to comment on an individual taxpayer's return.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

POSSIBILITY OF MOTION APPROVING REPORT OF COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL—EFFECT OF FREE VOTE ON MOTION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport, and it is supplementary to the questions asked by the Leader of the NDP. To expedite proceedings my question is in three parts. First, did I correctly understand the minister's explanation in answer to questions to be that there will be a motion for approval of the commission report regardless of the conclusions of the report? Second, since everyone has said that this issue is a technical one involving safety, and since a commission has been chosen to hear and assess technical evidence in a very complex field, does the minister think parliamentary approval by a so-called free vote is going to help or hurt the resolution of this technical question? Third, is this unusual and potentially divisive procedure to be a precedent in all future labour-management problems involving federal public servants, or is it to be restricted just to labour problems in the federal field where bilingualism is an issue?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is no, the second question is clearly argumentative, and the answer to the third question is also no.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY IF CANADIANS ON AIR FRANCE AIRCRAFT HIJACKED IN AFRICA

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I wonder if the parliamentary secretary could tell us if there were any Canadians implicated or involved in any way with the Air France aircraft which was hijacked in Africa this week.

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I understood, the hon. member is worrying about Canadians who were on the plane hijacked to Uganda. To the best of our knowledge, unfortunately there are five Canadians involved, probably six. I think it would not be appropriate to give the names in the House, but I could do so in private to the hon. member. I wish to assure the House that the department immediately sent a telex to our High Commissioner in Nairobi, urging him to send an official to Kampala to discuss with the government of Uganda and to do his utmost to save the lives of those Canadians who, for the moment, appear to be safe.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

EFFORTS TO STOP NATIVES EATING FISH FROM WABIGOON AND ENGLISH RIVERS—SUPPLYING OTHER SOURCES OF PROTEIN

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the most unfortunate news that Minamata Disease has been confirmed in Canada, would the minister tell us what efforts he is making to stop the eating of all fish from the Wabigoon and English river systems which are affecting the Indians at the White Dog and Grassy Narrows areas?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that one case of Minamata disease has been identified in Canada. The individual concerned was sent to Winnipeg to pass more elaborate tests so as to proceed with a necessary extensive follow-up.

With regards to Indians eating this fish, there is an extensive education, follow-up and control program for them which has been in force for almost two years now. There is also the problem of sport fishing which is done in this area. My colleagues are to meet the Ontario ministers responsible for those matters in early July. I hope that the government of Ontario will agree to close completely this river to sport fishing.

[*English*]

Mr. Malone: In view of the dangers of Minamata disease, and in view of what we have witnessed in Japan, would the minister guarantee that he will stop the eating of all fish from that system and supply supplementary diets to

the people who require fish or other products for a protein diet in that area to guarantee that they will not be eating diseased fish?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I cannot personally stop people from eating the fish caught locally, but the Ontario government should absolutely forbid even sport fishing in that area. As far as we are concerned, we did advise people not to eat that fish. We have taken steps, with the collaboration of the Ontario government, to have fish from other areas available. Further, commercial fishing in these rivers should be forbidden. There remains, however, sport fishing, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Ontario government. Once again, I hope that in the future months, the Ontario government will take the necessary steps.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REASON FOR DELAY IN PAY ADJUSTMENTS FOR BIOLOGISTS

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board regarding the biologists in the public service. In view of the fact that the biologists concluded their agreement on June 30, 1975, and the minister in a letter to me dated May 18 said that he would undertake to make sure their pay adjustments were made to them up to the Anti-Inflation Board levels, can the minister advise why these people after one year have still not received the pay increase to which they agreed.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has indicated, we have decided to pay them as much as the Anti-Inflation Board will allow. However, if the cheques have not been issued, I shall inquire immediately and report to the hon. member, because, if I remember correctly, the decision has been taken along these lines.

* * *

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

MEASURES TO ENSURE UNIFORM APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS GOVERNING CARRY-ON BAGGAGE

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. On March 31 last when I asked the minister about the lack of uniform application at different airports of safety regulations with regard to air passengers' carry-on baggage, the minister indicated that it was not a serious question and declined to answer it. In view of the current surge of interest in the topic of air traffic safety, I would now like to ask the minister whether steps have been taken during the past three months to assure uniformity of application of safety regulations at Canadian airports.

[Mr. Malone.]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, what was not serious was the way the hon. member asked the question on the previous occasion.

Mr. Horner: That is not for you to judge.

Mr. Lang: The department, of course, is endeavouring to see that regulations are enforced in a uniform way.

Mr. Clarke: Can we now assume that ground security for air passengers will be applied, when there is an opportunity, in a uniform manner throughout Canada?

Mr. Lang: I think the hon. member may recognize that a certain human element may still be involved.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

AUTHORIZATION FOR PAYMENT OF FUNDS TO CROWN WITNESSES—SOURCE OF FUNDS

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General, and I gave him some notice of it this morning. My question deals with the case of Regina versus Palmer, in which a Crown witness received some $25,000 for testifying. Could the minister now advise the House by what authority those funds were paid out and by whose authorization those funds are paid out to Crown witnesses in cases of this kind? I accept the fact that there is difficulty getting convictions in these drug cases.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to get a precise answer to the question, but from time to time the RCMP and other police forces do pay informers for testifying in cases or providing evidence. In this particular case there is a dispute between a witness and the RCMP with regard to the amount paid, and that is going to court, so I do not want to comment on it any more. However, I will attempt to get more information.

Mr. Leggatt: While the minister is trying to find more information, would he determine whether the amount is $25,000 or $60,000, as alleged by the witness, and would he also advise the House as to the source of these funds in terms of whether those funds are directly from the public purse or another source the RCMP is using for paying witnesses in these kinds of cases?

Mr. Allmand: I know that in general these funds come from the public purse, and I approve a general amount each year for purposes such as this, investigation purposes, and so on. However, I will try to find out if there are other sources of funds.

[*Translation*]

STATISTICS CANADA

INQUIRY WHETHER MINISTER MET AUTHORITIES CONCERNED WITH LAY-OFFS—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Following the question I asked him on Monday June 21, 1976 concerning some forty permanent employees declared in excess at Statistics Canada, who will lose their jobs if they are not given other functions by September 30, 1976 and about whom I sent the minister some documents before the beginning of this sitting of the House, can the minister tell the House whether he has been in touch with the management of Statistics Canada and if so, what were the results; if not, when will he check on this matter?

● (1500)

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as soon as the hon. member asked me the question I did communicate and I have a response with me at the present time. As a result of certain documentation which the hon. member was good enough to send me today, however, I am not entirely sure that the two letters are consistent. If he will bear with me, I will have his correspondence of today checked out with the appropriate officials and give him a response probably in writing tomorrow.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST THAT APPLICATION OF NEW DAIRY POLICY BE POSTPONED PENDING BETTER SOLUTION TO PRODUCERS' PROBLEMS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Agriculture is absent, I shall ask my question of the President of the Treasury Board.

Considering that next month milk producers, particularly in Quebec, will perhaps have to pay fines of more than $15 million and considering also that the minister is aware of their demands and difficulties and that the new milk policy will result not only in difficulties but also in bankruptcies, is the minister in a position to urge cabinet to delay the implementation of the new milk policy? I have already expressed the view that it was advisable and that last week the Quebec Order of Agronomists recommended that this be done to enable both parties to find a more equitable solution.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Department of Agriculture is in contact with the APU, which is expected in Ottawa, I think, but we are not yet in a position to make an announcement on this.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REASON FOR TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS ON MEMBER'S PASSPORT

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. I received my passport this morning because I am going to travel in the fall. I notice it is stamped "invalid for travel to North Korea, Namibia, Rhodesia and Taiwan". May I ask the Acting Prime Minister on whose authority my passport was stamped to the effect that I could not travel to those four countries?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs was asked that question a few days ago and indicated he would shortly be making further information available on the matter.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

ALLEGED INADEQUACY OF HOUSING FOR ATHLETES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In light of the arrival of athletes in the city of Montreal who are to take part in Canada's Olympic games, and since it is now appparent that the facilities to house them are hopelessly inadequate, may I ask if the minister has consulted with his colleagues in the province of Quebec who are responsible for the Olympic Games with a view to examining some options that may be open by which the federal government could assist in bringing some additional facilities into service?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to entertain any representation from the hon. member indicating in a specific manner that the accommodation of the athletes in Montreal will be, as he indicated, totally inadequate. I shall be pleased to look into any representation from the hon. member.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

TABLING OF AMENDED TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO AIR TRAFFIC DISPUTE

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table two copies, in both official languages, of the amended terms of reference for a commission of inquiry and also a memorandum of understanding concerning the recent air traffic dispute.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the wide interest in the

documents the minister has just tabled, could there be agreement to have them appended to today's *Hansard*?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). This would require unanimous consent. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed, and so ordered.

[*Editor's Note: For documents referred to above, see appendix.*]

* * *

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that at the conclusion of the debate on C-68 there was agreement that the vote would be held at a time to be announced after consultations amongst the House leaders. It is my understanding that it would be agreeable to have this vote tomorrow evening at 9.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is that understood and agreed?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed, and so ordered.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

[*Translation*]

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,139, 5,165, 5,374, 5,489, 5,524, 5,536, 5,541, 5,654, 5,729 and 5,754.

[*Text*]

TRIP OF MINISTER OF TRANSPORT TO CALGARY FOR GREY CUP

Question No. 4,139—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Did the Minister of Transport visit Calgary on Grey Cup Day, November 23, 1975 and, if so (a) for what purpose (b) what are the (i) times (ii) locations (iii) persons involved in any meetings?

2. What are the (a) names (b) responsibilities of passengers aboard the Minister's aircraft and, in each case, were they on official government business?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes. (a) and (b) Inter-alia representing the Hon. Marc Lalonde at events connected with the Grey Cup.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

2. Yes. (a) and (b) Mr. Ralph Goodale, Parliamentary Secretary, Mrs. Adrian Lang, Special Assistant, Miss Marian Hooge, Special Assistant, Mr. Dale Verbeke, Special Assistant, Miss Judy Cedar, Special Assistant.

FIRE ALARM SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES IN GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Question No. 5,165—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Dominion Fire Commissioner address a letter dated February 6, 1976 to Mr. David Morley, a Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Board on the subject of concern on the part of Mr. C. A. Edwards, President of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, of fire alarm systems and procedures in government buildings?

2. Did the letter state in part "as a result of the fire protection equipment installed, testing procedures and training of personnel in government owned or leased buildings, we feel that the protection provided far exceeds that provided in the private sector for similar occupancy"?

3. What is a detailed description of the (a) testing procedures (b) training programme for personnel in government owned or leased buildings followed by the Dominion Fire Commissioner?

4. Is a complete descriptive list of all fire protection equipment installed in public buildings maintained by the Dominion Fire Commissioner and (a) if not (i) for what reason (ii) can the Dominion Fire Commissioner properly function without such information (b) if so (i) since what date has such a list existed (ii) can such a list be readily and immediately produced and made available for public scrutiny?

5. Do government owned or leased buildings receive inspections (a) for fire prevention (b) of fire alarm systems by the Dominion Fire Commissioner and, if so, how often?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. (a) Testing procedures for installed fire protection equipment are listed in the Fire Protection Engineering Standards of the Dominion Fire Commissioner. Copies of these standards are available from the Department of Public Works. (b) The training program for personnel in government owned or leased buildings is outlined in the Dominion Fire Commission Fire Protection Standard No. 14 and Dominion Fire Commissioner Guidelines for Phased Evacuation Training. Copies of both publications are available from the Department of Public Works.

4. No. It is not considered essential for the Dominion Fire Commissioner to maintain a list of installed equipment. (a) (i) The Department of Public Works, Property Administration Branch maintains such a list for maintenance purposes in all federal buildings; (ii) Yes. Testing of all equipment is carried out during the inspection of buildings; (b) (i) Not applicable; (ii) Such a list may be obtained from the Property Administration Branch of the Department of Public Works.

5. (a) Yes; (b) Yes, during scheduled inspection at five year intervals.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 5,374—**Mr. Reynolds:**

Did a drug shipment mailed to the Vancouver General Hospital disappear on or around March 11, 1976, while being processed through the Vancouver Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Post Office officials are not aware of such an incident.

PRESIDENT OF PRIVY COUNCIL—STAFF

Question No. 5,489—Mr. Cossitt:

1. What are the names, job designations and annual salaries of all persons employed in the office of the President of the Privy Council as of July 8, 1974?

2. Since July 8, 1974, what are the names, job designations and annual salaries of all persons who have joined the staff of the President of the Privy Council?

3. What are the names, job designations and annual salaries of all persons employed in the office of the President of the Privy Council as of the date this question was answered?

4. What is the date this question was answered?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): 1, 2 and 3. See following statements.

4. The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements. The President of the Privy Council assumed his portfolio on August 8, 1974.

			Appointed	Resigned
Champagne, G.	CR-4	$ 9,280—$10,146		
Church, J. S. C.	Executive Assistant	Up to $25,000		December 31/74
Dugal, J.	Special Assistant	Up to $21,000		May 1/76
Lee, F.	ST-SEC-04	$ 9,797—$10,715		
Monette, J.	ST-SEC-02 Bil.	$ 7,743—$ 8,462		February 25/75
Morin, L. G.	ST-SEC-04 Bil.	$ 9,797—$10,715		
Winkler, I.	ST-SEC-05	$11,043—$12,086		
Legislative Unit				
Cloutier, A.	ST-SEC-04 Bil.	$ 9,797—$10,715		April 1/75
Deadman, I.	ST-SEC-03	$ 9,239—$10,102		May 28/75
Labelle, J. D.	Research Assistant	$10,500—$14,500		November 28/75
Lay, R.	Research Assistant	$10,500—$14,500		
Millson, L.	ST-SEC-03	$ 9,239—$10,102		
Morris, D.	CR-3	$ 8,360—$ 9,136		November 1/75
Van Dusen, T.	Legislative Assistant	Up to $25,000		
Yanover, J.	Legislative Assistant	Up to $21,000		
(b) Public Service Appointments				
LeBoeuf, L.	ST-SEC-02 Bil.	$ 7,743—$ 8,462		
McNamara, T.	CR-3	$ 7,777—$ 8,499		
McDonald, L.	CR-4	$ 8,633—$ 9,438		

2. As of August 8, 1974. (a) Appointed under Subsection 37(1) of the Public Service Employment Act.

Bryan, W. L.	Special Assistant	Up to $21,000	December 9/74
Menard, S.	ST-STN-1 Bil.	$ 5,665—$ 7,877	February 26/75
Paget, D. D. A.	Executive Assistant	Up to $25,000	January 1/75
Wiebe, J.	GS-MES-2	$3.79 per hour	October 8/75
Legislative Unit			
Carter, W.	Legislative Assistant	Up to $21,000	December 2/74
David, M.	ST-SEC-03 Bil.	$ 9,239—$10,102	August 5/75
Haldorsen, D.	ST-SEC-03	$ 9,239—$10,102	May 28/75
By Contract			
Robert Anderson Associates Ltd.	Special Advisers—see replies to part 1 of Question 5,437		
Douglas Wilkinson	and to Question 5,454, answered May 31, 1976.		
Owen, V.	Technical Assistant, Broadcasting of Parliament		May 3/76
(b) Public Service Appointments			
Bates, K.	CR-2	$ 6,936—$ 7,568	February 10/75	February 2/76
Bialy, S.	CR-3 Term	$ 8,360—$ 9,136	March 25/75	
Lajoie, L.	A/CR-5	$10,532—$11,519	March 17/75	

3. Presently on Duty (a) Appointed under Subsection 37(1) of the Public Service Employment Act.

Bryan, W. L.	Special Assistant	Up to $21,000
Champagne, G.	CR-4	$10,394—$11,364
Lee, F.	ST-SEC-04	$10,532—$11,519
Menard, S.	ST-STN-1 Bil.	$ 5,665—$ 7,877
Millson, L.	ST-SEC-03 Bil.	$ 9,239—$10,102
Morin, L. G.	ST-SEC-04 Bil.	$10,532—$11,519
Paget, D. D. A.	Executive Assistant	Up to $25,000
Wiebe, J.	GS-MES-2	$3.79 per hour
Winkler, I.	ST-SEC-05	$11,871—$12,992

Order Paper Questions

Legislative Unit

Carter, W.	Legislative Assistant	Up to $21,000
David, M.	ST-SEC-03 Bil.	$ 9,239—$10,102
Haldorsen, D.	ST-SEC-03	$ 9,239—$10,102
Lay, R.	Research Assistant	$11,500—$15,500
Van Dusen, T.	Legislative Assistant	Up to $25,000
Yanover, J. D.	Legislative Assistant	Up to $25,000

By Contract

Robert Anderson Associates Ltd.	Special Advisers—see replies to part 1 of Question 5,437
Douglas Wilkinson	and to Question 5,454, answered May 31/76.
Owen, V.	Technical Assistant, Broadcasting of Parliament

(b) Public Service Appointments

Bialy, S.	CR-3 Term	$ 9,363—$10,232
Lajoie, L.	CR-4	$10,394—$11,364
LeBoeuf, L.	ST-SEC-02 Bil.	$ 8,324—$ 9,097
McDonald, L.	CR-5	$11,796—$12,901
McNamara, T.	CR-3	$ 9,363—$10,232

CANADA WORLD YOUTH PROGRAMME

Question No. 5,524—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. Who were the original organizers of the Canada World Youth Programme?

2. What is Canada World Youth's past and present arrangement with the government?

3. During the years in which Canada World Youth has been in operation, what (a) have been the sources (b) was the amount of its funding in each year?

4. Are there any provisions (a) to ensure that indebtedness incurred by the organization will be provided for (b) to guard against the participants being stranded in foreign countries or being subjected to undue personal financial loss and, if so, what are the details of such provisions?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): According to the Canadian International Development Agency, the answer is as follows: 1. (a) Prof. Pierre Dansereau, then Dean of the Faculty of Science, University of Montreal; (b) Prof. Frank Scott, former Dean of the McGill University Law School; (c) Prof. Léon Dion, sociologist, Université de Laval; (d) Mrs. Gertrude Laing, President of the Canada Council, Calgary; (e) Mr. Jacques Hébert, publisher and President of the Civil Liberties Union; (f) Mr. William Neville, executive consultant, Ottawa; (g) Mr. David Bartlett, Secretary General of the Canadian Commission to UNESCO, Ottawa; (h) Mr. Maurice Champagne, Vice-president of the Quebec Government Human Rights Commission; (i) Mr. Harold Baker, Director of the Extension Division of the University of Saskatchewan; (j) Dr. Michael Oliver, President of Carleton University, Ottawa.

2. The Canadian Government has for the past four years entered into an agreement with CWY for the financial support of the program of Youth Exchanges between Canadians and youth from selected developing countries.

3. (a) and (b): 1972-73, Secretary of State, $1,400,000; 1973-74, Secretary of State, $2,000,000; 1974-75, CIDA, $2,500,000; 1975-76, CIDA, $2,950,000. Estimated value of contributions by overseas governments in exchange countries—$600,000 per year. Estimated value of contributions by other Canadian governments, municipal administrations, agencies and private enterprises—$450,000 per year.

4. (a) The provision of a grant to CWY for its planned program for a fiscal year does not include the guaranteed provision of funds to cover indebtedness incurred by the organization. CWY is expected to work within the income constraints of its budget as presented to and approved by CIDA; (b) The CWY budget for each fiscal year includes funds required to recruit, prepare, send, support and return all Canadian and overseas young people to their homes and CWY staff are responsible for the administration of these activities. In the past four years, there have been no volunteers stranded in foreign countries and appropriate health and accident insurance is provided in order to avoid undue personal financial loss.

[Mr. Sharp.]

PROCEDURAL CHANGES RELATING TO SALES TAX ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS

Question No. 5,536—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. Is the Minister of Finance considering streamlining the complicated and time-consuming method of "proving end use" in respect to small parts and attachments, in particular, under the provisions of the Excise Tax Act as they relate to the application of federal sales tax on agricultural implements, parts and attachments?

2. Will the Minister consider the advisability of accepting the proposal of the Prairie Implement Manufacturers Association to either implement a system of annual or semi-annual exemption certificates to replace the present requirement for an "end user certificate" upon the sale of each individual part or attachment, or provide that the parts and attachments be unconditionally exempt from federal sales tax, having in mind that they are designed for farm purposes only and that they are being sold for use on tax exempt whole machines?

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. A number of officials of my department and the Department of Revenue Canada are currently involved in a review of the commodity tax

system, as announced by my predecessor in the budget of June 23, 1975. I would like to assure the honourable member that the use of conditional exemptions based on "end use" to provide sales tax exemption for agricultural implements, parts and attachments will be considered during this review exercise.

2. The proposals of the Prairie Implement Manufacturers Association concerning the use of annual or semi-annual exemption certificates to replace "end user certificates" will receive careful consideration during the course of the commodity tax review.

CRTC—NON-ESSENTIAL TELEGRAMS

Question No. 5,541—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. What is the policy of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission with respect to the sending of non-essential telegrams during a period of austerity?

2. Did the CRTC send telegrams in 1975 and, if so (a) how many (b) at what cost to the taxpayer?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): 1. It is the policy of the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) to send telegrams and/or telex only in instances where mail service is not able to meet prescribed deadlines as set out in the Broadcasting Act for interventions, etc.

2. (a) 8,600; (b) $31,000.

INCREASE IN OIL PRICES

Question No. 5,654—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. How much has the government earned through the successive increases of oil prices, in each year, since 1972?

2. What percentage of funds has been granted to oil companies for research and to which companies?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. This matter is dealt with in the second section of the report entitled "An Energy Strategy for Canada—Policies for Self-Reliance" (especially page 39 in the English version; page 48 in the French version). This report was tabled in the House by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources April 27, 1976.

2. The above report (page 145 of the English version and page 162 of the French) shows the federal energy research and development program expenditures for oil and gas were $10.5 million in 1975-76 and about $12.0 million in the current fiscal year. Some of these monies will be spent via grants to private industry for approved projects, but not necessarily by oil and gas firms.

ST. LAWRENCE ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK—ACQUISITION OF LAND

Question No. 5,729—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to negotiations presently under way by Parks Canada for the purchase of certain islands in the St. Lawrence River as additions to the St. Lawrence Islands National Park (a) are such purchases governed by the National Parks Act, Section 3(b) which states that such acquisitions can be made when "agreement has been reached with the Province in which the lands are situated that the lands are suitable for addition to a National Park" (b) in the case of each of the properties presently being acquired, on what dates was provincial approval received, from whom was it received and who received it?

2. If provincial approval has not been received for the acquisition of additional property for St. Lawrence Islands National Park, on what basis can the government legally proceed with acquisitions now in progress?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. (a) No; (b) Not required.

2. Section 6(3) of the National Parks Act, R.S. c. N-13 amended by 1974 c. 11.

UIC—CHEQUES NOT PICKED UP DURING POSTAL STRIKE

Question No. 5,754—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is the total number of unemployment insurance cheques that were cancelled, and claims closed, as a result of the fact that the cheques were not picked up personally during the last postal strike and (a) how is the total broken down by province (b) was any investigation conducted to determine how many of these might or might not have been fraudulent claims and, (i) if so, with what result (ii) if not, for what reason (c) did the Minister or any other senior official of the Unemployment Insurance Commission receive recommendations for an investigation into possible defrauding and, if so (i) on what date and from whom (ii) was no investigation carried out on the grounds of insufficient manpower to perform it?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned—Approximately* 1,520 warrants were cancelled as a result of the fact warrants were not picked up personally during the last postal strike and (a) total by province not available but by region is as follows: Atlantic Region (Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland) ($7,679.00) or about 40* warrants; Quebec Region (Quebec) ($110,428.00) or about 600 warrants; Ontario Region (Ontario) ($109,967.00) or about 600 warrants; Prairies Region (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta) ($18,814.00) or about 100 warrants; Pacific Region (British Columbia) ($31,709.00) or about 180 warrants.

---

*Number estimated by dividing actual dollar value of cancelled warrants ($278,597) by average bi-weekly benefit payment of $178. Actual count of cancelled warrants not extractable from general statistics.

(b) Yes; through the normal benefit control activity. (b) (i) Statistics resulting from subsequent investigation of those failing to report are not extractable from normal benefit control activity of the Commission and, therefore, specific activities in this regard cannot be reported. However, 3 possible prosecutions have been initiated, 1 in the Atlantic provinces where it is suspected that an employer posed as a claimant and 2 in the Pacific Region where two claimants did not report earnings while in receipt of benefits; (b) (ii) Not applicable, see (b) (i); (c) The Executive Committee of the UIC decided that all claimants who could not be contacted, or where there was a suspicion of fraud, should be investigated by Benefit Control and this was done; (c) (i) See (c); (c) (ii) Investigations were carried out; see (b) (i).

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,394 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 5,394—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What are the names of all lawyers in Lunenburg, Queens and Shelburne Counties who have been appointed by the government to handle all federal prosecution duties since 1968?

2. What is the amount of the salary, commission or consultants' fees paid to these lawyers by the Department of Justice, or any other department during the years 1968 to 1975 inclusive?

3. Since January 1, 1970, what lawyers in Nova Scotia were engaged by the Departments of Justice, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Transport and Treasury Board and what fees were paid to them?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

CONCURRENCE IN MOTION TO AMEND CUSTOMS TARIFF

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) (for Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) moved that ways and means motion No. 16, to amend the Customs Tariff, tabled May 25, 1976, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE IN MOTION TO AMEND INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) (for Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) moved that ways and means motion No. 17, to amend the Income Tax Act, tabled May 25, 1976, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE IN MOTION TO AMEND INCOME TAX ACT APPLICATION RULES, 1971

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) (for Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) moved that ways and means motion No. 18, to amend the Income Tax Act application rules, 1971, tabled May 25, 1976, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE IN MOTION TO AMEND EXCISE TAX ACT

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) (for Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) moved that ways and means motion No. 19, to amend the Excise Tax Act, tabled May 25, 1976, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS TARIFF (NO. 4)

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) (for Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-95, to amend the Customs Tariff (No. 4).

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

EXCISE TAX ACT (NO. 2)

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) (for Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-96, to amend the Excise Tax Act (No. 2).

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MARITIME CODE ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE A MARITIME CODE FOR CANADA

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-61, to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order with respect to this matter. Last Friday, at the close of the day, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) rose in the House and indicated that the order of business for today would be Bill C-61 dealing with third reading stage of the maritime code. In the course of the discussion objection was taken to that by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield). The discussion arose out of a matter raised in this House on May 31, 1976, when we were talking about the extension of hours of the sittings of this House. At that time the President of the Privy Council made a very definitive statement about the business of the House prior to the recess. I would quote from page 13976 of *Hansard* for May 31, where he said:

● (1510)

These six items, all except one of which has already been the subject of extensive debate, plus the budget resolutions and supply, constitute the government's program before adjournment. Unless some emergency arises—

I emphasize the word "emergency".

—the government has no other items which it considers essential to be disposed of before the adjournment. The parties may, of course, be ready to agree on the approval of minor housekeeping matters such as motions 33 and 34 under government business.

As I recall, the last two motions mentioned were concurred in. Reference has been made to Bills C-68, C-81, C-84, C-87, C-88 and S-35. Bill S-35 has been disposed of, and Bill C-87 withdrawn from consideration before the adjournment pursuant to a subsequent agreement. Bill C-84 is now before the committee, and we have agreed to vote on Bill C-68. But nowhere on this list of bills does Bill C-61 appear.

I know the minister may be in some difficulty with respect to calling bills on the order paper. Bill C-83 is before the committee and I suppose could be called. The President of the Privy Council had indicated, quite properly, that it would be unfair to call Bill C-83, which deals with peace and security, when Bill C-84 was still before the committee. It would have been particularly unfair to call it since members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs are considering Bill C-84 and, therefore, could not attend the House of Commons. I am not quarrelling about that. The government has put the House in a difficult position. We are asked to debate a bill which we had understood we would not deal with until later this year, perhaps in the new session.

There is also the matter of hours to consider. It was always the intention, when the agreement was made for extended hours of sitting, that we should deal with the package of legislation which had been mentioned. That package was arrived at as a result of careful negotiation carried out in the best faith on the part of House leaders. Yet at present we are asked to debate a bill which was not included in that package. Perhaps the President of the Privy Council has something to say to the House about further extended hours.

I feel that I must raise a point of order about the calling of Bill C-61. I regret very much that it is necessary to do so. It was the impression of the hon. member for Halifax on Friday, as reported on page 14872 of *Hansard*:

—that a list of certain bills was to be considered, and that Bill C-61 was not one of those.

His recollection was exactly right. It therefore appears that the government should reconsider the matter of extended hours and the matter of reinstituting private members' hours. I would not raise the matter if the government had forced extra hours on the House; but that is not the case. Exactly the opposite is true. Extended hours were arrived at by agreement on the part of all parties for the purpose of debating a particular package of legislation which did not include Bill C-61. Therefore, I wish to know what the government House leader proposes to do about the question of hours.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, some of the comments made by the House leader of the official opposition, and some comments made the other day by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), have a good deal of merit. When laying down the business for the remainder of this session, I admit, frankly, that I did not anticipate the sorts of difficulties which have arisen in the last few days. However, I do not believe that the calling of Bill C-61 is contrary to any undertakings I gave. Nevertheless, the members of the opposition may feel from what I said that I did not intend to call the bill again. At one stage, I think it is fair to say, I did not think I would have the opportunity to call it again.

What I said in the statement which has been read by the official opposition House leader is not inconsistent with calling Bill C-61, because I have no intention of pressing Bill C-61 through to completion unless that is the wish of all parties in the House. There is no other way in which that can be done. I want to make a couple of points of emphasis and clarification. I do not intend to call Bill C-61 after today because I foresee no occasion when it will be possible to do so.

It is our intention, if the necessary consent is not given, to call Bill C-83 tomorrow and Wednesday. After that we shall get to Bill C-84, which is the last remaining item on the government's list of business which must be concluded before we adjourn. It may be that consent will be given, in which case we would devote the time available to Bill C-84 and not to Bill C-83, because I do not think it will be possible to dispose of Bill C-83 before we adjourn unless we were to keep the House sitting, contrary to the undertaking I gave in order to dispose of it.

As to the extended hours, the House leader of the official opposition is quite right. The extended hours were agreed on for the purpose of considering certain business. Bill C-61 is not one of the items we intend to dispose of unless there is agreement on both sides. I do not intend to use any of the extended hours for the purpose of debating Bill C-61. Since on this day there are no extended hours, that question does not arise. I see no opportunity to call Bill C-61 again because the House will be considering Bill C-84, which must be disposed of, and Bill C-83 which can be called when, as expected, the justice committee reports tonight.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the minister speaks now, will he not close the debate?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He has just moved the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The minister will be making the first speech on third reading.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that I was opening the debate, rather than closing it, which I hope may be the case. I suggest that the exchanges between House leaders on the government and opposition sides challenge hon. members to see if they cannot pass Bill C-61 before the House rises for the summer. In the limited time available, I suggest it will be possible for hon. members to understand the purpose of the bill. Hon. members will recall that the bill had broad support on second reading. It was referred to committee without division, and apparently without dissent.

This bill is part of a large program for advancing and improving the law relating to seagoing vessels. Generally, it would institute a maritime code for Canada. It is but a

part of a massive step of legislative change which has evolved from elaborate consultations between experts from the various departments of governments and many representatives of the shipping industry and interested shippers. It is, therefore, in its bulk a very importance piece of legislation in a practical sense.

● (1520)

I will not go over the second reading debate and recall to mind the very important changes in regulations which are involved in it, such advances as being able to deal with the sistership in connection with matters that are involved in appropriate legal process, matters which members from all sides of the House indicated they received well and warmly.

I will want to refer a bit to the broad principle involved in relation to the coasting trade. However, I must start by drawing the attention of hon. members to the importance of the whole of our maritime industry and the advantage in our being able to proceed with it into law now. What has happened, however, is that two matters of controversy have arisen in connection with the bill. One has been fairly satisfactorily settled as a result of the work in committee. That had to do with the issue of the central registry. Certain changes were made in the bill to deal with that.

The other area of controversy, and much the more important one, relates to the coasting trade provisions which are contained in clauses 8 to 15 of the bill. A number of individual problems with regard to the coasting trade were worked out in committee. However, three concerns remained outstanding at the time the bill was reported back to the House. Since that time representations have been made to me and my officials by interested parties. Our reaction to those concerns may be expressed by reference to three possible amendments to the bill which I draw to the attention of hon. members as we begin third reading. These are changes which I do not see as fundamental because the independent and basic purpose of the bill as it went through second reading and committee was really in accordance with these changes. Without doubt, however, these changes should allay some fears as to how the bill might be applied or whether it might cause some problem in its application.

I recognize the procedural problems that we will face in dealing with possible amendments. However, I wish to set out before hon. members the types of changes that may solve some problems we have had, and perhaps also to elicit suggestions and co-operation in order to deal with these changes procedurally. The first area of concern expressed was in relation to the intercoastal trade between the west and east coasts of Canada where there is a particular interest in maintaining lower transcontinental rail rates, and the fear that these might be adversely affected by changes in the law. It is based on the belief that while the quantity of goods moved by ship is small and is likely to remain so, the fact of its existence or potential existence creates a balancing effect on rail rates.

At the moment, both Canadian and British-built British flagships enter the trade freely. Foreign-built British flagships may enter the trade on a waiver system which is complex and poorly understood. It is not proposed materially to alter the cost of bringing non-Canadian ships into this trade where necessary, but only to formalize it and to establish a tariff procedure which will be understood and easily accessible to shippers.

I have given assurances that the tariff charged will be fair, and will be seen to be fair by all interested parties through the formulation of the regulations before these sections of the bill are proclaimed. That the tariff will be reasonable is further assured by the legislation itself which, in section BI-13, provides for publication of proposed regulations and for inquiries. Under the provisions of that section I give the further guarantee that public hearings will form part of the inquiry.

The concerned interests have argued that there should be statutory exemption for non-Canadian ships in the intercoastal trade. There has never been such exemption in the past, and to give it now, when we are attempting to bring the coasting trade under general and reasonable control, would be a retrograde step. What there has been in the past has been an ability by order in council, under section 665 of the Canada Shipping Act, to suspend the coasting laws in specified waters. Such suspension has taken place in the past in crisis situations wich made it necessary to attract large amounts of foreign tonnage into the intercoastal trade for temporary purposes. The special problem of the intercoastal trade has always been borne in mind, and Bill C-61 makes specific reference to it in clause 8(5). This clause gives the same sort of power as was formerly contained in section 665 of the Canada Shiping Act, but with direct reference to the intercoastal trade.

In order, however, to give the fullest possible assurances to the intercoastal trade interests that the balancing effect of that trade will be maintained, and that the potential for specific exemption will remain, we are prepared to reinforce the provisions of clause 8(5) by removing by individual and specific orders in council, and to provide published regulations in the same manner as regulations under section 12. This will give the further assurance of the application of section BI-13 and, as with the section 12 regulations, I am prepared to state at this time that if objections to the regulations are raised, public hearings will from part of the inquiry.

By amending clause 8(5) and adding a further subclause (6), we will again be formalizing the procedure. That has certain implications with respect to the ability to react quickly in times of crisis, but I am assured that if such a crisis were to develop in future, the reaction to it could be accommodated under the emergency provisions of clause 11(4) at least until such time as formal regulations could be published and any necessary inquiry held. To accomplish this objective, clause 8(5) of the bill will be deleted and replaced with the following subclause:

(5) The governor in council may make regulations exempting from the application of this section and sections 9 to 14, during such periods of time as are specified in the regulations, the carriage by water of such classes of goods as are specified in the regulations, and towage, in either direction, between,

(*a*) ports or places on the east coast of Canada, the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence River or the Great Lakes, and

(*b*) ports or places on the west coast of Canada.

Clause 8(6) will be added as follows:

(6) Section BI-13 of the maritime code applies with respect to any regulations that the governor in council proposes to make under subsec-

tion (5) as if those regulations were made under a provision of that code.

The second concern which has been expressed and to which we feel we must respond relates to the limitations of licences to 12 months. Although such licences would, of course, be renewable providing the initial circumstances remain the same, they could not be renewed as of right. The purpose of the limitation was, of course, to ensure that if in a particular case circumstances did alter and Canadian ships became available at reasonably competitive rates, we would not find that that particular segment of the coasting trade was locked in to the use of foreign ships. That principle should be maintained as the general rule.

We are increasingly aware, however, that special cases exist, particularly with respect to developing industries where the transportation is only part of a package which must be arranged to cover a term of years. We feel that allowance must be made for that possibility, but it should only be done where the licensing body is satisfied that no reasonable Canadian alternative exists. In addition, the licensing body must bear in mind the future possibilities of a Canadian alternative, but only if it can be accommodated within the terms of the applicant's current necessity. These are delicate problems which cannot be prejudged here, but for which allowance must be made. Such allowance can only be made by allowing the licensing body a considerable latitude of discretion. We propose to do this by amending section 11 as follows:

● (1530)

(1.1) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Canadian Transport Commission may issue a licence pursuant to that subsection for a period specified in the licence that exceeds twelve months from the day on which the licence is issued where it is satisfied that contractual arrangements with respect to the use of the ship in the aspect of the coasting trade of Canada in which the applicant for the licence proposes to use the ship cannot be made for a period of twelve months or less.

The third concern deals with the definition of coasting trade in section 8(3) of the bill as including the carriage of goods and passengers from one port in Canada to the same or another port in Canada whether directly or by way of a foreign port. Except for the reference to "the same port", which was included only to fill what appeared to be a technical gap, the words "whether directly or by way of a foreign port" also appear in the Canada Shipping Act and over a period of many years no problem has been caused by their use. In the past, these words have always been interpreted in the light of international practice with respect to the clearing of ships to a foreign destination.

In spite of that, their appearance in this bill did cause some fear that there would be interference with the extensive cruise trade which has developed over recent years on the west coast and which involves the use of non-Canadian ships. Because of the great variety of passenger cruises that are operated in Canadian waters, we feel it is necessary to retain the words from the Canada Shipping Act, but in order to establish clearly that no interference with the generally recognized international practice is intended, we propose to amend section 14 of the bill, which is the one dealing with offences under the coasting trade provisions, as follows:

(2.1) Notwithstanding subsection 8(3), the master and owner of a ship are not guilty of an offence under subsection (1) where

(a) either of them has obtained a valid clearance in respect of the ship for a port outside Canada as the intended destination of the ship, whether or not it is intended that the ship will return to the port from which the clearance was obtained or another port in Canada, and

(b) it can be established that an essential purpose of the voyage is to carry goods or passengers to a destination outside Canada.

This amendment will allow Canada to retain a measure of control without interfering with international practice. The whole section, the purpose of the change, was really to avoid the technical visit of a Canadian coastal ship in coastal service at a foreign port simply for the purpose of getting itself outside the rule pertaining to service in the coastal trade.

These amendments have been put before a certain number of interested members who took part in the work of the committee, and I hope they will answer most of the questions and criticisms which have surfaced during the course of the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Hogan: Would the minister allow one question for clarification? Can he tell us whether there has been a definitive cost-benefit study with regard to the impact of the proposed changes as they relate to coastal shipping in the Atlantic provinces?

Mr. Lang: A study of that kind has not been carried out because it would be very difficult to theorize the changes in shipping practice which might follow from these amendments. It is important to appreciate that when this bill received approval, in principle, on second reading it did so, I am sure, with the knowledge that we were making a change in the rules in relation to coastal shipping which involved a change in regard to Commonwealth vessels, it is true, and their particular position, but that the general approach of the law was meant to remain unchanged, by and large. In other words, we are making the same reasonable provision for Canadian shipping so that it will not be subject to predatory practices by vessels of other nations which might at a particular point in time make it impossible for a viable Canadian shipping industry to continue.

To this extent, protection is enjoyed both by those who might man the ships engaged in Canadian shipping and also by the industry as a whole. Canada benefits to the extent that a viable shipping industry is kept in being. Suppose, for example, there was no Canadian shipping industry. We would be at the mercy of foreign ships, and at a time when adequate shipping facilities were short we would find ourselves obliged to pay whatever rates were demanded, however high.

This is not meant to be a protective bill in the sense that it would allow for unduly high rates to be charged by Canadian shipping, but it is designed to protect shipping interests reasonably against predatory shipping practices so that a Canadian industry can exist for the greater good of this country. This is an important principle and one which in the formulation of the bill was well understood, though it may now have been lost sight of.

In order to reassure those in the Atlantic provinces and on the west coast who have worried what the regulations might be under this measure, I indicated to the Atlantic ministers and to the western ministers that the fullest consultation would take place concerning the regulations necessary under clauses 8 to 14, and that these consulta-

tions would take place prior to the proclamation of those clauses. I also indicated that I would not want those sections proclaimed until there was a high degree of satisfaction with the regulations. I mean, therefore, to attempt to give every assurance possible, in addition to suggesting these three amendments, that the bill will serve as intended and not be an instrument which needs to be feared by anyone who is interested in the shipment of goods between the coasts or in coastal water either of the Atlantic or of the west.

I have put before the House three possible amendments. I recognize the procedural difficulty in which we find ourselves. These amendments can only be dealt with at this stage by consent. We could revert to the report stage or, with a certain amount of trust and confidence, they could be dealt with in the other place, or I suppose they could be dealt with by sending the bill back to committee for the amendments to be put in there. I suspect that the latter course would delay the passage of the bill unduly in present circumstances, and that the middle course would be unacceptable to some members of the House for a variety of reasons, although I note that some hon. members who might hold such views are not present in the House. I refer to the absence—very temporary, I know—of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

The proposal I would make, therefore, is that we find a way, by agreement, to consider these three amendments as being positive advances in the context of the legislation and of the debate. If, as the debate proceeds, we can agree to revert to committee or deal with the amendments by consent, I trust we will do so in the hope that this bill, upon which so much work has been done and upon which so much depends in terms of a great part of the regulations—and upon which, after all, even a continued sense of a Canadian coasting trade depends—might find its way into law.

I shall not make a formal proposal at this stage because I believe that consultation might be required to bring about an effective result. But I would commend those sentiments to hon. members: that we should try, before leaving the bill today, to incorporate these amendments so that some of the fears which have been expressed concerning the measure might be allayed.

● (1540)

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have just heard the minister make mention of three amendments. For purposes of wider dissemination of the nature of the amendments, I wonder whether they may either be appended to today's proceedings or be read into the record by the minister.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have read them into the record carefully. However, in addition to that I will ask for extra copies so that hon. members present can have them at hand while the debate goes on.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister accept a question?

Mr. Lang: Yes.

Mr. Stanfield: The minister spoke of assurances, and I know his concern for transportation in the Atlantic provinces. Has the minister received any statement from the premiers of the Atlantic provinces, or even from ministers purporting to speak for the premiers of the Atlantic provinces, to the effect that they were prepared to have the bill passed with the assurances given by the minister? What can the minister say in this House in regard to the position taken by the premiers of the Atlantic provinces, in light of the assurances he gave this afternoon and having given those assurances to the ministers?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, we have tried to have further meetings with the premiers or their representatives in recent days, but because of the transportation problem we were unable to accomplish this. However, I appreciate the hon. member's question. The maritime code was discussed at the last meeting of the transport ministers of the Atlantic region which I attended, and at that time the concerns of the Atlantic area were fully expressed. I gave the assurances that I have repeated today to the Atlantic ministers. The five ministers from the Atlantic region and myself then joined in issuing a communiqué that indicated approval of Bill C-61, these assurances having been received by the Atlantic transport ministers. I have since elaborated on those assurances because of the further comments made in other regions of the country.

Mr. Oberle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister have similar discussions with the premiers of the western provinces, and did he receive similar approval from these ministers of transport such as he declares to have received from the eastern ministers?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the matter was discussed at a western transportation ministers' meeting, but because it was more particularly of interest to one western minister—not alone, of course, but more directly of interest to one than to the others—it was not made the subject of a particular communiqué. I had the impression at that time that there was satisfaction. However, since that time communications from the British Columbia minister of transport have led me to reinforce the assurances and to indicate that there would indeed be no proclamation until the regulations had achieved a high degree of satisfaction in our consultations. I hope that, as a statement of assurance, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, relating to the choices that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) suggested a few moments ago. I understand that while I was out answering the phone he made an allusion to that fact, and he was absolutely right in what he said. It seems to me that it would be quite unfair to the members of this House who have studied the bill to expect these rather substantial amendments to be made in the other place, which in effect allows for no possibility of discussion here.

Therefore, I urge the minister to have some member from his side move, as an amendment to third reading, that the bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the standing committee so that the amendments can be made there. It seems to me that that is the fair and reasonable way of dealing with this matter.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will indeed be happy to do that as the debate on the bill proceeds if it appears that this will

have some real chance of allowing the bill to make progress.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased with the minister's answer to the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He seemed to receive favourably the suggestion that an amendment be moved to refer the bill back to committee for further study, and that would be acceptable to me. We intend, I think, to make a motion to that effect later in the debate.

In days gone by this would probably have been considered a rather unique debate. The subject of a Canadian maritime code has been around parliament for a number of years. We are presently going through what is, I think, the longest session on record, yet this bill came before the House late last November, was passed on to committee on December 8, and we find ourselves at this late date being asked to give unanimous consent to three substantive amendments to the bill. I think this is an indication of poor handling of House business on the part of the government. I do not have the committee proceedings for December 8 with me, but it also appears that a certain practice is becoming widespread in the House and in committee. I refer to the fact that the committee was urged by government members not to call witnesses so as to speed the bill through. This was back on December 8, and the bill received rather rapid passage through committee.

I would not accuse committee members of not being diligent, but because not as many witnesses were called as possibly should have been called, the government argued throughout the winter months with a former colleague of theirs, now a minister of transport on the west coast, as a result of which we now have conflicting reports from the ministers of transport or premiers of the Atlantic provinces in regard to this legislation, and I include the province of Newfoundland.

At one time the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) said that the Atlantic provinces were in agreement with this bill. However, when we contacted them they said no, they would not agree to it without further changes. The minister has now told the House that he is prepared to give his utmost assurance that clauses 8 to 16 will not be approved until everyone is completely satisfied with the regulations that are to follow.

The minister's words have been severely questioned. It took him a great deal of time and negotiation with another body before he was able to give any assurance at all. It behooves every member of parliament to take his job seriously, to pass legislation and to serve his constituents well. Certainly, we are not going to turn over those responsibilities to the minister, and we will not leave it to him to decide when he has the complete assurance of the interested parties in this matter, the shippers and shipping companies.

In addition to improving perhaps the maritime code, the minister has said that over the winter there was lengthy consultation with the shippers and shippees. A rather simple check on how much consultation was held would readily indicate it was not nearly as much as we were led to believe by the minister today.

● (1550)

We are told that this measure is important for the economy of Canada. The minister admitted a few minutes ago that at no time has there been a cost-benefit study carried out. We have also been told during other debates on transportation matters that the "user pay" concept is the new principle on which the minister is staking his reputation. Apparently he is going to make the user pay. Some days ago, during a debate in the House of Commons, I suggested that the user is deeply concerned about this new concept. The user believes this will cost him more money.

First of all, the bill tends to minimize competition. It suggests there may be a shortage of vessels and at times there may be an inefficient use of available vessels. The bill seems to suggest that Canadian raw materials or resource products may be moved by ocean liners to foreign countries for manufacture at cheaper rates than those applying to similar movements to Canadian ports. That seems to indicate an increased cost of finished goods. The bill also seems to point out that many foreign products will be in a favoured competitive position and may even replace some Canadian products because of the increased transportation cost to Canadian companies. All of these concerns have not been fully considered by the minister, his department or the transportation committee which studied this matter. I certainly agree with the suggestion that the whole matter be referred back to the committee where more witnesses can be called. Without having a net cost or net benefit study to determine whether Canada will benefit from this bill and the "user pay" concept, I think members would be derelict in their duty if they accepted the bill wholeheartedly.

The other aspect of the "user pay" concept is that we are led to believe this will develop a whole new Canadian merchant marine and increase shipbuilding in Canada. The minister suggests that the full implementation of the bill will not take place for perhaps five years. He says this will give some time for those Canadian ships to be built. I suggest that while some ships may be built by then—and I suspect that many others will still be in construction—losses to the industry, such as those that will take place through lack of improvements to the STELCO steel mills and the linerboard plant in Newfoundland, will be tremendous. The resulting loss in jobs, I suggest, will be greater than the increase in jobs in the Canadian shipbuilding industry and the coasting trade.

We must take a very close look at this bill. It is regrettable that we have reached this stage of the session having to go on the minister's assurances. Already he has had a number of amendments ratified by the committee. The committee ratified a whole host of amendments during its sittings, and we now have three more in respect of which there has been no consultation.

The minister suggested that the provisions contained in clauses 8 to 16 would not be implemented immediately. The whole question of passenger trade on the west coast has not been satisfactorily explained. We have not had a satisfactory explanation regarding the number of vessels in the coastal trade on the west coast of other than Canadian registry. A great number of these ships provide a service to many many Canadian centres along the west coast, and fears in this regard have to be considered as well.

For reasons best known to myself and a few others, I was not in attendance at the committee during its considerations following second reading. For that reason, I come to this debate with no bias of any kind. Not being from either the west coast or the east coast, I suppose I could go along with the passage of this bill. However, in view of the slipshod manner in which the government has handled legislation, with a heavy emphasis on transportation legislation geared for the next session, and in view of the determination of the minister to follow closely the concept of the user shall pay, there should be unanimous agreement to refer the subject matter of Bill C-61 back to the Committee on Transport and Communications. That committee should be empowered to call witnesses so that these many fears can be considered. Perhaps in this way we can have a new maritime code.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I want, first of all, to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) to the extent that he agrees that the amendments proposed by the minister should be referred back to the committee. In the event we have unanimous consent to do so, I believe it important that the committee consider that we do not want the bill locked up in committee until we are faced with another throne speech, resulting in the measure dying on the order paper. Let me assure you that this is one party which wants to see the principle outlined in Bill C-61, which of course is the principle contained in the Darling report, put into law before this session concludes and we begin another with a new throne speech. This legislation has been a long time coming. We are now getting to the point of developing a Canadian coasting trade and a Canadian merchant marine. If we continue to listen to critics all the time, we will never get the bill through.

One can always pick holes in a legislative measure. Let us not kid ourselves about this bill. It will cost money to have a Canadian merchant service. We should not try to have the best of both worlds. Let me state, straightforwardly and honestly, that this party believes the small additional amount of money that might be required, in terms of transportation costs, would be well worth it to provide an additional 40,000 jobs with the creation of a new industry. That is a principle we have not been talking about this afternoon, and I think we should get back to it.

Let me refer to the Darling report and some of its recommendations. Incidentally, those recommendations are largely contained within the provisions of Bill C-61. The main principle is that the Canadian coastal trade should be reserved for Canadian flag vessels. This would result in the employment of an additional 40,000 seamen and a refurbishing of the Canadian shipbuilding industry. This would also ensure Canadian sovereignty in our coastal and Arctic waters. This has become especially important now that we are moving toward a 200-mile economic zone off both our coasts. If we are to be effective in terms of maintaining our jurisdiction in those zones, we must have Canadian presence. We cannot maintain a Canadian presence simply with a few military aircraft; we must have Canadian merchant service ships in the 200-mile zone.

If you support that principle, surely you support the principle of Bill C-61. The other advantage in terms of the Darling report is the development of Arctic and offshore resources. Here again, the question of Canadian ships with Canadian men, which would certainly involve a price well worth paying in the event there are some additional transportation costs.

● (1600)

I wish to say a word about the coasting trade. The bill has always contained provisions for licensing in terms of the coasting trade. I was much surprised when I picked up the paper not too long ago to find that the Vancouver *Province* had a headline which said that the cruise ship business of British Columbia would be completely on the rocks in the event this bill is passed. I really think the editor of the *Province* has not looked at clause 11 of the bill. I am also wondering whether the members of the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce read the bill, or whether they just listened to Norman Hacking, the editor of the Vancouver *Province*. Perhaps they just had cocktails together and did not look at the bill.

Despite all the publicity surrounding clause 11, there is a provision that licensing can be provided in proper circumstances. I submit that in the bill there is no risk to the coasting trade of British Columbia. What has happened is that this kind of red herring has been floated, and everyone gets excited and loses sight of the principle behind the bill, which is to create a very substantial number of jobs for Canadians in a brand new shipping industry.

I notice that representatives of Burrard Drydock, which is interested in seeing a substantial increase in ship construction in Canada, were absent from the chamber of commerce. It is time we in this country started to act like a country and did things for ourselves, such as provide our own merchant shipping. It is all very well to use foreign bottoms in terms of our coasting trade, and to exploit cheap labour around the world in order to subsidize the multinational interests such as the Greek shipping interests and that small coterie of ship owners around the world who dominate freighter traffic, but we can do something in this country in terms of shipping. If we improve the working conditions in our own vessels so, also, will we improve the working conditions of men in vessels around the world. That, alone, is very important, because in a sense humanity is being exploited around the world because of the conditions which exist in international freighters. Surely, by doing something under Bill C-61, we could make a significant contribution in that way.

I note the complaints about the use of a central registry and the suggestion that the registration facilities be moved to Ottawa. What is being done as a result of the amendment is that, really, we are superimposing one level of bureaucracy over another. This is a difficult sort of Liberal compromise. They looked at the question in terms of the provision of services on the coast and listened to the complaints coming in: rather than discuss the matter with the people who know something about the question of registration, they left the registration in Vancouver and have created another office in Ottawa. The registration was perfectly satisfactory before they started tinkering with it.

I shall not take very long, Mr. Speaker, because our party is substantially in support of the bill. We have some concern, however, about the question of the referral back

to the committee to deal with the government's amendments. I would not be interested in giving unanimous consent if the bill was to be locked away in the committee. I do not want to see the bill referred to the committee and killed—because that could happen unless we are pretty careful.

I would hope that the amendments to be referred back to the committee would not be there for a long time. I do not see why that would be necessary, although I agree they require careful examination because they are not simple amendments. The consideration of the committee should be restricted to those amendments and should not include the entire bill. I hope, when we are giving consideration to the terms under which the bill would be referred to the committee, those terms do not include a general reference but merely a specific reference related to the amendments.

That being the case, I hope this House will see that the bill is reported back expeditiously, given third reading and passed, so that at long last we can give effect to the very worth-while, useful and intensive investigation carried out by Mr. Justice Darling on the coastal trade and so we can create a new industry for Canadians, some new employment and do something useful for the country in terms of nationalism as well.

Mr. Goodale: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a question asked by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) in connection with copies of the amendments which the minister indicated to the House earlier would be available. I now have copies of the amendments for members who may wish to look at them during the course of this afternoon.

Mr. McCain: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I presume these amendments will be distributed to all members who are here. If, by any chance, a copy of the speech is available, it would be nice to have it as well. The minister made a statement in his speech which indicated there was agreement among the transport ministers of Canada, Atlantic and federal, in respect of the principle of the bill. Was that meeting held after May 25 and 26, when the premiers met and expressed some objection to the bill?

Mr. Goodale: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, first of all, with regard to the copies of the amendments, I have made copies available to the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and I believe he will ensure that members of the official opposition will have copies available to them. Other copies are available at my desk for members who may not have them. Second, in connection with the minister's reference to discussions with the ministers of transport from the Atlantic provinces, I am not aware of the precise answer to the hon. gentleman's question, but I will determine that information for him later this afternoon.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to join my colleagues who have spoken in expressing my concern over the fact that this bill is before the House today. There is no question in anyone's mind that the bill was not to be brought in before the recess of parliament. There were very specific reasons for this when we negotiated with the government to have the bill withdrawn from debate in the House of Commons until the fall. The minister, of course, enumerated these reasons. The first was that this would not provide sufficient time for consideration of the bill or its implications.

● (1610)

The minister is not surprised that there is further objection to this bill, and that is why he indicated today that he might be prepared to refer the bill back to committee. Of course, he knows exactly why. On the surface this looks like a very innocent bill. When we consider the geographic make-up of our great land, it is our natural desire to establish a maritime industry. We are surrounded by three oceans. We want to establish industry in our country to put the thousands of unemployed to work and to give us a greater variety of options with regard to self-determination.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) said that a maritime code would be essential for the development of our Arctic resources, but at the same time he said that if we had a Canadian maritime industry, it would cost more. Is not cost exactly the component which is hindering the development of our frontier reserves? The hon. member proclaims that additional costs should be added. The whole thing does not make sense. There has not been a cost analysis of this bill; the minister knows that very well. Industrial expansion must obviously be our aim, but it should be attuned to our areas and industries of greatest potential. In the opinion of my colleagues on this side of the House, the expansion of the maritime industry at this stage of the game, particularly when we are working with significant advantages as a result of not having artificial barriers, is not in the greatest interest of any industrial expansion today.

We are asking ourselves: Why Bill C-61 at this time? The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) says that this bill is a filler which he wants to get through today. It is poor planning that he should be caught like that at this stage. This has been the longest session in parliamentary history, and the minister brings in a bill of this magnitude to get it through as a filler. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) was somewhat less than honest when he proclaimed in the House today that there has been general agreement between industry and governments throughout our country, particularly on the west and east coasts. He is even less honest when he says that he has the agreement of east and west coast officials. I would like to quote from a letter the minister wrote to the minister of transport in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. Goodale: That is a hopeless case.

Mr. Oberle: The Minister of Transport to whom the letter is addressed sat across the House from us and received support for years, and now he turns out to be a hopeless case. The reason he is not sitting across the House from us is probably quite apparent, because people on the west and east coasts are sick and tired of the way this government deals with our industry and transportation system. In his letter to the minister of transport of British Columbia, the minister said:

General satisfaction and acceptance of the proposed legislation have been clearly indicated at these meetings by the provincial officials, including the representatives of your Department, subject only to the

development of suitable coasting trade regulations to be made under the legislation when enacted and proclaimed in force.

The minister of transport of the province of British Columbia replied as follows:

The western premiers expressed the strong view that pending legislation to change the Canada Shipping Act (which would remove the freedom to use foreign ships for inter-coastal trade) should be delayed until such time as the Hall commission has reported.

In response to the minister's saying that there has been consultation and agreement, the minister from British Columbia said this in a letter dated April 30:

It is not true. I have personally been present when four western ministers of transport told you personally that they objected to the legislation. Officials of the B.C. department of transport communications have been under instruction, since the change of Government in B.C., that the intercoastal provisions of Bill C-61 were objectionable from our point of view.

Mr. Goodale: You missed the reply to that reply.

Mr. Oberle: Why the rush? The minister said on previous occasions that he would expect that all provisions of this bill would be declared by 1980. This country has traditionally been built on those two strands of steel which tie us together from east to west. Our east to west trade is the basic foundation of confederation. Were it not for these artificial barriers, Canadians certainly would have a legitimate interest in developing a maritime industry; but we do have these artificial barriers. We do have horrendous problems with regard to freight rates, which no one ever understands. Even the people who work them out do not understand them—and we create these artificial barriers to protect the centre from the west and the east, and so on.

The reason the minister agreed that the bill should go back to committee was that cost-benefit studies have not yet been made. We have pushed for such studies. Since this bill emerged from committee in December, many of my colleagues got together with industries and individuals who would be affected by the bill and, for our own purposes, conducted such a cost-benefit study. The results should be made known, not only here but in committee. Witnesses should be called and the bill should be discussed further.

Let us consider, for instance, what this maritime code would do to the lumber industry in British Columbia. We have access to foreign bottoms on the west coast of British Columbia. Most of the trade in the lumber industry is with eastern customers in the United States and eastern Canada. That is the main reason the lumber industry on the west coast has a competitive advantage over the lumber industry in the United States. The reason for that is that Canadian railways and American railways have to compete against ocean shipping through the Panama Canal. Whenever the freight rates in our rail systems get to a point where the industry can no longer remain competitive in the eastern parts of the United States, we revert to shipping through the Panama Canal. Canadian railways have always taken that into consideration and have adjusted their rates accordingly.

It is true that all the lumber, or most of it, still goes by rail, but the industry does have the safety valve that if the policy of "user pay" should ever be implemented—and that is the new, sexy phrase which has emerged in recent times—then we have that additional option. Bill C-61 would remove this option and render the forest industry in British Columbia no longer viable because freight rates would increase by at least 30 per cent, freight rates which are already the biggest component in cost to our customers in eastern Canada and the United States.

The United States railways also attune their rates to the competition of the Canadian railways. For that reason, the forest industry—which, incidentally, has a credit balance of $5 billion per year with regard to foreign trade—has this competitive advantage over that industry in the United States. The legislation in that country is similar to what is proposed here. When we consider the concerns of these industries, the "user pay" concept is simply not valid.

For the record, I would like to point out what has happened over the last five years whenever a shortage of ships was experienced at the west coast. Naturally, the railways have responded, when the rates on foreign ships have gone up, and have increased their rates over a five-year period by 22.2 per cent. Current rates for shipping via the Panama Canal, in Canadian vessels, are more than double the rates for foreign flag vessels. Our concern is exemplified by the fact that over the last five years lack of water competition has seen rail rates applicable to lumber and plywood to eastern Canada more than double, with particularly sharp increases in 1974, which reflect the railways' conviction that water competition for this business is not a factor.

● (1620)

Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage of foreign vessels and a shortage of business, and this has been demonstrated to me. I recall flying over the port of Vancouver last summer during the grain handlers' strike. There were many vessels lying there, charging $10,000 or $15,000 per day in demurrage to our wheat shippers. We have experienced a shortage of vessels on the west coast for shipping lumber products. This vacuum could be filled if we were to improve our capacity to build our own vessels which could compete against other shippers.

The hon. member for New Westminster would have us believe it is our responsibility to improve working conditions on foreign vessels, and that workingmen, no matter where they perform their duties, should have equal pay and working conditions. I agree that we have a responsibility in this regard, but I doubt whether this maritime industry would create the 40,000 new jobs hinted at in the Darling report. If we were to make it our responsibility to improve the working conditions of seamen in foreign vessels, I dare say we would price ourselves out of the market and lose more than 40,000 jobs in the lumber industry alone which are connected indirectly and directly to that important sector of our economy.

There is no way that we can allow this bill to proceed in light of the working conditions that exist in our country. That is what it will boil down to. We have already priced ourselves out of the market in lumber and wood fibre products, plywood and pulp throughout the world because of some of the extravagances we have practiced in regard to wages and social conditions without paying proper attention to increasing productivity. There have not been the technological advances in the last ten years or so that we saw in the early sixties, and as a result we have priced

ourselves out of the market because of extravagant schemes in the labour field for which we will pay dearly in due course.

There is no question in my mind that the United States will soon import lumber from other parts of the world. As we all know, there is a serious trade imbalance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. It is no secret that the U.S.S.R. and the East Block countries have developed a lumber and wood fibre industry as modern and efficient as ours, and it is no secret that some of our own technology which we exported there has helped. Anyone who has travelled in the United States and has talked to senators and other people who are concerned with this matter realize that they will react to our nationalistic and centralistic approach with serious competition in the not too distant future. If Bill C-61 were to come in by 1980, we would face this competition without the United States pressing for any artificial barriers against our products.

This bill should be amended, Mr. Speaker, and it should be tabled for a number of years. We cannot establish any more artificial barriers than we already have, and that is what would happen: artificial barriers would be created to protect an industry which would yet have to be created. Do we not already have enough industries that need subsidies every year? Does our transportation industry not already need to be subsidized? I wonder if it is the intention of the government to use this bill to get away from the heavy subsidies paid to the railways at the present time.

In an attempt to get a cost analysis of Bill C-61, I corresponded with officials of the department of transport and communications of British Columbia. I would like to quote from a letter signed by the minister on April 15, 1976, as follows:

> Obviously, Bill C-61 is a "protectionist" device which owes its origins, primarily, to pressures from the central provinces. It solves a problem on the Great Lakes vis-à-vis U.S. shipping. But it hurts in the maritimes and it is bad, bad news in B.C.

The letter continues:

> —a senior official with the federal Minister of Transport states that "with regard to section 11, considerable concern was expressed that Canadian ships would lose out to foreign flag ships because they may be non-competitive due to higher operating costs.

The industry which we are artificially creating, and which we already know will need a subsidy, is thus identified. I ask my colleagues and the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker: Who is to make up this subsidy? Where is it to come from? There is nothing left in the bucket. The industry cannot afford any more artificial, any more intervention or constitutional conflicts between the provinces and the federal government. There is just nothing left to give. The letter further states:

> —"Upper Lakes Shipping is extremely interested in becoming involved in this movement." ... Central Canada will build the ships, man the ships and own the ships. We, out on the west coast, will have to use them if they are offered at all. And the additional cost will be borne either by goods coming or going from British Columbia. The netback on our resources will be diminished accordingly.

That is the view of the minister in British Columbia who not too long ago sat in this House, across the floor. I suggest the reason he is not there now is that he recognized then what this government is trying to do. We do not wish to use the minister as an example; there has been a change in government and there has not been time to complete the analysis that was necessary for this bill to be seriously considered.

I have here a telegram that was sent to the Minister of Transport, who has said that he consulted the industry as a whole. The telegram, sent March 24, 1976, was signed by a number of coastal industries—the Council of the Forest Industries of B.C., the Mining Association of B.C., the B.C. Construction Association, the B.C. Chamber of Commerce, and the Vancouver Board of Trade. I should like to know which of the coastal industries in British Columbia the minister consulted. If these are eliminated, not many are left. The telegram begins:

> Representatives of major industrial organizations in British Columbia have met at short notice to consider implications of Bill C-61 for transcontinental shippers. Represented were—

The firms are named, and the telegram goes on:

> The meeting was unanimous in its concern for the effects of Bill C-61 on the level of freight rates for transcontinental shipments. Bill C-61 will eliminate intercoastal shipping as an effective competitive alternate to other modes of transportation. Competitive intercoastal service is an important factor in maintaining a well balanced and economic domestic transportation system. The bill must be amended to exempt shipping between Canadian east and west coast ports ... organizations will make submissions to your special study committee when they visit Vancouver, urging that section 8 of the bill be amended to provide full exemption for intercoastal shipping.

● (1630)

The industry's position is clear, and the minister has promised study sessions. I suggest that the eastern maritime provinces and the province of British Columbia would like to be assured that this bill will be sent back to committee for the study it deserves. I hope that we can hear witnesses and evaluate the problem, which is not confined exclusively to our coastal trade.

The position of the associated chambers of commerce of Vancouver Island is clear. Incidentally, I think the hon. member for New Westminster will support me when I say that Bill C-61 does not say that Canadian ships should be built in Canada. The Jones Act of the United States requires commercial vessels used in trade between U.S. ports to be of U.S. construction. Even if this bill passes, there will be no assurance that Canadian ships plying our coastal trade must be built in Canada. We shall still be able to buy ships anywhere in the world and sail them under the Canadian flag. This is not the case in the United States. I suggest that the United States Jones Act has been of advantage to the United States shipbuilding industry. While the American maritime industry is protected, we have derived some advantage from using foreign bottoms. Actually, Canadian goods travel more cheaply on American railways than do some American goods, because American railways compete with Canadian railways and Canadian maritime shippers.

May I advance a proposal for the committee to study and on which, hopefully, it will report back? My proposal is that the federal government should alter this legislation to enable us to protect ourselves against countries like the United States which have passed restrictive legislation in this area. Because of the U.S. Jones Act, our shipbuilders cannot sell their ships to the United States. Therefore, restrictions in the legislation should apply only to maritime states which have enacted restrictive legislation.

As the associated chambers of commerce say, Bill C-61 seems to be an extremely ambitious piece of legislation which will require a tremendous expansion in the Canadian merchant marine in a very short time, by April, 1980. Even though the minister may have suggested this is possible, I say he is dreaming. I do not think it is possible. For one thing, Canadian shipyards lack the capacity for expansion beyond our present fleet of three ships. There is nothing in Bill C-61 requiring the construction in Canada of Canadian flag vessels. The Jones Act in the United States, as I said previously, requires commercial vessels used in trade between U.S. ports to be of U.S. construction. The associated chambers of commerce suggest the following alternative which, if accepted, would accomplish what the hon. member for New Westminster was talking about, namely:

That the federal government enact legislation that would permit vessels of foreign construction to be used for commercial purposes in Canadian waters only if the nation of origin extends the same privilege to vessels of Canadian construction operating in that nation's waters.

I suggest that such a position would meet the wishes of the hon. member for New Westminster and fortify the Canadian shipbuilding industry. We ought to enact legislation which will protect us against nations which have already adopted restrictive legislation in this field. The legislation ought to be aimed only at such countries and not against those which have not enacted restrictive legislation. As the associated chambers of commerce say, such a provision would permit the foreign construction of ships to be used in Canada and would exert pressure on the U.S. for amendment to the Jones Act in so far as Canada is concerned. The associated chambers of commerce go on to say:

Prior to 1973, many Canadian craft, particularly in the fishing category, were sold in the U.S.—the closure, by the Jones Act, has hurt Canadian yards, while Canadians continue to purchase large numbers of U.S. boats (indeed the Canadian Coast Guard recently chartered the *Lumba Lumba* built in Erie, Pa., over Canadian built vessels). We feel that there should be some pressure exerted counteracting the protectionism inherent in the Jones Act.

Bill C-61 will exert no such counteracting pressure, a pressure which would protect our industry, expand our productive capacity and create jobs for Canadians. We could build ships and sell them to the United States, if the United States agreed to buy them. If they do not so agree, we could sell them to other countries. But we shall not sell to others if we continue following the nationalistic, isolationist path this government has laid down in areas such as communication, investment, and so on. Apparently we are determined to create artificial boundaries. After existence for 100 years we are determined, apparently, to be unlike any other nation. Our neighbour to the south will not look kindly to that approach; neither will any other country with whom we do business. Other countries will not look kindly on what we have done in the field of communications, foreign investment review and so on.

Canada is not alone in the world. Cartels are being formed, nations are banding together to exert greater pressures on commodities traded internationally. Trading blocs are being formed. Countries are co-operating together as large trading units in order to trade more effectively and compete. This is happening in developing and third world countries. Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to interfere with that process. We must find ways to ship our goods more cheaply and produce them more cheaply. We must bring under control the management of our fiscal policy which is totally out of line internationally. If this means we must create artificial barriers to recapture what we have lost—

[Mr. Oberle.]

Mrs. Campagnolo: Whose artificial barriers?

Mr. Oberle: Does the hon. member for Skeena (Mrs. Campagnolo), in whose constituency exists, potentially, the greatest coastal harbour in our country, not know what her constituents are saying?

Mrs. Campagnolo: At least my constituents are not taking orders from Aristotle Onassis' heirs.

Mr. Oberle: Their message is, "For God's sake sit on this bill." Don't let them do this to us. This is the time for opening our doors. If we keep going the way we are, we will continue to be five to six percentage points of inflation behind the rest of the world. We will have a much slower rate of recovery with regard to economic matters than any other country. We must ask ourselves what we have done about opening our borders, improving our productive capacity and steamlining our capacity to ship and communicate with other parts of the world in an economic sense. We are not doing that now, and we must.

● (1640)

There is one example that I am sure other hon. members will probably quote. On the east coast there has been a recent development with regard to the Sydney Steel Corporation. It illustrates precisely what will happen if this kind of legislation is put in place to protect a non-existent Canadian maritime industry in a way that is artificial and cumbersome. I quote from the *Chronicle-Herald* of May 4, 1976. Had Bill C-61 been in effect, Sydney Steel Corporation would have been forced to pay more than double the rate now in effect for shipping ore to the Sysco plant. I quote:

The "Canadian flagship only" policy proposed in the Shipping Act amendments now before parliament would have prevented Sysco from entering into a contract with a foreign-operated shipping line, in this case of Bermudian registry under the British flag... When the time came to renew the contract, Upper Lakes Shipping wanted to increase the basic freight rate from $1.15 per gross ton to $3, plus the costs (of the day)—

The demurrage was also to be doubled. It was possible for that company to make a deal with a foreign shipping line at $2 per gross ton, without an increase in demurrage charges. Had the provisions of Bill C-61 been in effect, this company would have been trapped. It is no secret to anyone here that the proposal for the increase in rates would not have been limited to $3, but would have probably been closer to $5 or $6 had the protection been in place. I am sure my colleagues will cite other examples similar to those in the lumber and wood fibre industry in western Canada. Therefore, we would be ill-advised at this time, when we have so much catching up to do, to allow ourselves the luxury of creating yet another white elephant which we would have to support.

In closing, I wish to state that I share a desire and a dream. In my opening remarks I referred to the geographic make-up of this country, the three oceans that surround this great land and how it would be desirable for us in the

future to look closer at creating a maritime industry of which we could be proud. That, however, must be done in a way that is attuned to the industrial strategy of our country. It must be done as a vacuum occurs, and it must be done gradually. This must not be like the implementation of the Official Languages Act. What happened with regard to that program would happen again if we went along with the minister on this proposal. To say that by 1980 we would have a maritime industry would be just like when we said that by 1978 or 1980 everyone in Canada would be bilingual.

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): We never said that.

Mr. Oberle: The minister says they never said that. There was certainly an attempt to do it. In any event, it is probably a poor example. However, if we ever do become bilingual in this country, and that is certainly the desire of all members of this House, it must be over a period of 25 to 30 years. The process should not be started in the hierarchy of the civil service in Ottawa or in the regional offices. We should start with the educational system in our schools. It is probably a poor comparison to make.

Mrs. Campagnolo: We are talking about ships.

Mr. Oberle: Hon. members are again aroused. Every time something like this comes up, the hon. member is reminded of the letters she receives from her constituency. Many people write to her saying, "For God's sake—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member is again skating at thin line. I suggest he get back to Bill C-61.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oberle: That is probably because of my seatmate who is such a great Canadian skater. I was merely trying to demonstrate that we are always on solid ice. We have to make a commitment. I am sure that all hon. members are prepared to make that commitment. However, we have to know what are the costs. We must establish a proper time-frame and it must be in conformity with the aims and ambitions of other sectors of the economy as well as individual Canadians. We must know what the costs will be and who will bear them. We must also find out where the subsidies are to come from. I am at a loss to know what additional costs any of the industries I referred to are prepared or, indeed, able to pay. In that sense, we are not against the establishment of a maritime industry. There have been shortages of ships on the west coast to ship wood fibre products. Possibly we should stimulate shipbuilding in Canada. However, we must not do that in a way that rules out selling these ships to other nations, or rules out access to other vessels in our ports.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) referred to the poor seamen who travel on these foreign vessels and come into our ports. If every country did what this country intends to do, those poor seamen would not have any jobs at all. I wonder if the hon. member has considered that. It is time we in this country examined what is happening here and around the world.

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

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member may only continue with unanimous consent. Is there consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Oberle: I appreciate the courtesy that has been extended to me. I was just making my closing remarks. I was pointing out that it is high time we examine what is going on in our country. Possibly we have been a little extravagant in according ourselves a standard of living that is out of tune with what other countries have accorded themselves. We may have priced ourselves out of the market with regard to foreign trade. We are faced with a trade deficit which will be very difficult, if not impossible, to correct. We are faced with a slow growth in the increase of our gross national product. We are not experiencing any real growth in the economy. Therefore, at this time we can ill afford to create another problem which will have to be paid for out of the public purse, or which someone else will have to subsidize.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles)—Finance—Proposal that capital gains tax not apply to sale of family farms; the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez)—Communications—Proposed use of balanced armature receiver by Bell Telephone—Request for delay; the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—External Affairs—Allegation Israel has stockpile of nuclear weapons—Government action.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MARITIME CODE ACT

MEASURES TO PROVIDE A MARITIME CODE FOR CANADA

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-61, to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be read the third time and do pass.

Maritime Code

● (1650)

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, this debate is probably most notable for the fact that among the ministers whose duty confines them to the House, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and his parliamentary secretary are not included. This, in my opinion, is regrettable. It is perhaps indicative of the attitude which the government has taken toward this bill from the day of its presentation. It is most unfortunate that this should be the case.

I want to go back for just a minute to the committee meetings which were held in respect of this bill as the standing committee considered the subject matter. Several people appeared as witnesses, though a great many interested people did not appear. I think it is important that I should quote some of the things Mr. Gralewicz, for instance, said with respect to questions which were directed to him. He was asked what would be the effect upon other industries if this bill were to be made law in the form then before the committee. He said, in part:

As I said, I have never made this study. I would not know. However, the bulk carrier ocean-going vessel could not compete with lake carriers because the 730-foot lake carrier can carry umpteen million tons where the other one could not. So we would not be, we shall say, competitive.

I think we know that Mr. Gralewicz is the president of the Seafarers' International Union. With him that day was Mr. Nuss, who was counsel for the Seafarers' International Union of Canada. Some of the questions were referred to him. He said, with respect to the bill:

If there is to be a distribution of wealth in order to carry out the policy, that is what parliament is here for. That is what should be done. No matter what we do in Canada there are other places in the world where it can be done cheaper whether it be manufactured goods or transportation. We have to decide as a country that it is not merely a question of what can be done the cheapest which counts but also a question of policy that it should be done by Canadians.

I do not quarrel with the statement that it should be done by Canadians but, Mr. Speaker, what I would point out is that both Mr. Gralewicz and Mr. Nuss recognized that this is a program which cannot be introduced without government recognition of the total package. This is what the government has failed to do. I want to quote Mr. Gralewicz again:

Subsidies are given to the airlines and subsidies are given to the railroads. Why not a subsidy to the other mode of transportation which is water transportation?

But this is not being considered. He also said:

I could not compete if I were a shipowner with the airlines which are subsidized or the railroads which are subsidized unless there is some form of subsidy or some form of relaxation given, maybe on the Seaway tolls or whatever. I do not know what they need.

He asks, again, for recognition of the fact that government has a responsibility to bear in the form of assistance if this bill is to become law. It was suggested during that committee meeting that there were people whose jobs were going to become marginal as a result of the decrease in net returns which might accrue to certain coastal industries. It was in respect of this approach that Mr. Nicholson, the national vice-president of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and General Workers' Union, said:

Yes, I think I agree, but actually no Canadian, whether he is a worker, in management or anyone else, should be required to make an unfair or disproportionate contribution to the economy. He should get some realizable and beneficial gain from the economy. I think we are just talking about ways of doing that.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

That is what we were talking about, Mr. Speaker—an opportunity to give to the Canadian seamen a part of that which is due to them from the Canadian economy. But again, there must be recognition of the fact that it cannot happen by itself, by legislation alone. In response to a question I put as follows:

As we transfer that movement of freight to the Canadian ownership under the Canadian tax structure does this not damage the competitive position of Canadian owners and seamen in the area?

Mr. Nicholson responded as follows:

That is what I meant when I said there should be a cost-benefit analysis in this particular field. And there has not been.

This is Mr. Nicholson, speaking for the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers. I repeat his title because I think it imperative that the government and the people of this nation should understand that as the unions presented their case in connection with this bill, in every single instant they recognized that it could not happen by itself, that it might require study. To quote Mr. Nicholson again:

I think as a result of that cost-benefit study the government might well be in a better position to decide what financial arrangements have to be made and whether they are justified.

Now I would like to turn to the president of the Dominion Marine Association, as he appeared before the committee with his group of supporters. He was asked about the competitive costs of Canadian ownership of ships and the Canadian purchase of Canadian-manufactured ships in respect to cost to a Canadian purchaser or a foreign purchaser. This is what he said:

Oh yes, I see your point. You are speaking now of the STAP, the export plan, under which a foreign person can order a ship built in Canada, get our 17 per cent subsidy and get cheap money under the Export Development Corporation plan, which we cannot get. So you are right. That ship would cost the Canadian more than it would cost the foreigner.

It is, therefore, imperative that the government should recognize this additional cost to the owners and operators of ships who will take this position under this legislation. We have a certain class of Labour Code in Canada and it is not comparable to any other. Mr. Hurcomb, president of the Dominion Marine Association, said with respect to this:

No, I think by and large the other nations did not fall into this pitfall. They recognized the special case of the seagoing industry, of the water borne industry. I know of no other country which has the same kind of legislation applicable to its shipping industry.

Mr. Speaker, here is another handicap which we must consider. Admiral Porter, who was also appearing before the committee, is executive director of the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association. I put this question to him:

As a manufacturing structure, can you supply a Canadian shipping industry on a competitive basis at the moment or are there going to be subsidies and financial considerations required to make them competitive?

In reply, Admiral Porter said:

I think that a factor here is, of course, that every other country subsidizes its industry, and if Canada is to be competitive I suppose we have to do likewise. Perhaps I might just read you an excerpt from a study which was done by a European consulting firm. This was a study done in 1973 entitled "Shipbuilding Credits and Government Aid". This ia a quotation from it:

"Most countries today are providing financial assistance either directly for construction operating and interest subsidies or in the form of special taxation, depreciation and concessions or by financial guarantees. The OECD secretariat estimates that for 1970 the cost of government support for shipbuilding was about 12 to 15 per cent of the cost of ships or in the order of $650 million to $750 million. This is obviously only an estimate as the great variety of systems and the interconnections between the various forms of government intervention make it difficult to assess accurately the amount of government aid given to shipbuilding. Of the quoted amount, direct construction subsidies accounted for about $250 million. The various other forms of assistance, i.e., taxation relief, finance for investment, reorganization and research probably account for a similar amount."

● (1700)

We do not have the expertise developed here, but we have the opportunity to develop it, so that those who have been successful in Canada do not find it necessary to import certain of their requirements. The assistance given by Canada for exporting ships may amount to one or two percentage points of interest rate. On a boat costing anywhere from $20 million to $30 million, that one or two percentage points amounts to a lot of money. Should, then, the government continue in its present policy of giving a subsidy to those who purchase boats from abroad, giving them cheaper interest rates, which in turn puts the foreign-owned, Canadian-built vessel in a more competitive position than the Canadian-purchased, Canadian-owned and Canadian-operated vessel?

What I want to point out is that in every aspect of the presentations made to the committee on transportation, recognition of government subsidy was given. Whether it was the shippers, the seamens' union, the railroad union, the operators or the manufacturers of ships, all recognized that Canada had to be prepared to put money into the pot if the policy was to be successful. Let me repeat what I said when I spoke last on this matter in the House. When the unions made their presentation to the in-camera meeting at Halifax, they went so far as to say that if the government of Canada had to provide the boats to the operators, it should do so.

I am no less in favour of the principle of this legislation than was the hon. member of the New Democratic Party who spoke a few minutes ago, but I am concerned that we do not trade the devil for a witch. Some of the presentations made to the government never did get to the committee, and most of those who made representations came away dissatisfied with what they heard.

The minister has given us today an outline of certain permissive opportunities that enable the government to do certain things with this act. I wish it to be noted that in every instance, except only the one relating to a penalty clause, things are done at the discretion of the government, since in the second line of the amendment we find the word "may". This is what nearly every businessman has been complaining about in this legislation. The businessman has asked the government to spell out in its legislation precisely what will and shall be done under this act. It should not be put in permissive form, that a group of individuals within the structure of the Department of Transport "may" make decisions. These decisions will in the main be made by people who have never in their lives paid a freight bill, who never in their lives have run a business whose viability might hinge totally upon whether or not it could afford the transportation costs. That is why this must be given proper consideration, Mr. Speaker. No amendment to the bill to date has recognized that it may be necessary that the industry be viable both on the water and on the land.

I think it important to read into the record the press release issued by the Maritime Council of Premiers following their meeting on May 25 and 26 held at Charlottetown, P.E.I. They had this to say on national transportation policy:

The Premiers reaffirmed their position that transportation systems should be used by governments as positive tools for the attainment of national and regional objectives. They noted that over a year ago, the federal Minister of Transport had agreed with this policy, but they stated that despite the federal government's agreement with their position, there is an alarming lack of hard evidence that transportation is, in fact, being used as a positive development tool. Indeed, there are examples of just the opposite.

Bona fide consultation is required between governments to ensure that transportation is used to help rather than hinder economic developments. The premiers expressed concern that the federal government is increasing cost recovery within some transportation systems without considering the effects of this on the over-all economy. Consultation between governments should first establish regional economic objectives, they said. Then the undue reliance upon user pay concept should be replaced by the vigorous pursuit of cost effective solutions to these objectives.

They also commented on passenger service, but for the purpose of this debate I will skip that section. With regard to ports policy, which is an integral part, of course, of any maritime code that we might establish, the communiqué said this:

The Premiers expressed support in principle for the federal proposal to introduce a new port administration policy aimed at providing greater autonomy for our major ports. They commented that this is something they have been advocating for some time as they believe it will result in greater efficiency. However, the proposal put forward by federal officials lacks sufficient detail for them to draw definite conclusions as to its true merit. More specifically, the financial aspects must be better defined. For example, the financial performance of maritime ports will undoubtedly be compared with other ports when determining future investments. In making this comparison, consideration must be given to the cost of non-port activities required to keep ports operational. As an example, the fine natural harbours of the east coast require little of the expensive dredging and ice breaking that is required to keep the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes' ports operational. It may be felt that the development of inland ports is a desirable national goal, and that these substantial expenses should be undertaken in pursuit of such goals. However, Atlantic ports must not be penalized by defining artificial boundaries within which "cost recovery" is vigorously pursued, while ignoring real and substantial costs outside those boundaries.

I think the suggestions of the maritime premiers in these minutes of their news release are very pertinent. There are expenses not considered part of the cost of transportation in some areas of Canada, yet these expenses are in fact part of port expenses.

Let me come now to the coasting trade, and I again quote from these minutes:

The Premiers expressed concern that the safeguards required to protect regional industries against high transportation costs which would result from the removal of Commonwealth shipping in the coasting trade do not appear to have been adequately provided in either the new act or proposed regulations. The Premiers said that at a meeting of the Council of Maritime Premiers and the Premier of Newfoundland with the Honourable Jean Marchand in September, 1973, it was announced that Canada would withdraw from the British Commonwealth Shipping Agreement and reserve coastal shipping to Canadian flag vessels. At the same time, assurance was given by the federal minister that safeguards would be introduced to protect region-

al industries against high transportation costs. The Premiers today are sending a telegram to the Honourable Otto Lang urging him to permit the use of non-Canadian vessels according to the dictates of availability and cost. This is essential to enable maritime industries to benefit from one of the region's natural advantages.

● (1710)

The minister has said that the ministers of the Atlantic provinces pertaining to transportation are satisfied with the principle of the bill. As I am satisfied with the principle, so are they. But they are not satisfied with the realities of the bill, not with the regulations which they have seen once and on which they have met once. They have requested further meetings, through members of that committee, when they were discussing other transportation problems in Ottawa. No second meeting has yet been called to consider those regulations, or if it has been called it has been very recently and they have not as yet met.

When the area heard that this bill was to come back on the agenda of the House of Commons, the phones began to ring, because we had assurances, which we extended to the various interested parties in the Atlantic area, that this would not be brought forward again until the fall. The Atlantic area felt it would have an opportunity to make presentations to the government during the summer, or some opportunity while it was before hearings of the Senate or if it should go back to the House committee. They did not have an opportunity to present their case at the committee hearings which were held before. Certain individuals or groups have made presentations to the government and have been unable to obtain satisfactory replies.

One industry which was very deeply concerned, for instance, was the linerboard plant in Newfoundland. It wished very sincerely to give the government the position in which it would find itself, and that position is very serious. Yet it has not been possible to negotiate a firm position for these people so they may be sure they can obtain foreign charters to hold the costs in line with what they can afford. They are transporting hundreds of thousands of tons along the coastal areas of Canada, and any change in the rate which may accrue as a result of this measure will put a very heavy burden of expense on that industry. The figure it used was $400,000 in one instance.

These people have expressed concern. They believe, for instance, that the bureaucracy of the Department of Transport will control the destinies of a large number of industries in respect of waivers; the shipping industry will not offer their ships for charter in Canadian waters if there is no certainty of a definite term or a reasonable time for charters. This is the type of boat they have been using. It is all right to make all kinds of aspersions, casting them at Onassis and other shipowners on a worldwide basis, but I do not think that will help the case of the coastal industry which depends upon international shipping markets.

They are also concerned about the effect of this permissive, or enabling type of legislation with the changes in policy that can take place. They are concerned that it will not be the minister, but members of the staff who may not be familiar with shipping costs of a particular industry, who will make the decisions in respect of what these industries will pay for the cost of transportation. These people expend approximately $20 million for coastal transportation. That is a pretty large sum of money. If you spend $20 million for water transportation and your rates go up at all, you are then talking big money. A 1 per cent increase of $20 million is $200,000, and a 5 per cent or ten per cent increase, which is anticipated, might put these people completely out of business.

[Mr. McCain.]

Their concern is that the apparent benefits of the bill to the whole of the Canadian economy might well be offset by the detriment to their companies. The government has not justified that the bill is in the public interest. Members of these industries have attended meetings of the in-camera committee held in Halifax. There have been several meetings along that line, and the same answers have been received. Their comment is that the bill has never been changed substantially as a result of these meetings, and that the most notable government concessions was given in the minister's letter to Jack Davis that the government will not restrict waivers to one year. We already know there are those who must plan for 20 years for the development of this country, and there is a need to have assurances that there will be specific guidelines. Certainly the linerboard plant is among those who must look a long way ahead in the future. That is just one industry.

I must say that I am deeply disappointed that it has been the choice of the leader of the government to bring this bill back. As I mentioned earlier, the people in the Atlantic area had been advised, as a result of the statement by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), that this bill would not be back before the fall. They had gone back to mend their fences and prepare their presentations to put before the government or, they hoped, before the committee which was to study this bill further, either in the House of Commons or in the Senate. It was with great consternation that they received the word that this bill would reappear at all.

I appeal to the government and to the minister that the cost-benefit study that was urged by the unions, by the shipbuilders, by ship charterers and by the coastal industry, be undertaken, and that under no circumstances should this bill be put before the House of Commons again until we can have a reasonable measure of its effect on the coastal industry of Canada. It should not return until the minister can lay upon the table of the House a document showing what effect it might have on any industry in Canada which has had the benefit of water competitive rates. It should not be returned until such time as a Canadian shipowner can buy a Canadian ship as cheaply as a foreign shipowner can buy a Canadian-manufactured ship. It should not be returned until such time as the minister can advise this House that the government is prepared to accept the responsibility, which belongs at the government level, to subsidize transportation by water to the degree that it will not disrupt basic coastal employment in Canada.

It is the fear of Canadians that these industries will no longer be viable if they have a severe increase in transportation costs. We need a definite answer. We cannot have more permissive legislation which will be interpreted, on a daily basis, as government policy on a particular day when a particular application appears before the government. This is what the industry fears. The industry wants spelled out a foundation on which to do business. This is not

present in this bill. It is not even present in the regulations which, again, have discretionary powers and which give the decision-making not necessarily to the ministry. This will give to other people the authority to decide at a given moment in time that there is an unemployed ship in Canada and the industry must employ it regardless of the cost. This decision can be made under such enabling legislation as we presently have before us. These are assurances for which the minister has plenty of time to obtain answers and to respond to those who are going to pay the bill.

● (1720)

Again I state, in an unqualified way, that I wish Canada had a Canadian merchant marine. However, in an equally unqualified way I say that this is an item of national concern which must be paid for by the nation. As the union members have stated, clearly it should not be paid for by any particular group of people such as those presently employed in the coastal industries. These items must be spelled out and answers must be given before Canada or any part of Canada should give favourable consideration to such a piece of legislation which could have such a tremendous impact upon employment in coastal areas as well as in areas which are not coastal.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I, along with some other members, am reluctant to have this bill pass at this time for reasons which have been stated. However, what is much more important, I am opposed to this bill because I do not think it would do the things that have been recommended in the Darling report and in the other two major maritime reports, namely, the building of a merchant navy in Canada for our coastal trade, or the building of a shipbuilding industry in Canada which has been neglected for a period of years.

When this bill was before the committee there was discussion to the effect that if we were to implement a Canadian shipbuilding industry and a totally Canadian flag coastal trade, considerable expense would be involved to the shippers in the maritime areas of Canada, particularly on the east coast. I think that is a fact. If in a short period of time we were to re-establish our shipbuilding industry to build the type of ships that are necessary for the coastal trade, there would have to be a considerable capital expenditure in that industry, particularly if we were to eliminate the cheap labour and the improperly equipped ships which are now plying our coastal trade, especially on the east coast. There should be a considerable increase in the cost of moving goods on that coast.

I think we should realistically look at the problem in a much broader sense than we have up to now. If we were to establish in the maritimes a shipbuilding industry which would meet our Canadian requirements, which would have a capacity, as well, to meet our liner trade which is a trade that would enable Canadians to ship Canadian goods on international waters, this would provide employment in the maritime areas where unemployment is exceedingly high and where I believe the ability exists to build that type of ship and to provide that type of employment.

In terms of employment and the capacity of people in the shipbuilding industry to buy goods and services in other parts of the country, I believe this would have a very large effect on the economy of Canada in general. Also, I believe in the maritime areas we have the type of people who would be able to man those ships, who would provide a large maritime core that could be employed on a long-term basis. This would eliminate much of the problem which exists on the coast at the present time in respect of the issuance of licences which enables any fly-by-night operator to move into that area, obtain a licence and compete unfairly with other carriers simply because he does not have to pay the wages or meet the standards we have in Canada.

I was very surprised when the Liberal members of the committee and also the minister paid little attention to the requirements of the Canada Labour Code in respect of any ships operating under either permit or licence in the coastal trade. It seems to me that in the Canadian coastal trade, where we move goods from one port to another, if we do not have the ships to carry that coastal trade and offer a licence to a foreign ship or a permit to a Commonwealth country engaged in that trade, we at least should insist on the Labour Code being applied in respect of those ships so that scab wages do not apply, so that our normal safety requirements apply, and so that Canadian standards apply in order that damages do not occur such as those which obviously have occurred in respect of foreign bottoms which are not sufficiently safe to ply in those waters. I could mention the accidents which have taken place. Probably the people in the maritmes are well aware of the fact that some of those disasters are still causing difficulty in respect of insurance and because the companies which own those ships are not able to meet their liabilities under Canadian law.

The government has said that in implementing the first section of the maritime code, and in fact the first two of a series of five studies which have been commissioned and undertaken, we are providing for the development of a Canadian flag in coastal trade and are eliminating many of the abuses which have taken place off our coasts in the last few years. They have not. I think the fact is that nothing will happen under this act which has not happened in the past.

We have agreed that the Commonwealth countries will be phased out over a period by means of a grandfather clause, and that those who were issued permits who previously were doing business in the coastal trade will have their permits extended for a period of five years under that clause. If a person goes to a maritime area and is unable to ship his goods at a reasonable price in any available Canadian ship or Commonwealth ship, and can prove that such a ship is not available to carry his goods at a price, then he will be able to apply for a licence which will enable him to use a foreign ship which would be exempt from any of the regulations we would normally apply to any of our own ships on that coast.

Unless the Canadian public is willing to see all the advantages of having a Canadian shipping industry, and all the advantages of having a Canadian shipbuilding industry, as well as the advantages which would accrue to the Canadian public, we will always find great reluctance by shippers on the coast of Canada to ship in Canadian bottoms when there are other bottoms they can obtain that will carry those goods at a cheaper price.

● (1730)

There are few people who have said that they would like to establish a Canadian flag fleet on our coastal waters if it were going to mean that the communities there would have to pay the total price of having those ships and Canadian crews operating in competition with foreign vessels. Most people are well aware that if we in Canada are going to enjoy the advantages, we will have to pay the price. Obviously considering the moneys and benefits we would receive from having our own shipbuilding industry again, and from having the capacity to go into international shipping as the need arises, there has to be a price tag, but I think the Canadian people would be willing to pay.

I was very surprised that the government in this bill did not at least have the Canadian Labour Code attach to all ships. We are well aware of the fact that there are Koreans, Portuguese, those flying under the Panamanian flag, the Liberian flag and all the other flags of convenience who are receiving very low wages. By the standards of this country they are paid considerably less than our minimum standard. These people are working in conditions which are well below the standards demanded in Canadian ships, which include standards for the safety of the crew, the safety of the ship, navigation facilities, and all the other requirements. Yet the government was not willing to apply that section of the Labour Code which would have ensured that any ship operating under Canadian licence would have to meet the Canadian labour standards. That would have provided Canadian operators with the opportunity to compete on a more equitable basis with the foreign ships of convenience which are now often in the coastal trade of Canada.

There are problems which would develop from having a totally Canadian owned shipping industry. Restrictions often have odd effects, and one of those effects would be on the west coast where large cruise ships are going up and down the coast between the mainland of the United States and Alaska. They call at ports in British Columbia, mainly for convenience, and pick up passengers at one Canadian port and drop them off at another Canadian port, or pick them up at a Canadian port and drop them off at the destination of the ship. This service is operating and would obviously have to be an exception until we are able to develop a replacement coastal service.

No one objects to small exceptions, but I think it is a shame that we are going to operate on the basis of licences which will not be the exception but which will be the general rule for much of the shipping in the coastal area. We are going to issue those licences without demanding that any Canadian requirements attach to them. I think this is the weakness of this legislation. It has been hailed by many as a step in the right direction, and I think it is. By this legislation we will be able to overcome some of the problems we did not have when designations of terms were used. For instance the word "ship" has now been applied to things like floating derricks, oil drilling rigs, and other facilities which are now used off our coasts. They are not necessarily self-propelled and are not movable in the sense that the term "ship" had previously been used. I think this is really worth while.

In this legislation we have eliminated the very stringent requirements there were under the Arctic waters protection legislation in which we demanded that all shipping be totally under the control of Canadians, and also in which anyone operating in that area must do so by applying all the protection Canadians demand of themselves, and that things like Canadian standards must apply to crews in that area as well. It seems odd, in looking at the Arctic waters protection legislation, that we as members of parliament were faced with a new problem. We were faced with a problem that was very young in nature but was growing very rapidly and was of considerable importance to the economy of Canada. The Arctic waters protection legislation was designed in such a way as to give maximum protection to Canadian interests in an area where Canadian interests are of primary importance and where already there were a number of other interests likely to have a continuing effect. I think that really is the direction we intend the new Maritime Code to go.

We want to protect a Canadian industry which, in effect, we do not have at the present time. We want to develop a capacity, which we do not have at the present time, for the building of merchant fleets, and at the same time we want to establish sovereignty and nationalistic aspirations. These are some of the considerations anticipated by the general public, but I am sorry to say that in my opinion these objectives have not been met. Many of them have been written in such a way that they will be considered at a later date, and many of them will be considered far into the future when the situation may have changed drastically.

We are often very dependent on the economic factor rather than on the Canadian sovereignty position most Canadians now want. I am thinking of one instance in which a ferry was going to Newfoundland. The ferry ran into difficulties, and we brought one in. We were able to operate it on a lease basis much more cheaply than we could operate our own because of the wage factor and other considerations. There was great reluctance to go back to the system we had before, and there was a great desire on the part of many people to retain that service which appeared to be cheaper to operate than our own Canadian service.

I think everyone will agree that we do not want to add to the cost of maritime transportation a large sum for developing Canadian Sovereignty, but I think there is a large benefit to be obtained from developing the maritime industry, the shipbuilding industry, and the coastal trade industry. That would provide us with the possibility of developing an international capacity, something which we gave up a long time ago.

It is interesting to consider what some other people have done. Most countries in the world have decided to have a capacity of their own to deliver their export goods, no matter where those goods may go. The Arabs have bought many tankers and have a capacity now which they did not have a few years ago. They decided to buy this capacity simply because they wanted a guarantee that deliveries would be continuous and that those operating the ships would not be able to hold them up for ransom. This was also true of the United States and of almost all other countries, and there is a great desire on the part of the newly developing countries, the Third World countries, to

develop for themselves the capacity to move their goods to market in their own ships.

● (1740)

Many countries signed a United Nations resolution; indeed about 80 per cent of the countries concerned with shipping signed it but Canada did not. One of the reasons was consideration of the economics of developing our own facility rather than buying it from those in the business of selling transportation. This has produced in Canada, as elsewhere, the large lobbies that I think have been very influential with our civil servants who were largely responsible for developing this legislation. The bill is really only a modernization of some existing legislation, and has not come to a legislative decision that we are to have a Canadian shipping industry and navy.

There are those who contend it is not possible for Canada to develop a maritime capability, but it should be remembered that during the last war Canada was able to handle about one third of the world's shipping mainly through the Liberty ship program. There was no other way to move our goods across the ocean. But it was surprising how the friends of C. D. Howe decided shortly after the war that there was no place for Canada in international shipping. The ships were sold to Onassis, and some of them are still plying the seas and coming into Canadian ports. We have the ability, Mr. Speaker. There is an immense amount of unemployment in the maritimes but I am sure people still have the skills and the facilities necessary to build ships that would be needed for a Canadian coastal trade if such were included in this bill.

While we are getting rid of the grandfather clause we are in effect eliminating the Commonwealth preference within a five year period but we have not done anything to get rid of the licence that would permit foreign ships, Commonwealth or otherwise, to ply the waters off our coasts. That is unfortunate because I think we are ready to go into that ourselves. We should also give consideration to the next step, international trade. We could buy tankers to move some of our oil. I see the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) in the House and I am sure he will remember the time when we faced a great shortage of oil and hired a tanker to bring oil from western Canada to eastern Canada. Nobody was too sure whether the ship could stay afloat, it was in such poor shape, but we had to take a chance because there was no alternative. I do not blame the government in that case, but I think it is a disgrace that a country with one of the largest coastlines in the world should not have one tanker.

About a year ago I spoke to the engineer of a tanker which was lying at Freeport. He indicated that it had not been to sea for six or seven months and was going into drydock for refit at a cost of $1½ million. He did not think there was any advantage in putting it in drydock because he did not see any future for that relatively small tanker. The tanker's last trip had been to Quebec City in winter, bringing oil from the Caribbean. The engineer was of the opinion that Canada could get a real bargain in that tanker and a number of others that were lying offshore. They could be used in emergencies if we needed them. There was nothing wrong with this particular tanker that $1½ million would not correct, but it was too small for international trade.

Some members may be surprised to learn that Japan has on the drawing board a tanker capable of carrying a million tons of oil, and already there are a number of ships on the high seas capable of carrying half a million tons of oil. This small tanker that came into Quebec City is available if our government should see fit to buy it. However, we have not made the decision to develop a merchant navy.

Workers in the area of maritime trade will be interested to see if we take the step of ensuring that the Canada Labour Code applies to every ship that is issued a licence to participate in our coastal trade. I do not know whether the government believes that Canadians can compete, but I believe they can and that they have proven it in the past. If people are employed at a dollar an hour on a foreign ship under a flag of convenience while Canadians demand $4 or $5 per hour for the same job, not many shipping companies would be willing to compete. We should demand that companies operating under licence comply with the Canadian Labour Code and I would suggest that they also carry the Canada Labour (Safety) Code.

I do not come from a coastal area, Mr. Speaker, but from inland—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Land-locked.

Mr. Peters: Not quite land-locked. When I have a new riding under my jurisdiction it will have the only salt water port in Ontario.

Most of the sailors who were part of the Canadian merchant navy during the last war and those who manned the naval ships, came from the prairies. They had never seen salt water in their lives.

This country has an extensive coastal area and most Canadians acknowledge that shipping is important to us if we are to be competitive in export trade. I think most Canadians would agree that it is desirable to establish a Canadian merchant navy and international fleet, and to do so we must start with our coastal areas. We have now established a 200-mile fishing limit and are talking about establishing the continental shelf as the edge of our fishing zone but, Mr. Speaker, we do not have ships that will go out that far. We have, under the Canadian flag, three or four ships registered which are capable of going to the edge of the continental shelf. We should develop additional capacity in this field.

● (1750)

I strongly urge the referral back to committee of this bill. We should require the Canadian Labour Code to apply not only to ships of Canadian registry flying the Canadian flag but to ships operating under permit in our waters. This provision should apply to Commonwealth ships and to foreign ships operating in Canada under the permit-system. Nothing less will satisfy Canadians who want to see the Canadian merchant navy flying on ships plying our coastal waters and the oceans of the world.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, one should not be surprised at the manner in which this bill has been sneaked back into the House, despite previous undertakings. I suppose that this sort of thing has become part of our way of life around here. Certainly it is par for the course for the government to

make an undertaking and then renege on it later. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), having raised this matter by way of a procedural point of order, I shall let the matter rest. However, I do wish to indicate that I was disconcerted and distressed by the sudden re-appearance of this bill since I had given certain undertakings on the basis of assurances given to me earlier this month that the bill would not come back. I gave an undertaking to a variety of interests on the west coast that the measure would not re-appear, would not be called again, before our rising for the summer.

With the coming of summer the tourist industry on the west coast became concerned in case the provisions of this bill should damage or disadvantage the tourist trade on the west coast. For example, there was the fear that under the terms of this legislation tourists would be unable to embark either at Vancouver or Victoria, proceed on a tourist cruise into the South Pacific or the Caribbean, return, and disembark at Victoria or Vancouver, or wherever they had embarked. I say this because the existing language of the bill made it seem that such cruises would be part of the coastal trade.

As well, another queer sort of procedure took place which I still do not understand properly. Certainly it went beyond any of the procedures of which I have been aware in the House. I am referring to three informal meetings to which members interested in this bill were invited. Actually they were notified of the meetings. The meetings were not in camera but there was no record kept of them. Members concerned about and interested in the provisions of this bill were given the texts of amendments which the government was planning to introduce to clarify ambiguities in the bill. I could not then understand why unanimous consent of the House was not sought for returning the matter to committee to permit the amendments to be made. However, the House has now heard the terms of certain amendments.

I do not know when the initial philosophy behind Bill C-61 was developed; perhaps it was before my time in the House, and I have been a member for about four years. As I recall, when we examined the bill in February and March, it was found that a number of amendments needed to be introduced to correct problems connected with translation, for example, and careless drafting.

Although this bill has been before the House for a long time, three more substantive amendments have been proposed in an unusual way. When we attended the meeting with officials in the West Block, we were handed copies of the amendments and of the regulations, and enjoined not to show them to anyone. Why they were offered to us I do not know. Why were they not brought forward in the House? Surely it was most unusual to propose the three substantive amendments in the manner followed this afternoon. The minister read them into the record. I am glad he did so, because he at least removed from them the aura of confidentiality with which they were clothed when they were first shown to us. Some who were more conversant than I am with the rules and practices of this House had wit enough to pass these amendments around to certain people. If I may call it six o'clock I shall continue later, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It being six o'clock I do now leave the Chair until eight o'clock later this day.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, when I called it six o'clock I was referring to the extraordinary practice of letting us have copies of these three amendments which were read into the record this afternoon by the minister, along with the injunction that they not be transmitted to the interested parties.

As I was also saying before six o'clock, there are those who are more familiar with the customs and practices of this House who sent these amendments to the trade in order to secure some reaction. I did not do that until this morning. On learning that the bill was coming forward, I felt it was high time that I had the opportunity to get some reaction from the provincial authorities and the shipping interests on the west coast who had expressed concern because these amendments deal with three matters: intercoastal trade, the licensing operation, and operations in the tourist trade.

Having had the text of the amendments passed to us and having been told not to circulate them, I intended to consult with the interested parties during the summer. However, as the bill was brought back very unexpectedly today, I felt I should get the amendments off, together with the regulations, because we have another draft of the regulations.

The regulations, of course, are another matter. If I am not mistaken, one copy of the regulations has already gone out to the provincial authorities. I am not sure whether the second set has gone out. Admitting that they are draft regulations, they are being fed out for reactions to see if they fit the need. This is being done because there is a tendency here, at the centre of things, to get a sort of tunnel vision. We sometimes cannot see some of the implications that are readily noticeable when the provinces, tourist trade, or shipping concerns look at the regulations and apply them to the jobs they have to do. Therefore I was going to consult the trade again when I went back to the west coast.

I believe that the matter of consultation is very important. In answer to a question put to him the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle), I got the message, although I have not checked the blues to see if my impression is correct, that the minister is satisfied that the western provinces have agreed to these various amendments. I have had within recent date correspondence with the minister of transport of the province of British Columbia that suggests otherwise. He has suggested that there should be time to consider the whole matter, particularly the amendments that are brought forward.

● (2010)

In this connection I should like to read a letter, of which a copy was sent to me, from the minister of transport and communications of the province of British Columbia, dated April 30, indicating just how much consultation there has been between this government and those who are interested in this legislation. The provincial minister, Mr. Jack Davis, who of course is a former colleague of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), refers to a communiqué which was issued by the western premiers in April dealing with Bill C-61. In that communiqué the western premiers had this to say:

> The Western Premiers expressed the strong view that pending legislation to change the Canada Shipping Act (which would remove the freedom to use foreign ships for inter-coastal trade) should be delayed—

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, "should be delayed".

> —until such time as the Hall Commission has reported.

The Hall Commission, so far as I am aware, has not reported. To pick up the letter again:

> This is in line with the views which the four western ministers of transport expressed to you—

Meaning the federal Minister of Transport.

> —orally in Edmonton two months ago. It also reiterates in a very general way the concern expressed by a number of ministries in western Canada about the generality of Bill C-61 and the fact that exclusion of inter-coastal trade by regulation is simply not good enough.

This may be the purpose behind one of these amendments. I pick up the letter again:

> I was surprised, of course, to receive your letter of April 14th, 1976 in which you—

That is the Minister of Transport's letter.

> —say that "relevant clauses of the Bill have been reviewed at meetings between the federal and provincial governments. General satisfaction and acceptance of the proposed legislation have been clearly indicated at these meetings by the provincial officials, including the representative of your department.

That is a quotation from the letter of the Minister of Transport to the minister of transport for the province of British Columbia. To pick up the letter from the provincial minister once more, he says quite bluntly:

> This is false. It is not true. I have personally been present when four western ministers of transport told you personally that they objected to the legislation. Officials of the B.C. Department of Transport and Communications have been under instruction, since the change of government in B.C., that the inter-coastal provisions of Bill C-61 were objectionable from our point of view.

They are pretty solid objections. Obviously there is some sort of foul-up in the consultations between the Minister of Transport and the provinces. I speak only for the west; the same may apply in the east for all I know. I do not know whether the Minister of Transport came back from the consultations with some misunderstanding, but there is certainly every need imaginable for referring this bill to the committee and for calling witnesses to speak to the substantive changes, if only to satisfy these well formulated objections.

For example, in one of the amendments—and this could cause concern—having to do with clause 8(5) of the bill, the governor in council "may make regulations exempting" certain classes of goods. The governor in council is given no mandatory power there. If there is good cause for these regulations to be made exempting from the application of this provision the carriage by water of certain classes of goods, I think that should be clear and the provincial ministers should be given the chance to come here to speak, or to send their representatives here to speak on their behalf, to these proposed amendments.

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I personally want to see a Canadian merchant marine. I have said this in the House on more than one occasion. I feel we need it, and the reasons are fully outlined in my intervention on second reading last March. They have also been outlined in my contributions in the twenty-ninth parliament. However, I cannot carry this wish to the point of failing to hear what problems are likely to arise if we are to establish a merchant marine without consulting those who are concerned. In view of the contradictions that are all too apparent in the correspondence between the Minister of Transport and the provincial minister of transport, I think this caveat on my part is well grounded. It is most important that these apparent differences be resolved; indeed it is essential that they be resolved. This can no longer be done on paper since obviously correspondence between the ministers leads to misunderstandings and absolute contradictions. Therefore it has to be done in committee, and I hope that my colleague from Capilano, who will next have the floor, will be able to move the required amendment.

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, as I enter the debate on third reading of Bill C-61 it is still a mystery to me why the government has not accepted the advice that has been given during the many hearings and presentations the bill has received over the past several years. It has been submitted that national policies aimed at developing a merchant marine and a shipbuilding industry should be kept separate from policies governing the transportation of goods. If we in the province of British Columbia have one serious reservation about the implications and aspects of Bill C-61 it is just this, that we are mixing the transportation of goods with our transportation policy, with potential spin-off effects which can be extremely detrimental to the economy of the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, and also the Atlantic provinces.

I listened with attention to the minister's presentation today and I compliment him on being calm, cool, and very rational. He made several points that we have understood from the many communications he has sent out across the land to people who have been studying this bill, but one of the matters that has caused a backlash in the province of British Columbia so far as Bill C-61 is concerned is this: various interested groups—I speak of the Board of Trade, the B.C. Chamber of Shipping, the B.C. Council of Forest Industries and the B.C. Chamber of Commerce—groups that have a dedicated interest in the future of their business, have not received courteous attention from the staff of the minister or his parliamentary secretary as they were not invited before the committee during committee stage. Why this has happened I do not know. On going back into the files I find that all of these organizations in British Columbia submitted briefs to the former minister of transport, and resubmitted and supplemented them to the incumbent Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang).

● (2020)

There is a situation that has developed in British Columbia in which we do not trust the government in Ottawa any longer in its desire to rule by regulation. There are too many examples on the record of rule by regulation favouring some and not being applied uniformly across the land to all the interests competing in the same arena.

West coast interests have been on the record with the two ministers since 1973 in this regard and, as I said, not one of those interests has been invited to appear before the Committee on Transport and Communications during its deliberations and study of this bill. The minister has gone to a great deal of trouble to circulate a whole series of telegrams and letters he has received from various interested groups in Canada who are in favour of the passage of Bill C-61. It is very interesting to note that of all these letters and telegrams that have been circulated, fundamentally from the unions and the guilds in the Great Lakes region, none that I can see comes from anyone outside that group of unions and corporations in the Great Lakes region. This is the region that supports Bill C-61 as it is presently written.

I notice also, and I guess this adds to the feeling of distrust we have out west, that none of the other submissions have been circulated by the minister to give a fair view of our concern in British Columbia. This is the group of organizations and associations which co-ordinate the interests of the people and employees in British Columbia. They are concerned about the spin-off and detrimental effect to our markets and to the rising costs that we are facing in transport of goods to market, and in the transport costs of the goods we receive from the Atlantic provinces.

I might say that the B.C. Council of Forest Industries put in a specific request to meet with the committee. The committee was out in Vancouver studying the port of Vancouver. It sat three days there and visited the port and the airport at Seattle, yet at no time did the B.C. Forest Council receive an invitation to appear before the committee. Why is that when it has had briefs prepared and its concerns have been expressed most clearly in telegrams and letters? That council has not been given the chance to put its positions specifically on the record. I hope I am able, in the time allotted to me tonight, to do just that for that council.

That council was also advised by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) in this regard, and I will read his letter into the record. This is a letter sent by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni on House of Commons letterhead to the Council of Forest Industries, British Columbia, under date of May 27, addressed to Mr. Lanskail:

> As you may have heard it is the government's intent to recess on June 30 and for this reason it will be impossible to give third reading to Bill C-61 prior to this date.
>
> It is still unclear as to whether a new session will be initiated upon members' return to parliament in September or October and therefore Bill C-61 may or may not be carried forth into the fall and winter session. For this reason the informal committee of which I was appointed co-chairman to study regulations dealing with Bill C-61 will not meet certainly before the end of June and possibly if the bill is not carried forth, ever.
>
> [Mr. Huntington.]
>
> Representations have been made to the minister by British Columbia Liberal caucus members and you can rest assured your interests will be considered in any new proposed legislation.

Just what is going on, Mr. Speaker? This is a letter to a very responsible organization which is overseeing an industry that provides 65 per cent of the income of British Columbia, and it received a letter such as this from a member who purports to be the co-chairman of the committee. He said the bill would not be brought forth in the fall. Then what are we doing here today? The government has brought the bill forth but did not even place it on the list of legislation to be discussed by parliament prior to the summer recess. This is another reason why there is a feeling of mistrust in the west concerning the attempts and the desires of the minister and his staff to cover key points concerning British Columbia and other maritime provinces by regulation.

If the government is really sincere it would be very easy for it to put these points of concern into the statute and not into regulation. The whole thing causing concern is the attitude on the part of the government. The feeling of mistrust is there, and if I were on the government benches I would be extremely concerned about that mistrust of the department and of Ottawa in general.

Added to this attitude, we have a member of the Department of Transport commenting in a newspaper column. He was being interviewed concerning the technical details of the cruising industry in British Columbia. It is reported in the newspaper that:

> When representations were made to one Ottawa transport official, he replied: "Why don't they pick up their passengers at Seattle?"

The passenger cruising industry out in the port of Vancouver carries on between the months of May and September. Since I was born that very beautiful cruise along the coast of British Columbia up to Alaska has been run by Canadian ships; the CNR ran a vessel and the CPR ran a vessel, and for years that was one of the great experiences, travelling up the coast and back between May and September.

Our tastes have changed. That whole industry now depends on cruise ships that can carry 350 to 400 people during the short season from May to September. We were never able to cut the mustard with Canadian bottoms because of the short season, but now all of a sudden we want to destroy the industry that has a spin-off effect in these short months within the port of Vancouver, and the spin-off effect amounts to $29 million for victualling these ships, and the expenditures of passengers and the clientele of these ships. Yet we are here fooling around with this kind of input in my city.

I have been asked if there is any concern for this industry in my province, particularly in view of this type of interference and dogmatic attitude whereby this $29 million seasonal industry should be sloughed off to the city of Seattle. How are we going to keep our pay rolls going in order that our economy can help pay off the debts we have incurred in the past three years in the province of British Columbia unless we do something constructive?

There is a complete lack of trust and faith in the west regarding rule by regulation. There were two gentlemen, one from the CTC and one from MOT, out meeting with various interest groups in British Columbia recently, and I

believe this point was clearly made to them. I am very surprised that in light of the subject matter of these meetings this bill would be presented again now before June 30, and particularly in light of the correspondence received from a member on the other side.

West coast industries are completely opposed to rule by regulation when it is not necessary. There are all kinds of examples which show that this has caused nothing but trouble. One in particular that recently came to mind involved the Financial Arrangements Act as it applied to post-secondary education. This was a statute that the province of British Columbia agreed to, and as soon as it was agreed to and the statute was passed, officials started to work on regulations. The federal government wrote each of the ten provinces asking for a definition of post-secondary education. The government accepted three different definitions and did not advise the other provinces. The sum and substance of that kind of treatment in the west is that on a per capita basis in respect of that one transfer alone the province of British Columbia was short changed $290.8 million. Another eastern province gained $448 million through that hidden regulation or that definition that was not shared equally across Canada. You wonder, Mr. Speaker, why we do not trust them down here! How much do we have to take in order to feel a part of this country?

● (2030)

I have other examples of regulations here in Ottawa whereby fines are imposed unevenly. Fines are imposed on individuals and small organizations, while large organizations which should be fined for the same infraction are overlooked. As an example I speak of GELCO and its failure to file under CALURA. While the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is fining a bunch of little people it overlooks the fact that GELCO is guilty of the same thing. This is another example of the reason we mistrust rule by regulation. Where do we get assurance from rule by regulation that fines are not bestowed on those in political favour? This is something that has the backs up of people out west because they do not know how to play that game. What we are in the regulations—

An hon. Member: Is a shafting.

Mr. Huntington: —is a shafting. You bet it is. We are just building another bureaucracy, when we should give the industries operating on the west and east coasts a chance to plan for the future.

A few moments ago I spoke of the cruise industry. Those ships run for a short period of time. The charters must be arranged anywhere from two to four years in advance of the time the passengers go abroad. Who in his right mind would enter into commitments with the penalties involved in charters unless he knew exactly where he stands in this regard? Why not cover these regional needs in the act? This Bill C-61, as I read it and as I look at the telegrams and everything else that the Minister of Transport circulates, is a Great Lakes bill and an SOU bill. Very little consideration is being given to other interests.

In my area I have probably more shipyards than there are in any other riding on the west coast. I cannot count the number. They are large and small. They are extremely skilled, with a very high degree of technology. Those shipyards today are in real difficulty. Their work forces are low. If the Burrard Shipyard did not have the two icebreakers it would not have work for its skilled workers.

The Vancouver Shipyard, thinking it was going operational, expanded the yard. The employees say they are the highest paid tradesmen there are, but there is no work for them. That yard today cannot build its own equipment. It can have that equipment built in Korea at 42 per cent less than it would cost them to build it themselves in their own yard. There is something seriously wrong with our priorities when we try to impose something on the citizens of Canada which has no relation to the cost involved with the same industry in other parts of the world.

We are very generous in respect of foreign aid; we are up to .7 per cent of our GNP, and some people would have us go as high 1 per cent. We are very generous through CIDA which is a soft loan organization giving aid to offshore countries. In EDC, the Export Development Corporation, we have a hard loan lending fact for the development and assistance of Nations less developed than Canada. Today in the House I have heard speeches in which we have been chastised for utilizing labour from Third World and less developed countries than Canada on ships which carry our goods. Surely that is a form of aid if we ourselves cannot compete.

I could tell stories about how we are building very technical high horsepower units to service the oil platforms in the North Sea. Those ships were built with Canadian technology and are of Canadian design. We have every right to be very proud of our ability to build and design equipment for coastal work, towing services, and offshore exploration rigs, but can we man those Canadian ships and vessels with Canadian crews to service the North Atlantic? No. Those Canadian ships of Canadian design are manned by crews from the Scandinavian countries. Not only is there a cost factor involved, but we have difficulty in Canada getting Canadians to serve, no matter at what level of pay, in that type of work.

I welcome the marine college, the expansion of our patrol vessels, and the expansion and need for expansion of our coastguard, but since the SIU has called for this bill can it assure us that it can man these vessels? We are now financing industrial sales to Algeria and Poland which have idealogies foreign to those of most Canadians. We now find that the greatest merchant marine in the world is that of the U.S.S.R. We think we can build a Canadian merchant marine and be competitive with that organization. They have one of the largest merchant fleets in the world. I guess it now surpasses that of the United States. The U.S.S.R. is a member of 30 of the 300 ocean conference tariff groups.

We must charge $52.75 per ton for carrying kraft wrapping paper from the U.S. west coast to the Far East while the Soviet price for the same commodity on the same route is $38 per ton. Russian ships are hauling coffee or sisal from Kenya to Europe for half the conference rate, machine tools from west Germany to Canada at 45 per cent reduction, or indeed any product at whatever discount will win the business. Should we not be expending our energies on that which we can do best?

How can we operate a Canadian merchant marine in competition with fleets like that of the Soviet Union which

has got itself in a real box in terms of international payments and is trying to earn foreign exchange in any way possible? How can we compete without massive subsidies from the public purse? I often wonder why this has not been said in any of the dialogue pertaining to this bill that is thrust upon us. The United States now has to subsidize the use of United States bottoms for the movement of goods throughout the world. When members of the Transport Committee were in Seattle we spoke to the U.S. officials on this subject. This subsidy is justified by way of a military need for ocean transport in the event of war. It is extremely hard to compete with the type of rates the Russians offer in the ocean movement of commodities.

● (2040)

Before the turn of the century one of our greatest wants will be capital. With the right work attitude, the right national attitude, and the right community attitude we could generate that capital. However, we keep killing our chances of national self-determination. Our desire for national ownership of everything has absolutely got our priorities all out of whack.

Clauses 8 to 14 serve Great Lakes interests and are impositions on the coastal maritime provinces and the industrial interests of our maritime provinces.

The two points I want to make—and I will repeat them—are that our priorities for coastal regions on the use of much needed capital are mixed up with a bill written for Great Lakes interests, and that the continuing man-year benefits for Canadians are just not there, because of uncompetitive wage costs and because of a lack of desire to serve on the high seas.

I listened with attention to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt). He was saying that there is work for 44,000 people, and I have read elsewhere in the debates that we could have 175 ships on the high seas carrying Canadian goods. However, I see nothing but an increase in the cost of carrying those goods, and those costs will have to be borne either by the regions producing those goods and trying to market them in the world or by the Canadian treasury, and that means spreading it across the country.

I suggest that if we were to get back on the track with regard to the tremendous need for capital, we in Canada, between now and the end of the century, have to do more saving and more work, particularly with regard to energy from the north, for future generations. We must rebuild and modernize our transportation system, and in some areas the transportation system will have to be electrified. We should not be applying our much needed energy and tax resources to this area where there is world surplus and where there are labour forces in the world. In no way, shape or form can we compete with the end costs.

We can only add to the burden of those people responsible for the production and delivery of goods. In the Beaufort Sea we will have a need for underwater silos. We will have a need for a pipeline. These are the areas in which our dollars can be well spent.

I repeat what I said in my opening statement that national policies aimed at developing a merchant marine and shipbuilding industry should be kept separate from a policy governing the transportation of goods. We cannot fight inflation—

[Mr. Huntington.]

An hon. Member: On the backs of barnacles.

Mr. Huntington: On the backs of barnacles. Thank you very much.

We cannot fight inflation when we start to spend our dollars in a way which will create a burden for the future generations of this country. Why not spend our dollars where a benefit can be derived? Let us put money into the treasury and not keep taking it out.

We have heard from the NDP today to the effect that there is no cost-benefit study in terms of dollars and man-years on this subject. We have heard that there are 44,000 man-years of work to be created. I would like to know where these studies are and where these figures come from, because the straight logistics do not make any sense.

In view of the fact that the B.C. Council of Forest Industries, along with others from the west coast, have not had an opportunity to present their briefs and thoughts to the committee, I would like to put on the record their concerns with regard to Bill C-61. Their concerns apply to the inter-coastal trade, and they state that what causes significant damage to the forest products industry of British Columbia adds inflationary pressures to the eastern Canadian consumers of B.C. products, and adds to the cost of eastern manufactured goods consumed in British Columbia.

The Council further states that access to non Canadian vessels on a duty free basis for use in intercoastal service is an important factor in maintaining a well balanced and economic domestic transportation system. To a significant degree Canadian rail freight rates to eastern Canada are based on the availability of the competitive alternative, shipping via the Panama Canal on foreign flag vessels. Current rates for shipping via the Panama Canal on Canadian vessels are more than double the rates for foreign flag vessels. We have just recently seen an example of that in the movement of western coal into Hamilton for steel and hydro purposes.

The concern of the B.C. Council of Forest Industries is exemplified by the fact that, over the last five years, lack of water competition has seen rail rates applicable to lumber and plywood to eastern Canada more than double, with particularly sharp increases in 1974, which reflect the conviction of the railways that water competition for this business is not a factor.

In 1971 there was a 7.2 per cent increase in rail rates; in 1972 a 6.7 per cent increase; in 1973 a 6.6 per cent increase; in 1974 a 19.9 per cent increase, and in 1975 a whopping 22.2 per cent increase in rail freight rates for getting B.C. products to eastern Canadian markets. The effect of Bill C-61 would be to double the rail rates in the next five year period. It would eliminate British Columbia producers from the eastern Canadian market. The producers out in British Columbia would be replaced by producers in the United States southern pine producing territory who in 1975 double their shipments to eastern Canada over those of 1974, and by U.S. plywood producers who now enjoy in excess of 25 per cent of the Canadian plywood market.

Here we are adding to the cost of getting our goods to a market, and we have that market now buying from the United States causing further demand on our balance of international payments. The B.C. Council of Forest Industries goes on to say that water transportation is a vital factor if British Columbia lumber and plywood manufacturers are to maintain eastern Canada markets. The cost of that water transportation must reflect the competition of foreign flag vessels. To do otherwise is simply to place these markets in the hands of American producers. This is the kind of spin-off about which we in British Columbia are very frightened. We plead with the government and those on the staff of the department to understand this need.

The B.C. Council of Forest Industries is not convinced that regulations under the act will provide adequate provision for the use of foreign vessels in intercoastal trade. The proposed regulations are still classified confidential and therefore are not available for perusal and comment. That was true at the time of this brief, and the government has been good enough since to give us the draft of those regulations, which has helped us indeed.

It is interesting to note that at a meeting on the west Coast of all the organizations interested, the B.C. Chamber of Shipping, the B.C. Council of Forest Industries, the chambers of commerce, the Vancouver Board of Trade, and the Chamber of Mines, to an organization and to a man were against rule and interference by regulation, because of the past record of the government.

There is no reason at all why an area of Canada trying to provide jobs and get its product to world markets cannot work and have an improved decision making base. There is no reason at all why the key factors of concern in clauses 8 to 14 inclusive cannot be organized and be part of the statute so that our decision making base will be improved and so that we will not have to keep traipsing back to Ottawa—the act states "in writing"—to the minister. Mr. Speaker, have you any idea how long it takes for mail to come from British Columbia to Ottawa these days? It is unbelievable. The mail clears out of here and goes to British Columbia in about one third of the time it takes to move in the opposite direction.

● (2050)

The minister mentioned that the regulations would be made public, kept public, and that all changes would be public. This is one of the major concerns of the Council of Forest Industries, that changes in the regulations that are subsequent to the approval of the bill are not subject to the public procedures and public scrutiny that would prevail when a change in the act is proposed. They say that the only acceptable assurance is a specific amendment to the bill to exclude intercoastal trade, in clause 8.

On the west coast we are very edgy about rule by regulation and we are very edgy about the attempts of the bureaucracy down here to get this through. They seem to be more interested than does the minister. I would urge that our concerns be given full consideration. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro):

That Bill C-61 be not now read a third time but be referred back to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications for the reconsideration of clauses 8 to 14 inclusive including any government amendments to be proposed thereto.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale).

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully today to the debate in this Chamber on Bill C-61 and have been interested to hear the views expressed and the arguments in some quarters for changes in the legislation. This legislation has been before the House for a long time. Members of this Chamber who have sat in previous parliaments know that this subject has come before the House for consideration in the past, and that legislation has been presented to parliament which has not emerged in the final legislative process to become law.

The basic concepts we have been discussing today have been of interest to various groups in the country for many months and years. It is a subject which is not new to members nor to those who have an interest in it and have been looking at this particular concept and the proposals before the House for some long time.

The points of concern in regard to Bill C-61 were clearly and specifically identified earlier today in the comprehensive speech delivered by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang). With respect to those aspects of the objections and the concerns which lie outside the scope of the statute, the minister on many occasions in this House has given far-reaching undertakings not only to consult with all interested parties with respect to regulations but also to search conscientiously for a fundamental consensus about those regulations before moving the coasting trade provisions into law.

Mr. Oberle: Why has he not done it before?

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I heard a voice ask why it was not done before. As the hon. member would know if he had studied the debates of this House and the minutes of the standing committee, and the publications issued from time to time by the Department of Transport, this minister and his predecessor have made it very much their business to consult with interest all across the country. The consultations have gone on literally for years and are going on right at this time.

As the minister indicated this afternoon, if it had not been for the unfortunate disruption of air services this past week, officials of the Department of Transport would have been in in the maritime provinces on Monday of last week consulting with senior officials there to determine what further steps needed to be taken to satisfy the genuine needs of some interests across the country. To make a phony allegation that there have not been consultations or a commitment to further consultation is ridiculous.

With respect to the complaints about certain aspects of the statute itself, that is, the wording of the proposal which is before the House, the minister has clearly identified those specific clauses which might be subject to further amendment. This afternoon he placed before the House the substance of three amendments which would serve to meet the complaints raised about various clauses.

There has been thorough and lengthy discussion of all aspects of Bill C-61 in this Chamber and outside, and it has been going on for a number of years. There was an opportunity to consider the provisions of the bill in principle in the lengthy debate at second reading stage; it was considered again for weeks at the committee hearings, and finally it came back to this House some weeks ago for further analysis and discussion at report stage. If we refer the bill or part of it to the standing committee for further analysis at this stage, we should be very specific in our requirements. I do not believe it would be wise to make a general or broad reference back to the committee.

The hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) in the wording of his amendment referred to clauses 8 to 14 inclusive, but I believe that phrasing is still too broad. The reference from this House should be more specific and direct the attention of the committee to those clauses of the bill which have been identified by interested groups and by the minister in the House today as requiring some modification. I refer to clause 8, clause 11, and clause 14.

There has been considerable discussion and certain representations about the bill in this House, and I think members have identified the areas about which they are concerned. I think it is clear that the areas that should be dealt with by further statutory amendment are those in clauses 8, 11, and 14, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the wise and proper course for this House to follow would be to ask the standing committee to consider generally the subject matter of the coasting trade which has been before the committee already and has been exhaustively examined.

● (2100)

I suggest that it would be more appropriate to ask for consideration of those portions of the statute which could be subject to further modification at this stage. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais):

That the amendment be amended by deleting the words 'clauses 8 to 14 inclusive' and substituting the following words therefor:

'clauses 8, 11 and 14'

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, amendments, and amendments to amendments are coming thick and fast tonight, as we debate this bill shortly before we are to return to our ridings. Bill C-61 is an attempt to implement government policy in certain maritime areas.

You know, as I listened to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale), the minister having been involved in other activities for the last few days, I wondered if the minister and the parliamentary secretary who come from the heartland of this country, beautiful Saskatchewan—

Mr. Goodale: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: —where the wheat grows as thick as seaweed grows on the east coast, would have shown the same cavalier attitude to changes affecting the east and west coasts if the Crowsnest Pass agreement were under scrutiny with a view to amendment. Yet there were the minister and the parliamentary secretary using professorial platitudes to describe the effect of Bill C-61. The parliamentary secretary, whose experience is limited basically to the heartland of Saskatchewan, proposed an amendment. If he had felt the sea between his toes he would begin to appreciate what this bill means to maritimers.

[Mr. Goodale.]

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Would he not have felt the salt?

Mr. Nowlan: The only thing the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) knows about the sea is that the St. Boniface River ultimately empties into the sea.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I was in the navy before you were born, son!

Mr. Nowlan: Joe, you are getting old.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Not old, better.

Mr. Nowlan: As long as you keep the fire in your belly and not in your head, you'll be all right.

Bill C-61 is a measure fundamental to the east and west coasts of this land. We heard the minister speak today in a competent way. He is one of the competent fellows on the other side. At least he stands out in comparison to other cabinet ministers, something like a lightning rod to attract lightning. There are so few competent cabinet ministers opposite that when one is the least bit competent, he rather stands out like a lightning conductor for the lightning to strike. Unfortunately for the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) he will get hit by a lightning bolt if he allows Bill C-61 to pass without amendment.

The minister gave assurances that, before certain regulations are proclaimed, there will be a committee hearing at which the impact of these regulations can be assessed.

Mr. Goodale: It is in the bill.

Mr. Nowlan: As the parliamentary secretary says, that is in the bill. We know what that means.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): It is as if the minister had a simulator.

Mr. Nowlan: He does not meet the expense of running a simulator. We know that once the government makes up its mind and regulations are defined, it is somewhat late in the day to hold public hearings. Perhaps I can use an analogy the parliamentary secretary can understand, because he does not understand much about the sea but understands something about barnyards. You know, it is a bit late to close the barn door after the sheep, cattle, and livestock have bolted out to the range. It is a bit late then to close the barn door. Mr. Speaker, I say this because you, I, and other hon. members have been involved perhaps in more situations requiring common sense than has our young parliamentary secretary from the heartland of Saskatchewan. Be that as it may, it is difficult for Canadians to listen to the Minister of Transport and believe what he says when he gives assurances about matters affecting transportation. They remember that we had an election a couple of years ago when, almost every day of the week, some announcement concerning transportation was made.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): And it started in Cornwall.

Mr. Nowlan: People wonder how many of those fundamental promises to do with transportation have been implemented since the majority government was formed after that unfortunate event of July 8, 1974. How can the minister and the parliamentary secretary expect Canadians to go along hand in hand down their rose petal-strewn path of assurances and guarantees? People are suspicious.

Let me now talk about specific provisions of the bill. What bothers me is that the minister and his officials in the gallery are looking at this bill in terms of what it will do to shipowners and unions running the ships rather than in terms of the potential it could have for developing industry in areas of the country which very much need industry. In the opinion of many this bill will adversely affect the development of our industry.

The minister has talked much of the user-pay concept as applied to transportation. But Bill C-61 sort of leaves behind the user-pay concept with respect to the burden being imposed on the shipper and the public, which nobody wants.

Bill C-61 also contains a fundamental paradox. Instead of expanding competition in the marine trade and the trade along our coasts, it will actually restrict competition because certain provisions are to be restricted to Canadian bottoms and Canadian sailors. Perhaps the government has in mind a laudable object. But will the attainment of that object increase competition? Competition, after all, is the anchor or keystone of the National Transportation Act. In his speech the minister glossed over two fundamental paradoxes involving the user-pay concept. It has been completely ignored in Bill C-61.

All speeches by members on this side today, in committee and on second reading, clearly set out that if you restrict the movement of goods along our coasts to ships with Canadian bottoms and Canadian crews, no matter how laudatory that may be, you obviously restrict the competitive factor which is so important not only in setting competitive rates at sea but in maintaining some balance of rail rates on shipments between our coasts and inland. The hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) and the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) amplified those concerns earlier today.

● (2110)

The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte asked why, after all these years, we are moving in this new area without a cost benefit study to tell us as members, and the Canadian public, how Canadians will benefit by restricting coastal traffic to Canadian bottoms.

If the Conservatives had been in power as long as this government, with all the cobwebs hanging from its ears, and had done all the surveys, research, and reviews of surveys, we would be subject to the same legitimate complaint. The government is renowned for studies, task forces, reviews of studies, but there has not been a cost benefit study to give us some indication of the economic impact, good or bad, on what will happen in the coastal areas of our country, let alone the marine industry, by restricting coastal trade to Canadian bottoms.

Before being elected to this institution, many years ago I practised law. I have not practised since being elected. However, when you could not prove anything beyond a reasonable doubt or even a preponderance of evidence—if the hard evidence was not there—you had to draw inferences from some of the facts that were given. The only inference I can draw from this glaring omission is something that is fundamental to a meaningful consideration of Bill C-61, namely, a cost-benefit study of how many ships will be built in Canadian yards as a result of this bill. How many Canadian sailors will ship out on Canadian bottoms as a result of this bill? As the hon. member for Capilano and the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte said, the fact that there is not a report leads one to infer that it will not confirm some of the generalities that had been expressed on the other side, namely, that the passage of Bill C-61 will open up a new day for Canadians along our coast and for those serving on Canadian ships. Otherwise there should have been a survey. With all the time spent thus far, and there is still time to do it, it is almost beyond comprehension that there has not been that type of study.

I am amazed there has not been such a study because many stories circulate. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) is not in the Chamber this evening. However, I am sure he saw the article in the *Chronicle-Herald* of June 2 which states the province of Nova Scotia may be losing 2,200 jobs involved in a $700 million deal because of the potential of Bill C-61 becoming law. I would like an answer with regard to this story from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Transport, or the Secretary of State for External Affairs because this is right in his own backyard. I will not read the whole article, but simply the highlights. It was written by Ian Thompson, the transportation reporter of the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald*. I quote:

> It would appear Nova Scotia has lost a planned $700 million iron ore processing mill planned for either the Strait of Canso or Garbarus Bay because of proposed amendments to the Canada Shipping Act.
>
> The plant would have directly employed 2,200 and initially would have used 200,000 tons of Cape Breton coal a year.

As I said, this is right in the backyard of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He should be called upon to explain whether this front page headline story in the June 2 *Chronicle-Herald* is just a frivolous report. This type of story certainly deserves some explanation.

If there is any credence at all to that story, the potential loss of the 2,200 jobs will more than offset any potential jobs in the merchant marine for Canadians serving in Canadian bottoms as a result of Bill C-61. What kind of set-off is it to give the monopoly to Canadian bottoms on the coast, with the higher traffic charges, when there has not been a scintilla of evidence either today, on second reading, or in committee, to show how many jobs will be created by the Canadian merchant marine if the bill is passed?

This headline story states unequivocally that P. E. Kavanagh, one of the right-hand men of Cyrus Eaton, was prepared to go into this type of development but changed his mind because of the potential adverse effect of Bill C-61. That is pretty close to the core of Atlantic Canada, which does not have that type of industry at the best of times, let alone the bad times we are now experiencing. Therefore he should receive an explanation from the government as to the credence to be placed in that story before we proceed further with this bill.

I wish to quote another story, not from the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* because I would not want hon. members to think I am prejudiced. This story, involving the St. Lawrence Seaway, appeared in that great paper, the Montreal *Gazette*.

Those of us in the deep east have always been glad to bring part of the sea into the heartland of Canada through the St. Lawrence Seaway. It has not helped us in terms of developing viable industries, but we are largely Canadian, notwithstanding some of the small Canadian talk we have heard in this parliament in the past few days.

The Seaway is a fact of life. If it ever starts paying its way, we will not begrudge it. However, we will begrudge it if it does not start to pay its way or forgive some of the debt that has accumulated.

I want to refer to a story on page 54 of the May 25 *Gazette*—I did not know it had that many pages—where it states, and I quote:

● (2120)

The federal government's shipping advisory board expects to make its first recommendations on federal support for a Canadian merchant marine by this summer, according to a board official.

This is dated little more than a month ago. In other words, a creature of the government, the Shipping Advisory Board, is expected to make its first recommendation by this summer concerning a merchant marine for Canada. The article goes on:

A key element in forming the recommendations will be a series of cost-benefit studies now under way, Roland Murray, a senior adviser to the federal transport ministry, told a meeting of the Naval Officers' Association of Canada, Montreal Branch.

Before the House leader gets us too far down the road beyond return, or to use nautical language, before he gets us into the locks and pulls the plug and leaves us high and dry, surely he has some responsibility or rather the government has some duty to let us know what the results of these cost-benefit studies show. It is obvious there is some work going on but the minister has completely omitted to tell us about it.

Further on in this article in the *Gazette* we read:

Murray, who heads the board's working committee, said there can be no policy recommendations to the transport minister until the board sees the conclusion of 20 studies it has commissioned covering such areas as international agreements, labour, shipping rates and shipping in the Arctic.

These studies are being carried on through an agency of the federal government yet we know nothing about what they tell us.

It really gives one cause for concern when knowledgeable people within the industry draw attention to these things. For example, Michael Bell, senior vice-president of Federal Commerce and Navigation Limited, has stated that Canadian registered ships can only be profitable in areas in which they have a special advantage which offsets high Canadian labour costs. One such area would be the operation of bulk carriers and tankers especially designed to operate in the Canadian Arctic.

I would call attention to the following paragraph in the article from which I have already quoted:

Bell estimated that a blanket policy of using Canadian ships for Canadian trade would drive up shipping costs by as much as $400 million requiring an annual government subsidy of that amount if rates for users were to remain unchanged.

Is it any wonder, when such views are expressed by people with more knowledge of the marine industry than I have, that any objective member on the opposition side would ask to see the conclusions of these cost-benefit studies which are presently being undertaken, or that the government should be urged at least to deal candidly with the taxpayers? In the absence of subsidies, shipping rates are bound to go up and those living in the extreme east and west of our country will be faced with costs which are even higher by comparison with those borne by central Canada.

I realize there are many others who wish to speak in this debate. There are many other aspects with which I should like to deal but I shall make no attempt to cover them all. I might point out that the concern I feel with respect to this bill is widely shared.

The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte earlier read into the record certain parts of the communiqué issued by the Atlantic premiers. I should like to read now a telegram dated May 26, 1976, again a little over a month ago, and addressed to the Minister of Transport. It was sent by the Chairman of the Council of Maritime Premiers, Premier A. B. Campbell of Prince Edward Island. Incidentally Premier Campbell is a great friend of mine—we went to law school at the same time—though he and I do not wear the same political stripe. I believe the parliamentary secretary was asked about the situation outlined here but I am not sure whether he gave a full answer as to whether there had been any meaningful consultation with the Atlantic premiers since their meeting. The telegram reads:

Further to our telex to you of December 16, 1975, and other representations made to you and your predecessor, we are still deeply concerned about Bill C-61. Recent representations from industry have heightened this concern, giving it a new dimension.

In view of this, we now urge you to take action which will retain for Atlantic industries their access to non-Canadian vessels for the coasting trade without serious impediment in the form of the necessity for either expensive or difficult-to-obtain waivers, licences or permits. Availability of suitable vessels and their cost should be the criteria for the selection of carriers, with the decision resting with the shipper.

Existing industry and future industrial development in the Atlantic provinces will be seriously affected if this bill, and those regulations of which we have been made aware to date, come into effect. This legislation would tend to transform the Atlantic provinces into inland provinces insofar as coastal shipping is concerned without their concomitant advantages. High transportation cost to and from markets is already one of the most serious obstacles restricting growth in this region. By restricting competition, Bill C-61 will increase these costs for water, rail or truck.

We urge you to withdraw or change this legislation as it pertains to coastal shipping and to permit the use of non-Canadian vessels according to the dictates of availability and cost, thereby enabling our industries to benefit from one of this region's natural advantages.

That is signed by the three Atlantic premiers, two of whom happen to be Liberal premiers. Political stripe means nothing when something as fundamental as Bill C-61, the maritime code bill, is going through the House, a measure which is bound to affect Atlantic interests so directly. Those of us who come from Atlantic Canada, together with members from west coast constituencies who are familiar with marine traffic, are obviously among the most vociferous in expressing concern.

As I drove to parliament Hill tonight, knowing there might be a chance of speaking on Bill C-61, I found it whimsical to reflect that the last time Canada had a merchant marine was way back in the days of sail, if one excludes the Canadian National Steamship boats which plied the Atlantic coast just before they were stopped during the second world war. And here in this Chamber are members from the Atlantic coast and the west coast who have lived with the sea and who want a merchant marine. They are also well aware that at least in the days of sail—and I could get very rhapsodic and philosophical about all the little Newfoundland ports we come from, and the ports along my own coastline of the Annapolis Valley—these places were viable communities some 50 years ago. I know you cannot turn back the clock; the days of sail pass into the days of steam and the days of steam pass into the days of nuclear energy, I guess. The fact that this bill ignores is that the reason there was a vibrant Canadian merchant marine in the days of sail was that there was competition between the ports of Atlantic Canada and between the skippers in those ports.

● (2130)

I will now conclude since my illustrious colleague, the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), is usually renowned for his brevity and conciseness and I want to exhibit those same qualities and let others speak. However, having had for the first time the opportunity to speak on Bill C-61, I cannot emphasize enough that unless changes are made to preserve the cost situation and provide access to other bottoms so there can be meaningful competition, be it on the east coast or in the central part of this beautiful land, the maritime industry will be done a disservice. As I have said, the bureaucrats here in Ottawa really do not know the sea, so I hope they will come down to the sea to see for themselves.

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague who has just resumed his seat, this is the first opportunity that I have had of speaking in this debate. I was afraid that I was not going to get the opportunity to speak tonight, but since I do have a few minutes I should like to make some comments on the bill now before the House.

In concert with many of my colleagues I regret the fact that Bill C-61 has been brought forward again at this time. As stated by several hon. members, not only this House but the nation as a whole had the understanding that this bill would not be brought forward for third reading until the fall. Some of the individuals and organizations interested in the bill were instituting studies into various aspects of the legislation the results of which, I believe, would bring about a much better measure than that before the House at the present time.

I think the action of the government House leader has again raised the question of the credibility of the government and of the dependability of the assurances and promises that have been given. We have had quite a discussion today about the assurances or guarantees given by the government, or which the government is willing to give regarding various measures, but I wish there were some basis upon which we could accept those assurances. Certainly a study of past statements that have been made would not give one much hope that those assurances would be carried out.

I should like to refer, first of all, to a matter regarding which concern was expressed in earlier debates in this House. I refer to the change in location of the registry office. I realize that there have been some accommodations reached in this particular connection, but I believe that the policy in operation up until the present time is still the best one and that we should stand by that policy.

I think the government would be inconsistent in closing down the registry office and reducing its effectiveness by moving it to the city of Ottawa. This point was dealt with on second reading quite eloquently by my colleague, the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen). I believe my colleague from Grenville-Carleton also dwelt on that topic.

The government has made much of its policy to decentralize its departments and to bring government closer to the people. I understand too that a very large part of this decentralization is for the purpose of dealing with chronic unemployment areas. In this regard two or three announcements have been made. One was in connection with a certain branch of the Department of Supply and Services, and another was brought to light a few days ago when certain agencies were moved to the city of Moncton, New Brunswick. I am not raising any objection to those moves; I am just pointing out an inconsistency in government policy.

On the one hand the government is decentralizing, moving certain government operations to the regions to encourage employment and to bring government closer to the people. On the other hand the government is moving an operation that has been highly satisfactory from the west coast to Ottawa, a distance of 3,000 miles, expecting it to give the same service to the people that it gave on the west coast. I say the government is not being consistent and I think this policy will result in a lower standard of service for the people on the west coast.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Vancouver shipping registry office is the largest in Canada with more than 10,000 ships on file.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the parliamentary secretary rising for the purpose of asking a question, or on a point or order?

Mr. Goodale: To ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, time is running short. I think the hon. member had ample opportunity to make his contribution so I would prefer he waited till I had concluded my remarks. The Vancouver shipping registry office is run by a staff of only four and is a very effective and efficient operation. I would not want to guarantee that the same degree of efficiency will be maintained if the move that is presently contemplated is carried out. The port registry performs a valuable service for all boat owners, most of whom know from personal experience the courtesies extended by the staff there. The inconvenience to the general boating public will be incalculable. Those who want to register bills of sale or mortgages will run into additional red tape which will make things more difficult.

If I may speak on behalf of these people, even though some accommodation has been reached, I understand, I still maintain that a service that has been satisfactory and that has offered personalized service to the people should be left as it is, instead of being moved as is currently under consideration.

I should like to move on to another aspect of the bill. Having read the debate on second reading of this bill I was very impressed with the argument put forward by my colleague, the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), regarding the necessity for developing a Canadian merchant marine. I think the time has come for Canadians to be made aware of our shortcomings in this area and for the government to get on with the job and encourage the growth and development of this particular industry. I know government supporters will probably say that this is what is being done by Bill C-61, but I cannot see how the bill will accomplish this.

I think much of Bill C-61 is essentially negative in nature and does little to encourage shipbuilding, which is really what we must start with in developing a merchant marine. I say it is negative because its provisions restrict the right of foreign ships to carry on the transportation of goods and people from one Canadian port to another. That is negative enough, Mr. Speaker, but in addition it contains no provisions to substitute or provide additional Canadian carriers for this purpose.

If I could draw an analogy in this respect—I realize it is not exact in every respect—it would be the government's policy on energy. We in Canada have a great resource and a great reserve of oil. I believe it would be sufficient for Canadian uses for many years to come if it were handled in the proper way. It is still in the ground or in the tar sands, and requires as well additions to our transportation system. We are running into this problem and we are now facing an emergency because of the lack of foresight and planning.

● (2140)

Now we have the government moving forward and placing restrictions on transportation before we have had an opportunity to provide for an adequate supply of Canadian carriers to transport our goods and our people from place to place. The situations are similar in respect of potential self-sufficiency in energy and potential self-sufficiency in the matter of transportation.

The measure before us calls attention to several important aspects, and I should like to comment on one or two of the statements made during the course of this debate. Let me also put on the record some facts taken from a study conducted by the government of British Columbia under the auspices of the Hon. Jack Davis, provincial minister of transport and communications. I know hon. members across the way groan whenever they hear this gentleman's name. Nevertheless he was held in fairly high regard when he was over there. We looked upon him as one who was earnestly endeavouring to fulfil the responsibilities that were his in that ministry.

Let me refer first of all to the minister's references to agreements with the maritime ministers of transport. This has been denied by some of the members taking part in this debate. They have pointed out that this was not so,

that they did not reach an agreement. They suggested there may have been an agreement is some particular respect, but there were so many ambiguities, so many things not above board and not on the table that there was no really effective agreement as far as the maritime ministers of transport were concerned. Certainly I do not think there was any as far as the transportation ministry of the province of British Columbia was concerned.

My colleague read from a document that pointed out just the contrary. The minister has given the assurance that all the guarantees necessary have been given and that there will be a high degree of acceptance before the implementation of these provisions.

Again I should like to refer to some statements made in the past. I am not going to take the time to document them, but we have had assurance after assurance and guarantee after guarantee, yet all of us in the House, at least those on this side, realize that the guarantees which have been given in many instances have not come to fruition, or have not been fulfilled. I think it is straining the intelligence of the people in the western part of this country to expect them to take the word of the minister that certain things are to be done and certain things will not be done. There must be more than that.

Let me now put on the record some conclusions which are drawn from the study that was conducted, as I already indicated, by the British Columbia government. I have not had time to check all these out, what amendments have been suggested or accommodations reached, but I will give some of the conclusions in order to pinpoint some of the concerns of the British Columbia government regarding Bill C-61. The conclusions drawn are:

1. A very powerful competitive influence on transportation rates of other modes will be lost.

2. Users of both intercoastal shipping and transcontinental transport services will be required to pay excessive and otherwise avoidable inflated freight rates when this competitive influence is lost.

3. The policy will have a significant direct negative impact on major B.C. industries, particularly those in forestry, mining and construction.

My colleague, the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle), and also my colleague, the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), have mentioned these particular issues.

The conclusions then continue as follows:

4. Virtually no Canadian-flag vessels exist for use in intercoastal movements, certainly not on the west coast.

5. The past history of intercoastal traffic will do little to encourage the building of Canadian vessels for the service.

6. The beneficiaries of the policy will overwhelmingly be in eastern Canada as a result of developments in off-shore and eastern Arctic resources where there is reason to give protection to Canadian interests.

7. This is not sufficient reason to include intercoastal trade, which is a totally different economic activity, in a blanket application.

8. No in depth cost-benefit analysis has been conducted to show where and to what degree these cost-benefits accrue.

This has been dealt with by a number of members and there is no need to enlarge upon it at the moment.

9. The policy, as administered and controlled through the regulations, will be slow, unresponsive and costly to B.C. interests.

10. Domestic products will become much more susceptible to substitution in the domestic market.

11. The massive subsidies required to maintain the protectionist policy for the U. S. coasting trade have failed to prevent a steady decline in the U.S. coasting fleet.

It concludes:

The province of B.C. is therefore strongly opposed to intercoastal trade being restricted in any way from employing the services of a foreign-flag vessel if it is to the advantage of the shipper to do so. The intercoastal trade must be given permanent exemption from the restrictions proposed in Bill C-61 for other aspects of the domestic coasting trade.

There is just one additional thought I should like to add before concluding. There has been the argument that consultative efforts have been made, and have been made consistently. We think of the confrontations which have taken place between the federal and various provincial administrations. When there was supposed to be negotiation and consultation there was confrontation. I suggest the same argument could be made in respect of this particular matter. We have an amendment before us and a subamendment. While the subamendment goes to some extent in meeting the need, I do not believe it is adequate. It is my belief that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Capilano should receive the endorsation and entire support of the House.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would entertain a question before concluding his remarks?

An hon. Member: There is a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. parliamentary secretary has requested the right to ask a question of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Patterson). I think we should put his request to the hon. member, who may accept or refuse it. Is the hon. member ready to entertain such a question?

Mr. Patterson: Yes.

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I want to ask the hon. member if he is aware of the work done by the standing committee in relation to the registry to which he referred in the early part of his remarks. These provisions were substantially amended.

An hon. Member: That is an insult.

Mr. Goodale: I refer particularly to that aspect dealing with regional deputy registers. His remarks might have referred to—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: I wouldn't even answer.

Mr. Paproski: Shame on you. That is just an insult.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You are looking for a ministry, that is what you want.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the discussion that went on. I made the statement that while there was a degree of accommodation, I still believe that the planning and the program that are in operation at the present time are far superior.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

● (2150)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I might raise two points of order about the business before the House. The first is to seek a change in an order of the House made earlier this day for the taking of the vote on Bill C-68. It was agreed at that time that the vote would be taken tomorrow evening at 9.30. We have had subsequent discussion because there is another event of some importance taking place which some members would like to attend. Therefore it is agreed that instead of being taken at 9.30 p.m. the vote will be taken shortly after 8 p.m. I say shortly after 8 p.m. because I think the bells ought to ring twice—once to summon the members and then, after a short interval, again to bring members to a vote. If that could be agreed I would come to the second point of order.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister. We are very happy to accommodate him for the special event that is necessary. It will probably be the only happy occasion in that particular location for quite some time. We are very happy to agree.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this change is acceptable and we agree to it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: We agree, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There seems to be agreement that the vote on Bill C-68 be taken shortly after eight o'clock tomorrow night. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, may I come to the second point of order. It relates to the business for the rest of the week. There has been some discussion among the House leaders, indeed going beyond the House leaders because the subject under consideration is Bill C-84 which is the subject of a free vote in which all members of the House have a special interest. I would therefore like to move, with unanimous consent:

That, notwithstanding any standing or special order:

1. The House shall not sit from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 29, 1976;

2. The House shall not sit on Friday, July 2, 1976;

3. The House shall revert to Presenting Reports from Standing and Special Committees at 10:00 p.m. this day;

Maritime Code

4. The report stage of Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and other serious offences, shall be taken into consideration when the Orders of the Day are called on Tuesday, June 29, 1976;

5. Notices of amendments to be proposed at the report stage of the said bill shall be considered to be properly given if received no later than 12:00 noon on Tuesday, June 29, 1976; and

6. The Clerk shall be authorized to publish a supplementary notice paper before 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 29, 1976 for the purposes of part 5 of this order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House give consent to the President of the Privy Council to move the motion at the present time?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion and I am glad the hon. gentleman characterized the discussion in the way he did. Speaking for myself, and I hope for others in that context, there is consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is correct that the details set out in the motion read by the minister have been discussed. We agree to them and are prepared to support the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, we had discussions with the leaders of the government with regard to the business of the House, and we agreed with them. On the other hand, I should like to point out that it is a pity we could not get the unanimous consent of the House to get the day off after St. John the Baptist Day as we will this Friday, that is the day following Dominion Day. I regret having to point this out, but I do think we should see to it that this does not happen again in coming years.

An hon. Member: You'll have to convince the Progressive Conservatives.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not note any objection so there would seem to be unanimous consent. Does the House wish to proceed by way of a motion or an order of the House? It might be simpler if the House considered the wording of the motion as a House order as accepted and implemented unanimously. Is it agreed and accepted unanimously that the terms of the motion as proposed by the House Leader be made an order of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By unanimous consent it is agreed and so ordered.

* * *

MARITIME CODE ACT

MEASURES TO PROVIDE A MARITIME CODE FOR CANADA

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-61, to provide a Maritime Code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be read the third time and do pass.

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the remaining two minutes would only take away from the excellence of the remarks I wish to make, may I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. According to the order previously accepted the House will now revert to Presenting Reports from Standing and Special Committees.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Eighteenth report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. MacGuigan.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FINANCE—PROPOSAL THAT CAPITAL GAINS TAX NOT APPLY TO SALE OF FAMILY FARM

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, my remarks tonight on the capital gains tax on farm property are based on the questions I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) on June 17 as recorded at page 14611 of *Hansard* of that date. The first question was:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. It relates to the capital gains tax on family farm property. A family farm operator, during his lifetime, directs all his profit to the improvement of his farm and equipment. When the farm is sold upon his retirement, the proceeds become his sole private pension fund. It is therefore grossly unfair to use capital gains tax to seriously reduce this pension. Will the minister consider amending the Income Tax Act to permit a once-in-a-lifetime sale of a family farm without attracting capital gains tax?

● (2200)

The minister's reply was simply this:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are certain provisions now with regard to family farms but I do not see at this time the opportunity to be able to expand those.

The second question was a supplementary and along a similar line. It was as follows:

Mr. Speaker, since the capital gains taxes collected on family farm property amount to only 10 per cent of the total collected on property generally, would the minister weigh the appraisal and accounting costs, plus the major irritant effect of this tax, against the net revenue derived and hopefully remove this unfair and unjust tax altogether?

I felt that the minister's response was altogether too brief. He simply said:

. . . it of course has to be relevant also to the question of equity to other taxpayers.

I suggest that the answers were entirely unsatisfactory in the light of the importance of capital gains taxes and the way they affect farmers, particular family farmers, and also small businessmen.

The reason for this particular question relates to activity going on in the riding I represent, Norfolk-Haldimand. There has been expropriation or threat of expropriation of a very large section of farmland. This is to serve as the industrial sites for hydro, Stelco and Texaco, and also for the satellite city which is to be built in that area. The province has just completed a land assembly program there. This, of course, resulted in the forced sale of many farms. I think there has never been such a concentration of farmers paying capital gains tax in such a small area as the one I just described.

The farmers whose properties have been sold in the manner I described are having income tax returns reassessed, and a whopping capital gains tax is being imposed upon them. Tax paid, of course, is on one half of the capital gain derived from the valuation day value subtracted from the value at the time of the sale. The government land appraisers have assigned abnormally and unrealistically low valuation day values of something in the neighbourhood of $350 to $400 per acre. The sale value has been in the neighbourhood of $2,000 plus per acre. Therefore the capital gain is $1,600, and the tax on half of that is a tax on $800 per acre. On a 100 acre farm that is a capital gains tax assessed on an amount of $80,000, which is certainly drastic and exorbitant.

A $400 valuation day value is totally unrealistic. The government appraisers are not in touch with reality, and one wonders if any of them have ever operated a family farm.

The farmers are angry. They are pooling their resources to fight the assessment of capital gains in the manner described. They are going through the formal appeal procedures as laid down in the act. They are going through the courts, and if necessary, they will even go to the highest court in the land to see that justice is done.

The minister is aware of this situation because of previous letters from me to him on this matter, and I feel it is time to face up to this giant rip off which is being perpetrated against the farming community in Norfolk-Haldimand.

Let us examine the effects of this unconscionable action. As I said in my question, it destroys farmers' retirement funds. During his lifetime a farmer puts his profits back into improving his farm, his buildings, and his equipment. The value increases. Upon retirement he sells the farm. The proceeds become his pension fund; he has no other.

The bandits from National Revenue pounce upon this fund and wipe out this one opportunity to retire with dignity. The farmers have pride. In my opinion they are the last bastions of independence and free enterprise. The tradition of providing for their own retirement goes back for generations.

Mr. Paproski: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Surely it should be the responsibility of the government to foster and encourage this independence and the retention of self-esteem. Instead, the present system of taxation discourages and stifles initiative. The farmer is tempted to give up, to resign himself to allowing big brother to take his savings, and he reasons that he might as well take a handout from the welfare state, along with everybody else.

The second reason is that it removes the opportunity for the younger farmer who does not want to retire to purchase another farm. Such a farmer hopes to use the proceeds from his forced sale to purchase a new farm. Again the capital gains tax so erodes the net proceeds of his sale that sufficient funds do not remain to enable him to relocate. In this case he is also completely frustrated by this grossly unfair and iniquitous tax.

The case of the small family business enterprise is exactly parallel to what I have described. The profits of the small business are the only means by which it can amass capital for expansion, so the businessman ploughs the profits back into the business. Like the farmer he expects to sell the business at a profit, which is his retirement fund. He faces equally disastrous results at the hands of our present tax laws.

The solution that I suggest is simple. The family farm or small business could be sold once in a lifetime without attracting capital gains tax. It would need only a very simple amendment to the Income Tax Act, and the time is now opportune. Only today the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) on behalf of the Minister of Finance introduced certain changes to the act.

Could I just have one more minute, Mr. Speaker, to finish my remarks? It should be noted that in the publication "Preliminary Taxation Statistics" issued by the Department of National Revenue, for the 1974 taxation year at page 47 in Table K under the subheading "Occupation Class" it is shown that the revenue received from capital gains on farm property is only 10 per cent of the total of the capital gains tax. The loss would be minimal, Mr. Speaker. Surely the government could forgo such an iniquitous tax.

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles) has reiterated the question he posed to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) on June 17. He went on to describe a situation which is quite different, however. I think I would agree with him that if it were the disposition of the farm and the accumulation of the capital, that perhaps it should be looked at closely. What he is talking about, however, is something entirely different. He talked about expropriation, and I believe he mentioned Stelco and Texaco. I think it is a different problem altogether. He spoke of a rollover once in a lifetime of the value accumulated. I have some sympathy with his view and I agree it should be looked at in that particular light, but not necessarily in the way he posed the problem.

What he has said, and what should be said is that farmers, having worked for many years and accumulated a particular amount of property, should not be penalized when they dispose of it. That is the point at issue; not the

expropriation aspect, but whether a farmer, having worked in some cases 25, 30 or 40 years to accumulate the property, should be penalized.

He talked about what this brings in to the national revenue, but that is not the question either. It is the aspect of whether the farmer who if he has not any sons or daughters who want to carry on, and he wants to dispose of the property, should be penalized. That is the question to which we should address ourselves. I have some sympathy with it and I shall make sure it is looked into—not to discriminate against any other taxpayer but to make sure that the farmers who contribute to the economic life of this country should not be penalized in our tax system.

I shall make sure that is not the case and that they are treated fairly.

COMMUNICATIONS—PROPOSED USE OF BALANCED ARMATURE RECEIVER BY BELL TELEPHONE—REQUEST FOR DELAY

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I think most of the members of this House would agree that once a group of people in this country has established a right to a service it ought not to have that right unilaterally taken away.

I think we all agree that Canadians should not lose the right to health services, education, or any other service they now have. But unfortunately very soon one group of Canadians is going to be losing part of the rights it has to communication services. I am speaking of the hearing impaired in this country and the full rights they presently have to use telephones.

● (2210)

The Bell Telephone Company has decided it is going to save some money by installing a device in its telephones called a balanced armature receiver. The problem is that this balanced armature receiver does not produce a strong enough magnetic field to activate the hearing aids and teletype machines in the homes of the hearing impaired. The present telephones make this possible, but when the new technology is installed, starting this July, these persons with hearing disabilities will no longer be able to use the telephone for communication purposes; at least they will not be able to use the telephones of the Bell Telephone system.

A group of people, concerned about the loss to the hearing impaired of full access to our communications system, has approached both the Bell Telephone Company and the Canadian Radio-Television Commission over the last year to make its concerns known and to push for delays or changes in technology which would ensure equal right to communication by telephone for the hearing impaired. The Bell Telephone Company, however, has refused even to delay installation of these devices. Instead it has merely promised that it will begin to go to work researching hearing aid designs. It also promised that it would make pay telephones and telephones in the homes and work places of the hearing impaired compatible with present hearing aids. For use with other telephones Bell has offered to produce an adaptor, which is the size of a hockey puck and costs $8.

[Mr. Trudel.]

The steering committee on the telephone receiver and the hearing impaired has taken the position that this does not go far enough, and I agree with them. Why should the hearing impaired be forced to carry adaptors around with them when they do not have to do this now? And who is going to pay for these adaptors and their maintenance? Why should the hearing impaired be forced to have this additional nuisance and expense? For that matter, I am sure all hon. members who have children with hearing difficulties realize how absurd it is to ask active children always to carry an adaptor with them. Beyond that, this also means that in emergencies the hearing impaired will no longer be able to use the telephones of their friends and neighbours or even the phones of strangers, something which all of us take for granted.

If this is going to cause so much inconvenience for the hearing impaired, why is Bell going ahead with it? Does it want to save, relatively speaking, a paltry $7 million to $10 million over the next ten years? This might sound like a lot of money, but keep in mind that it comes to less than .04 per cent of Bell's budget. Keep also in mind that if Bell were to put a device called a fluxcoil in its phones the whole problem would be eliminated, because this device would create the necessary magnetic field. But Bell is unwilling to do it, because it would cut its savings by one third.

Many might think that not a lot of people are touched by this issue; but keep in mind that up to 10 per cent of our total population suffers from hearing handicaps. That group includes almost one third of our pensioners. Bell's action will affect all these handicapped people; not to mention their families, friends and fellow workers, all of whom must communicate with the handicapped and whose telephones might be needed by the hearing handicapped.

Let us also keep in mind where this will hit the hearing handicapped hardest. With three quarters of a million people out of work now, the hearing handicapped already have a special disadvantage finding work. Now they will have to go to prospective employers and tell them they must go to the added inconvenience of adding special phones if they want to hire a hard of hearing person. And make no mistake, businesses will be the first to get these new devices.

The telephone company has said that this will not become a problem for some time because it will not have large numbers of the new telephones installed. But beginning next month it will start installing the new receivers; without doubt, the hearing handicapped will begin to feel the effects very quickly.

When I raised this question in the House on June 9 the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fleming) said that the CRTC was trying to get the two sides to co-operate and that he would bring the matter of the fluxcoil to the attention of the CRTC. We see how much good that has done. Bell Canada has refused to delay the implementation of the new receiver and next month will begin use of its balanced armature receiver. The CRTC has not shown, a few days before the end of June, any indication that it intends to force Bell Canada to postpone the implementation of this technology.

I call on the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé), who has ultimate responsibility in this matter, to inform

Bell Canada directly that it cannot change its receiver program until the large groups of impaired and defenceless Canadians are provided with equal access to telephone use within the Bell system.

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, as most hon. members are aware, Bell Canada and the Steering Committee for the Hearing Impaired have been trying for some time to resolve their differences created by Bell's plans to upgrade the existing telephone receiver at a considerable saving which hopefully would be of benefit to consumers. While the two sides have not been able to reach an agreement, it should be noted that the matter is not easily resolved. While the concerns of the hearing impaired are very important, even the Consumers Association of Canada hesitated to support a resolution outlining the demands of the hearing impaired at the recent CAC meeting in Winnipeg.

The Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission has now—if I can make that correction for the hon. member—at the senior staff level heard representatives from both Bell Canada and the hearing impaired. The executive committee of the CRTC will in the very near future be considering both sides of the issue in an effort to find a constructive course of action which will bear in mind the best interests of the hearing impaired and the consumer at large. I know that the CRTC will do its best to lead these two parties to a positive conclusion in the best interests of all Canadians, and particularly bearing in mind the needs of the hearing impaired.

My minister has asked me to assure the House that meanwhile she and her officials will continue to watch the situation closely and to encourage Bell and the steering committee to find a solution acceptable to both.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—ALLEGATION ISRAEL HAS STOCK PILE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, on June 16 I asked the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs:

> In view of the government's posture of devout nuclear virginity and stern anti-proliferation of nuclear arms, may I ask if in the light of sustained and widespread reports of possession of substantial nuclear stock piles by the Republic of Israel, the minister can advise if the government of Canada has made any investigation of, or inquiry into, the serious allegations and, if so, has it cautioned the friendly government of Israel regarding the danger of adding further highly incendiary elements to the already explosive Middle East situation?

I was amazed that no reply was given to this question dealing as it did with nuclear weaponry, a matter I would think of some considerable importance. The minister was abroad and I am sure the parliamentary secretary was on official duty, but the system here provides for questions to be taken by an acting minister.

On March 23, under the provisions of Standing Order 58, this House had a full length debate on the issue of proliferation of nuclear weapons. At that time the minister spoke at length about the issue and Canada's zealous devotion to non-proliferation; there were references to the Club of London, and a long narrative of our assertions and exertions on the noble side of this matter. But I am impressed by the lack of response to or visible concern about serious and recurring reports of the possession, by Israel, of a stockpile of nuclear bombs. The reports do not deal with peaceful uses of atomic energy but with weaponry.

It has been something of an "open secret" for some time that Israel has nuclear warlike capacity. As recently as April 12 *Time* magazine carried a chilling story about the possession of nuclear bombs by a country in the most dangerous and explosive area of the world today. It records:

> At a briefing for a group of American space experts in Washington recently, an offical for the Central Intelligence Agency estimated that Israel had between ten and 20 nuclear weapons "available for use." In fact, Time has learned, Israel possesses a nuclear arsenal of 13 atomic bombs, assembled, stored and ready to be dropped on enemy forces from specially equipped Kfir and Phantom fighters or Jericho missiles. These weapons have a 20-kiloton yield, roughly as powerful as those that obliterated Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The newsstory goes on to relate that in the face of Arab victories in the early days of the 1973 war, the then premier, Mrs. Meir, authorized the use of the Doomsday weapons. Actually no bombs were activated, the Israelis having reached a much more successful stage in the conventional warfare.

● (2220)

Most of us will recall that serious and mysterious red alert sent out by the U.S. in 1973. *Time*'s explanation is worrisome to say the least:

> Did Israel's nuclear capability play a part in the U.S. global military alert of Oct. 25, 1973? According to *Time*'s sources, the Israelis were convinced that the Russians had learned of the newly acquired nuclear potential, possibly through a Soviet Cosmos spy satellite over the Middle East. What is certain is that on Oct. 13, the Russians dispatched nuclear warheads from Nikolaev—the naval base at Odessa—to Alexandria, to be fitted on Russian Scud missiles already based in Egypt. The U.S., in turn, detected the Soviet warheads as the ship carrying them passed through the Bosphorous on Oct. 15 and issued a warning to Moscow by means of a world military alert.

Many years may elapse before we will know how close we came to a dreadful nuclear confrontation. It is difficult to know how fully accurate is the *Time* story, although the account of the Dimona nuclear installation in the Negev seems authentic enough. I would not suggest that Canada ally itself to one or other of the Middle East protagonists. All I have ever sought is a policy of genuine objectivity. But surely there should be no failure to recognize the awful danger which the introduction of nuclear bombs would bring upon that region and indeed all of us.

I think we can be sure that the use of nuclear arms by one of the parties to the dispute would invite and assure intrusion by the great powers, and after that who can describe or delineate the range and extent of the chaos into which we should all be plunged?

One of the most astute Canadian observers of the Middle East is Reverend Dr. A. C. Forrest, Editor of the *United Church Observer*, who wrote a stirring, challenging editorial, "Israel and the Bomb: Why Doesn't Somebody Scream?" It is an article to which I invite the minister's attention. The following is an extract:

> An astonishing silence followed in the wake of *Time's* disclosure of Israel's arsenal of atomic bombs and near use of them. Press and radio in Canada didn't seem to be surprised or alarmed. And the pulpits, church courts, editiorial writers and other would-be prophets and opinion-makers seemed to have nothing to say.

If it were revealed that some other world leader—a Russian or British prime minister or an American or French president—had given approval for the use of the bomb, we wonder what would have been said. But when Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan decided it was time to press the button, well, that's Israel, and it seems impolite to say anything.

The world has been warned and warned again that the Middle East is the most threatening situation in the world. The Arabs have demonstrated that they can inflict economic disaster by withholding oil exports or sharply increasing the price. Israel is politically unstable, economically dependent, and divided about what to do about the West Bank. She is a threatened colonial island in a hostile sea and has demonstrated what we suspected—her ageing leaders would commit national suicide in fact of defeat.

Church leaders and others who have some responsibility for communicating information and creating public opinion should not ignore the *Time* revelation and what it means. If we can't agree on everything, we should at least agree that the postponed Geneva Conference should be held, and the Palestinians should be there. And soon. For the Middle East is moving inexorably towards Armageddon.

Mr. Speaker, to a Bible-reading Presbyterian, that word Armageddon is chilling and penetrating.

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like first to say to the hon. member that I hope he was not criticizing the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) and of his parliamentary secretary on June 16. The minister was attending the CIEC Conference of the group of industrialized nations in Paris and I was opening a photographic exposition called "Between Friends"—"Entre Amis"—in the second biggest city of the United States, beautiful and hospitable Chicago, for the American bicentennial.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Bégin: I am sure all members of the House share this expression of friendship for our neighbour to the south.

When I returned to the House I read the question which had been asked by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and which had not received an answer. I thought that might have had something to do with the way in which his question had been formulated.

Without acknowledging the accuracy of these speculative reports to which the hon. member refers, I can assure the House that Canada has been active in all appropriate fora in warning the international community of the dangers of nuclear proliferation and has taken concrete initiatives to strengthen the international non-proliferation system.

With specific reference to Israel, it is not my practice to comment on media reports, especially those concerning important international issues. We are, of course, anxious to avoid the addition of any destabilizing or "incendiary" elements into the Middle East conflict. This Canadian view is frequently brought to the attention of the international community and is well known to all of the parties to the conflict, including Israel.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

APPENDIX

P.C. 1976-1576

Certified to be a true copy of a Minute of a Meeting of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 23 June, 1976

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Transport, advise that, pursuant to Part I of the Inquiries Act,

the Honourable W. R. Sinclair of Edmonton, and

the Honourable Julien Chouinard of Quebec City

be appointed Co-Commissioners to inquire into the safety of the introduction of bilingual IFR Air Traffic Services in the Province of Quebec, and report upon the implications in relation to aviation safety and operational efficiency, upon the procedures (and methods of their development) being developed by the Department of Transport in conjunction with the aviation associations and the aviation industry, and upon such other matters as might influence the further introduction of bilingual Air Traffic Services in Quebec, and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, to consider, evaluate and report upon

(a) the parameters of a procedural study to be conducted by the Department of Transport based on the use of an air traffic control electronic simulator;

(b) the documentation required pertaining to the various procedures developed in order to facilitate evaluation of those procedures;

(c) the detailed conduct of the Department of Transport's studies and participation therein of representatives of the aviation industry and associations by monitoring, as appropriate, through specially appointed professional advisers if considered necessary, and by means of interim recommendation to the Department of Transport, the aviation industry and associations;

(d) the IFR procedures finally developed, and the VFR flight operations in Dorval and Mirabel Terminal Radar Service Areas, and St. Hubert Control Zone, in terms of the adequacy of the method used in developing and testing the procedures and the implications in relation to aviation safety and operational efficiency; and

(e) relevant matters that may in the course of the inquiry arise or develop and that, in the opinion of the Commissioners, should be included in the report.

The Committee further advise that

(a) the Commissioners be authorized to prescribe and adopt such practices and procedures for all purposes of the Commission, including hearings, as they may from time to time deem expedient for the proper conduct of the inquiry and to vary those practices from time to time:

(b) the officers of the Department of Transport and of Air Canada furnish to the Commissioners such information and assistance as they may require for their activities;

(c) the Commissioners invite duly designated representatives of aviation associations and the aviation industry to be present and to participate in the inquiry;

(d) the Commissioners be authorized to engage the services of such accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts, clerks, reporters and assistants as they deem necessary or advisable and also the services of counsel to aid and assist the Commission in the inquiry, at such rates of remuneration including transportation and living expenses as may be approved by Treasury Board;

(e) the Commissioners may submit interim reports promptly to the Minister of Transport on the results of particular aspects of the inquiry, and shall submit a final report with all reasonable dispatch and within ninety days of the receipt of the final results of the study based on the use of the air traffic control electronic simulator;

(f) the Minister table any interim reports and the final report in Parliament and report in Parliament at an early date on the implementation of such reports; and

(g) the administrative and related costs of the Commission shall be the responsibility of the Department of Transport.

The Committee further advise that Order in Council P.C. 1976-1143 of 13th May, 1976 be revoked.

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY
P. M. PITFIELD
CLERK OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

P.C. 1976-1588

Certified to be a true copy of a Minute of a Meeting of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 28 June, 1976

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Transport, advise that, pursuant to Part I of the Inquiries Act,

the Honourable W. R. Sinclair of Edmonton,

the Honourable Julien Chouinard of Quebec City, and

the Honourable D. V. Heald of Ottawa

be appointed Co-Commissioners to inquire into the safety of the introduction of bilingual IFR Air Traffic Services in the Province of Quebec, and report upon the implications in relation to aviation safety, implementation costs and operational efficiency, and upon the procedures (and methods of their development) being developed by the Department of Transport in conjunction with the aviation associations and the aviation industry, and also upon such other matters as might influence the further introduction of bilingual Air Traffic Services in Quebec, and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, to consider, evaluate and report upon

(a) the parameters of a procedural study to be conducted by the Department of Transport based on the use of an air traffic control electronic simulator;

(b) the documentation required pertaining to the various procedures developed in order to facilitate evaluation of those procedures;

(c) the detailed conduct of the Department of Transport's studies and participation therein of representatives of the aviation industry and associations by monitoring, as appropriate, through specially appointed professional advisers if considered necessary, and by means of interim recommendation to the Department of Transport, the aviation industry and associations;

(d) the IFR procedures finally developed, and the VFR flight operations in Dorval and Mirabel Terminal Radar Service Areas, and St. Hubert Control Zone, in terms of the adequacy of the method used in developing and testing the procedures and the implications in relation to aviation safety, implementation costs and operational efficiency; and

(e) relevant matters that may in the course of the inquiry arise or develop and that, in the opinion of the Commissioners, should be included in the report.

The Committee further advise that

(a) The Commissioners shall be authorized to prescribe and adopt such practices and procedures for all purposes of the Commission, including hearings, as they may from time to time deem expedient for the proper conduct of the inquiry and to vary those practices from time to time;

(b) the officers of the Department of Transport and of Air Canada shall furnish to the Commissioners such information and assistance as they may require for their activities;

(c) the Commissioners shall invite duly designated representatives of aviation associations and the aviation air carrier industry to be present and to participate in the inquiry;

(d) the Commissioners shall be authorized to engage the services of such accountants, engineers, technical advisers or other experts, clerks, reporters and assistants as they deem necessary or advisable and also the services of counsel to aid and assist the Commission in the inquiry, at such rates of remuneration including transportation and living expenses as may be approved by Treasury Board;

(e) the Commissioners shall submit interim reports promptly to the Minister of Transport on the results of particular aspects of the inquiry, and shall submit a final report with all reasonable dispatch and within ninety days of the receipt of the final results of the study based on the use of the air traffic control electronic simulator;

(f) the Commissioners shall append to their reports any statement on the aspects of the inquiry reported upon, received from CATCA or CALPA within a specified period of time designated by the Commission;

(g) the Commissioners shall not in any of their reports indicate that safety has been demonstrated unless they can justify beyond a reasonable doubt why any contrary view expressed by CATCA or CALPA should not prevail;

(h) the Minister shall table any interim reports and the final report in Parliament and report in Parliament at an early date on the implementation of such reports; and

(i) the administrative and related costs of the Commission shall be the responsibility of the Department of Transport.

The Committee further advise that Order in Council P.C. 1976-1576 of 23rd June, 1976 be revoked.

Certified to be a true copy
P. M. Pitfield
Clerk of the Privy Council

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BETWEEN:

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

AND:

THE CANADIAN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL ASSOCIATION (CATCA)

AND:

THE CANADIAN AIR LINE PILOTS' ASSOCIATION (CALPA)

IT IS HEREBY AGREED

1. THAT the public Commission of Inquiry which has been announced be composed of three (3) judicial appointees; the third being acceptable to CATCA before any public announcement of his appointment is made.

2. THAT a prerequisite to the expansion or introduction of any bilingual air traffic service be a unanimous report of the Commission declaring the proposed expansion or introduction to be consistent with the maintenance of current safety standards in Canadian air operations.

3. THAT the terms of reference now contained in Order in Council PC-1976-1576 should include a provision to the effect that "the Commissioners shall append to their reports any statement on the aspects of the inquiry reported upon, received from CATCA or CALPA within a specified period of time designated by the Commission".

4. THAT the terms of reference should include a further provision to the effect that "the Commissioners shall not in any of their reports indicate that safety has been demonstrated unless they can justify beyond a reasonable doubt why any contrary view expressed by CATCA or CALPA should not prevail".

5. THAT the terms of reference should be revised on page 1 thereof as follows:

(a) In the preamble, by amending line 9 thereof to read as follows: "in relation to aviation safety, implementation costs and operational efficiency, and . . . ";

(b) Further in the preamble, by amending line 13 thereof to read as follows: " . . . industry, and also upon such other matters as might influence . . . ";

(c) In paragraph (d), by amending line 7 thereof to read as follows: " . . . to aviation safety, implementation costs and operational efficiency; and . . . ".

6. THAT the terms of reference should be revised on page 2 thereof as follows:
   (a) In paragraph (a), by amending line 1 thereof to read as follows: "... the Commissioners shall be authorized to prescribe ...";
   (b) In paragraph (b), by amending line 2 thereof to read as follows: "... and of Air Canada shall furnish to the Commissioners ...";
   (c) In paragraph (c), by amending line 1 thereof to read as follows: "... the Commissioners shall invite duly designated ...";
   (d) In paragraph (c), by amending line 3 thereof to read as follows: "... the aviation air carrier industry to be present and to ...";
   (e) In paragraph (d), by amending line 1 thereof to read as follows: "... the Commissioners shall be authorized to engage the..";
   (f) In paragraph (e), by amending line 1 thereof to read as follows: "... the Minister shall table any interim reports and ...";
   (g) In paragraph (f), by amending line 1 thereof to read as follows: "... the Minister shall table any interim reports and ...".
7. With reference to the "specially appointed professional advisers" mentioned in paragraph (c) on page 1 of the terms of reference, Transport Canada and CATCA will submit a joint list of appropriate controller advisers to the Commission.
8. THAT Transport Canada will submit before July 1 a recommendation to the Privy Council which the Government will process expeditiously and publish in the *Canada Gazette* at the earliest possible date as an air navigation order with regard to the use of language in the air, and Transport Canada undertakes to pursue the enforcement thereof.
9. THAT, following the tabling of the final report of the Commission in Parliament, the Government will present a resolution to the House of Commons seeking concurrence therein in a free vote.

This MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING was signed at Ottawa, on the 28th day of June, 1976, subject to acceptance by the membership of the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association.

The Honourable Otto Lang,
Minister of Transport

J. M. Livingston, President,
Canadian Air Traffic Control Association

K. A. Maley, President,
Canadian Air Line Pilots' Association

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 29, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

NON-SMOKERS' RELIEF ACT

SUGGESTION BILL C-242 BE PUT FORWARD AS GOVERNMENT MEASURE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, and seconded by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald), I move:

That Bill C-242 which deals with smokers in transit be put forward as a government bill in order to facilitate its passage through the House prior to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Once again I express serious reservations about procedural matters being contained in motions moved under Standing Order 43. In any event, the motion cannot be put without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED CENSORSHIP OF RUSSIAN LANGUAGE BROADCASTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity with regard to copies of certain internal documents of the international service of the CBC which have come into my possession and which indicate, among other things, an attempt by the Department of External Affairs to influence and censor CBC Russian language broadcasts critical of the Communist system on such matters as persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union; and a direct attempt by the Department of External Affairs to silence comments by CBC Russian language commentator Dr. F. Yaroshevsky of 30 Judith Drive, Toronto, as outlined in a series of questions on today's Order Paper. I would therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie):

That an immediate parliamentary inquiry be made of the programming of Radio Canada International to countries in eastern Europe, particularly the Soviet Union, for purposes of determining the degree of censorship exercised by the government, in particular by the Department of External Affairs and certain senior CBC personnel, in influencing program content away from criticism of the Communist system, Soviet mistreatment of Jews, the subjects of politics, economics or religion; and finally, that the Secretary of State for External Affairs be required to apologize publicly on behalf of the government to CBC Russian language commentator Dr. F. Yaroshevsky of 30 Judith Drive, Toronto, for slanderous accusations made against him and subsequently proven false.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST THAT FRENCH ONLY BE USED IN AIR COMMUNICATIONS IN CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion about an urgent matter calling for immediate attention.

Since the information paper issued to members of parliament by CALPA insists that CALPA is not Anti-French but in favour of using a single language, and since CALPA maintains as well in that paper that the use of two languages may cause air accidents and jeopardize air safety, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House urge the government to respond to the very commendable concern of CALPA about safety by establishing French unilingualism in air communications in Canada so as to avoid the hazards which could result from the use of both languages in air communications.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There not being unanimous consent, such a motion cannot be put.

● (1410)

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

PROPOSED REVIEW BY BOARD OF HALL REPORT ON CONTRACT OF AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS GROUP—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In light of the fact that the Anti-Inflation Board has rejected the carefully reasoned judgment of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall on the wage recommendations concerning the Treasury Board and Aircraft Operations group contract and as the AIB has ignored the amended Section S-67 of the AIB regulations which allows increases over the $2,400 ceiling in special cases, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling):

That this House direct the Minister of Finance to instruct the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board to implement an immediate review of the Justice Hall report and provide a complete written statement to the Treasury Board and the striking aircraft safety inspection group on their findings.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POSSIBILITY OF LEGISLATION GOVERNING INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN VIEW OF STRIKES—CONSULTATIVE ARRANGEMENTS WITH LABOUR CONGRESS

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Having regard to the growing number of industrial disputes which have been witnessed in this country, particularly in the public sector, since the establishment of wage and price controls, will the Prime Minister advise whether it is the intention of the government to introduce legislation governing industrial relations following the summer recess?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to bring back before the House the matter of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, but I do not plan to go into any detail. This, as the House knows, is the kind of thing that is dealt with at the time of the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Mazankowski: Inasmuch as the CLC seems to have committed itself to a withdrawal from the existing consultative mechanism with regard to establishing government labour relations in this country, at least until the control period ends, what sort of consultative arrangements are being considered by the government during this period?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I must disagree with the premise of the hon. member's question. The CLC has been meeting with the government. We had a meeting about ten days ago. We are planning one in about another ten days for a whole day and perhaps even two days. Therefore, there is certainly an indication by the CLC that they are interested in discussing with the government the future of this country.

ALLEGED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN MINISTER'S FIGURES AND OFFICIAL STATISTICS ON MAN-DAYS LOST AS RESULT OF STRIKES

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour, I will direct my question to the Minister of Finance. As man-days lost as a result of strikes are up to two million in the first three months of 1976, representing an increase of 60 per cent over 1975, and as the Minister of Labour said in the House on June 17 that man-days lost are decreasing, can the Minister of Finance explain the discrepancy between the figures and opinions of the Minister of Labour and those of official government statistics?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to bring the hon. member's argument to the attention of my colleague.

Mr. Ritchie: Has the minister any statistics to bear out the claim made by the Minister of Labour that the anti-inflation program has substantially reduced the number of man-days lost in view of the figures for the first quarter which indicate that the opposite is the case?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me the hon. member is making the same argument over again.

* * *

HEALTH

MERCURY POISONING—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON MONITORING OF HEALTH OF NATIVES IN AREA AFFECTED

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare and supplementaries for the ministers of manpower and environment. Bearing in mind the inadequacy of fast responses by the government to the dangers of mercury poisoning, and now that the presence of the dread Minamata disease has been confirmed in the Grassy Narrows Indian Reserve for the first time in Canada, I ask the minister whether the federal government is now prepared to conduct an intensive and ongoing monitoring of the health of the people in the area affected, including regular blood tests, so that individuals may be advised of the danger of mercury poisoning as it pertains to their own case histories?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member does not seem aware of all the measures which have been taken already during recent months in this field in the whole Grassy Narrows area. Those measures have already

been implemented for several months with teams of medical experts and the tests carried on those Indians will go on extensively. In fact, the cases identified up to this day were discovered following the policy which was recommended and implemented by the government.

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST THAT ENGLISH AND WABIGOON RIVERS BE DECLARED WATER QUALITY CONTROLLED ZONES

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): The minister knows full well that those are only random samplings. I should like to direct a question, now, to the Minister of the Environment. In view of the fact that the mercury-polluted English river/Wabigoon river system is an interprovincial waterway, will the minister now acknowledge federal responsibility and begin discussions with the Ontario and Manitoba governments preparatory to declaring the area a water quality controlled zone under the provision of the Canada Water Act, or, in the event of failure to get provincial co-operation, take unilateral action as the Act empowers him to do?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware that we are constantly trying to eliminate mercury from the environment. We have established standards in this respect. We continue to do so and keep cooperating with the provinces to eliminate not only mercury but PCBs as well. If, in this specific instance, there is something which could be done, I shall be very happy to.

* * *

[*English*]

MANPOWER

PROVISION OF EMPLOYMENT FOR NATIVES OF WHITE DOG AND GRASSY NARROWS RESERVES IN VIEW OF LOSS OF WORK AS GUIDES

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): I see the buck-passing still goes on. I will try once more. In view of the fact that the Indians living on the White Dog and Grassy Narrows reserves depend on fishing and guiding for employment and that mercury pollution is destroying not only their health but also their livelihood, I would ask the Minister of Manpower what special plans he has to provide alternative employment for those residents who are desperately in need of assistance?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): We have had some discussion with the government of Ontario in connection with special employment programs for that whole area. The program would extend not only to those directly affected but to others in the area, and I expect to announce some specifics in the not too distant future.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PUERTO RICO SUMMIT CONFERENCE—EFFECT OF DECISIONS ON CANADA

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister concerning the important meeting just held in Puerto Rico. I am happy that this time Canada was invited to this economic summit and, Mr. Speaker, this is to the credit of the Prime Minister and of the Canadian people.

My question is this: can the Prime Minister tell the House what will be the impact of those talks on the domestic administrative policies of the country and also whether he made any commitment on behalf of Canada towards the chiefs of state he met?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, no decision which could affect the domestic administration of any country, including Canada, was taken. We exchanged views, statistics and data which enabled the countries represented to try developing a common knowledge of economic issues and freedom problems in general.

POSSIBILITY OF SENDING ADDITIONAL FOOD SUPPLIES TO THIRD WORLD

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question.

Could the Prime Minister tell the House whether during those discussions someone raised the possibility of allocating new funds for additional food aid to be sent to countries in the Third World?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there was a rather lengthy discussion on aid projects for the Third World. Each country participated in this discussion. The Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs also spoke at length as co-chairman of the conference on economic co-operation in Europe which is being held in Paris, but there were no precise commitments made by any leader of participating governments. Of course Canada has played a major role in encouraging member countries to help Third World nations.

* * *

● (1420)

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

ALLEGED MASSIVE FRAUD INVOLVING 200 COMPANIES—INQUIRY WHETHER INVESTIGATION BEGAN BEFORE VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue and is related to the alleged massive tax fraud involving 200 different companies and $400 million uncovered by a journalist for the Montreal *Gazette* and which was the subject of a radio interview on the CBC. Can the minister inform the House whether his department is investigating this

allegation, whether charges are contemplated, and what generally is the department doing to plug this loophole?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the figures cited by the hon. member are impressive, but once again I must plead the confidentiality of any investigation that we may be conducting. It seems to me to be appropriate, if we are conducting an investigation, that if an individual is found to be innocent the matter should not be reported. If it turns out that the individual is guilty, then that should become public information and it seems to me that that is the time to make a public disclosure.

Mr. Oberle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since it is reported that most of these firms have been allowed to make voluntary disclosures of their attempted fraud, can the minister advise the House whether the investigation to which he makes reference was underway before the voluntary disclosures were accepted by the tax department, or was the investigation launched after the disclosures were made?

Mr. Cullen: First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, I did not say there was an investigation; the hon. member suggested that there was an investigation taking place. I should make it quite clear that no one is permitted to make a voluntary disclosure or to abide by our rules under that heading if it comes about as the result of an investigation that is being conducted. So, if we initiate an investigation, no one is afterwards permitted to make a voluntary disclosure. I might say that that is comparatively new. There was a court case in which the department was reprimanded for not taking this action and we do take that action nowadays. If it comes about as the result of our investigations, no voluntary disclosure is permitted.

Mr. Oberle: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister please tell the House whether there is or is not an investigation into this alleged massive tax fraud, which is obviously a contravention of every rule of the tax department?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is precisely the question that the minister answered in the first instance.

Mr. Oberle: No, Mr. Speaker, he did not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton West.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REASON FOR RESTRICTION ON TRAVEL TO FOUR COUNTRIES ON MEMBERS' PASSPORTS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Last week I asked him a question about restrictions that had been imposed without notice either before or after passports has been issued to members of parliament, and possibly to others, in respect of certain countries. The minister said that he would look into the matter and give an explanation if possible.

[Mr. Oberle.]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have looked into the matter and it is true that the practice has been established of indicating in special and diplomatic passports that these passports are not valid for entry into four countries. These are countries which at the present time Canada does not recognize. It is not a new practice; it was applied, for example, in the case of East Germany which at that time Canada did not recognize.

I believe that the holders of both diplomatic passports and special passports usually hold these passports because they are on public business or because they hold a special position and expect, in accordance with international practice, to receive better than normal treatment at the hands of the host government. Since these passports constitute a signal to the host government which might be construed as a form of recognition, this particular insertion is placed in the passport. Obviously it is not my intention to restrict the travel of members to any country they may wish to visit, of course, with an ordinary passport. That is the explanation for the practice.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister why this is now done surreptitiously without notice either before the passports are called in, allegedly for endorsation that a member is part of an official delegation, or following, and why this endorsation is put in somewhere at some page without any indication given afterwards? The minister did not even know this when I asked him the question last week! In addition, would the minister give an explanation in regard to the case of Taiwan which, when this government cravenly and in a bootlicking way decided to kowtow to Mainland China, altered the status, and members on the government side and on the opposition side—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Members on the government side and on the opposition side have received no special consideration. This has been the case since the time the government decided to withdraw recognition of the very well established government in Taiwan. Why is this being done now and what is the rationale, or is this just some special kowtowing that is going on?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not special kowtowing; it is the result of the circumstances which I have already explained. This is a policy that applies to others, not only to Taiwan, a country we do not recognize. We do not have a two-China policy and that has been a well established element of Canadian foreign policy. We cannot attempt to provide recognition to Taiwan indirectly which we withdrew formally in extending recognition to China. That is the basis of the policy, and it applies as well to Rhodesia and Namibia. It is based upon a precedent that has already been established. I am sympathetic to any point of view the hon. member may wish to make in respect of members of parliament whose mobility and rights I have no intention of disrupting or impeding in any way, consistent—

An. hon. Member: You have.

Mr. MacEachen: Not at all. I do not intend that, consistent with the fact that Canada does not intend, through this form or method, to provide indirect recognition to any of these régimes.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

PROPOSAL THAT AIRLINES PAY FULL SECURITY COSTS AT AIRPORTS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in light of earlier statements by the Minister of Transport to the effect that there would be an announcement on June 1 indicating whether the airlines would be compelled to pay full security costs at MOT airports across Canada, I would ask the minister whether consultations with interested parties have come to a conclusion, and will a statement be forthcoming?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a conclusion was arrived at, and is subject to some further consultation, that reduces the figure significantly from the earlier one proposed; I believe to 20 cents from 65 cents.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN ALLOWABLE EARNINGS OF RECIPIENTS OF WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, in view of the difficulty being experienced by war veterans allowance recipients in earning a little more income to provide for the necessities of life, will the Minister of Veterans Affairs advise the House whether any consideration is being given to increasing the casual earnings allowable by a single or married recipient of war veterans allowance?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member will recall that this was looked at approximately a year and a half ago as well as three years ago. It is now one of the things to be looked at again, and we are doing this at present in my department.

● (1430)

Mr. Marshall: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would give in a little more detail the amount of the increase in the casual earnings he is considering, in view of inflation in the last few years.

Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, the present amount is $1,000 of allowable earnings for a single person and $1,500 per married couple. I would prefer not to make figures known today until we have a little more study on them.

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

DATE OF RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LOWER ST. LAWRENCE AREA

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

I would like to ask the minister if he could give the House a progress report on the discussions and negotiations with Quebec authorities about the renewal of the agreement on the development of the lower St. Lawrence, of Gaspé and of the Magdalen Islands and if we can expect this agreement will be reached as soon as possible?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the question of the hon. member by telling him first that we are not negotiating a renewal of the agreement itself. In fact, it is a new agreement under the general development agreement we signed with the province of Quebec more than two years ago.

As a matter of fact, we are negotiating this agreement. The civil servants at both levels of government met on several occasions. My counterpart and myself will soon have another meeting to evaluate the work accomplished, take some decisions and give a certain direction to our civil servants.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR DELAY IN DEPORTATION TO CHILE OF SERGIO PERES

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that the government intends to proceed tomorrow with the deportation of a Chilean refugee identified as Sergio Peres who was active in Chile, both in the trade union movement and politically as a supporter of the murdered President Salvador Allende, and in view of the fact that such a respected international observer as George Cram, the overseas development project officer of the Anglican Church of Canada, has said that Peres "could certainly be detained, could well be tortured", and that he personally had interviewed many political prisoners in Chilean jails who had less political involvement than Mr. Peres, could the minister postpone any action in this matter until he can be thoroughly acquainted with the dangers faced by Mr. Peres should he be returned to Chile?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the case just came to my attention this morning. I have examined it to the extent that I note that the gentleman's application for refugee status was, of course reviewed by the interdepartmental committee and found not to be valid by that organization. It was then referred to the Immigration Appeal Board for second review and the refugee claim was not upheld. Having said that, and having just had the opportunity to alert myself to the situation, I will look at the case and as

the hon. member suggests satisfy myself that it is the proper course of action.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE DISCUSSION OF PUERTO RICAN CONFERENCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADIAN INFLATION RATES

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In answering a question put by the hon. member for Richmond the Prime Minister indicated that the Puerto Rican meeting was an exchange of ideas and certain data. I wonder whether the Prime Minister could indicate if he picked up any idea when he was in Puerto Rico as to why United States inflation rate is down to almost 6 per cent currently while ours is still almost 9 per cent with controls?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not have to go to Puerto Rico to know the proper answer to that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Every informed member of this House knows that the Canadian economy was out-performing the United States economy very substantially, including the year 1975, when there was a recession of some 6 per cent in the United States and in Canada there was a GNP growth of only minus one. So there is a different phasing between the two economies. We did indeed talk a great deal about that and the dangers to economies if they tried to recuperate and pull each other into an excessive stimulation which would lead to increased inflation. This whole problem was discussed and of course I informed them about the Canadian position.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON RESULTS OF PUERTO RICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Prime Minister could indicate whether he intends to make a statement concerning the conference and if not why not?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I intend to table at the proper moment, when orders of the day are called, the communiqué in both languages which was issued at the end of the conference yesterday. On the question of why not make a statement, I am following my habit of not making any statement after my travels abroad because I find that generally they are counter productive.

[Mr. Andras.]

FINANCE

EXTENT TO WHICH LINES OF CREDIT TO ENGLAND AND ITALY HAVE BEEN CALLED UPON

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance who also attended the Puerto Rican conference. I am wondering if he could indicate to what extent our lines of credit to England and Italy have been called upon and has there been any request for the lines to be increased?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there was no request for an increase in Canada's stand-by credit to the United Kingdom. There has been a drawing on this but I have been advised by the Governor of the Bank of Canada that it has been the general practice not to indicate the amounts drawn at any time specifically on this particular credit. There was no further discussion about extension of credit to the United Kingdom, although there was extensive discussion about the balance of payments problems that Italy faces at the present time and some consideration of the possible actions that might be taken in the international monetary fund to assist in this regard.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BASIS ON WHICH TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS ENDORSED ON MEMBERS' PASSPORTS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I should like to know first, who made the order to deny to members the use of passports wherever they choose to go. Was it done by the cabinet or was it done by officials in his department, because it is a very serious interference with the principle of the charter of the United Nations that there shall be free egress and ingress. I should like to know on what this practice which is being carried out is based?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman will certainly be assured to know there is absolutely no effort to contravene the charter relating to entry or exit from any country. All that has happened has been that diplomatic passports, and passports of a special category, are not valid for entry to those countries under the present action that has been taken. Hon. members are free to travel, as are other citizens on ordinary passports which do not imply a possibility of recognition to regimes which Canada does not recognize.

The right hon. gentleman has asked under what authority. The special and diplomatic passports are issued under the authority of Order in Council 1956/1373 dated September 13, 1956 and regulations can be made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs under that particular Order in Council or administrative action can be taken by officials of the department under delegated authority. It is the latter category under which this action was taken. I am presently reviewing the action in light of the comments made by hon. members.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The other day the minister did not know of the existence of this at all. He looked very abashed and unusually suavely silent. If he is looking into it, he must be convinced there is something wrong. I would ask him whether he has been so convinced because this is a dastardly interference with Canadian rights.

● (1440)

REASON DEPARTMENT CENSORING RUSSIAN LANGUAGE BROADCASTS OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it is on the subject of CBC international programming to the Soviet Union. Will the minister tell the House why his department has been attempting to influence the nature of such programming, and particularly why his department played a part in censoring a broadcast by the CBC Russian language commentator Dr. F. Yaroshevsky of Toronto reporting on a demonstration in Toronto against the mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my department is not responsible for the operations of the CBC. We have absolutely no authority nor control over the broadcasting policy of that corporation.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REASON FOR RESTRICTIONS ON SUBJECTS MENTIONED BY COMMENTATORS ON INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTS

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): The minister honestly misunderstood my question. I realize his department has no authority over the CBC, but it was his department that committed the act to which I have referred, and that is why I directed the question to him.

I will direct my supplementary question to the Secretary of State responsible for the CBC. Is the minister prepared to explain to the House why CBC radio international personnel have been forbidden to give background information on the news or to comment on any political or economic matters, and especially why persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union has been specifically censored from certain broadcasts at the request of the Department of External Affairs?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any of that, but I will be pleased to look into it.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REASON FOR DELAY IN GRANTING INCREASE PROVIDED TO EMPLOYEES BY AGREEMENTS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board who was behind the curtains a while ago.

An hon. Member: Ring the bell, he will return.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Yes. Well, I am waiting for him.

An hon. Member: He is coming.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Well!

An hon. Member: You could put the question to his parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for telling him to come back.

He has already been asked several questions in the House—at least four if memory serves—concerning decisions taken about collective bargainings in the public sector granting salary increases to several professional groups, such as biologists, sociologists, statisticians and agronomists. Some of those decisions were deferred and others referred to the Anti-Inflation Board. I would like to know whether the minister has inquired about the matter, because the employees involved have been waiting up to 12 months for the results of those decisions.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, according to the information which I have obtained, in the case of biologists—and that question was put to me yesterday by the member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta—their retroactive payment, in accordance with the agreement, was mailed to them and they all have now been paid. As for the others, I have no information about them.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Would the minister be prepared to make an investigation on the other questions and report to the House? Some of them have been waiting for 12 months.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, every time there has been an interim agreement, I asked my officials to expedite retroactive payments to civil servants. I have been told that, generally, this is done within 90 days, as required by law. I must admit that in the case of biologists, following the agreement with the union concerned and the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board, the delay did extend beyond 90 days and I asked my officials to make sure this does not happen again.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

BLUE TONGUE—STEPS TO ENSURE VETERINARIANS RESPONSIBLE FOR QUARANTINE PROGRAM WILL NOT STRIKE

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I should like to direct a question to his parliamentary secretary. In light of the minister's statement on June 15 in which he announced the imposition of a new blue tongue quarantine in British Columbia, what steps is the minister taking to ensure that the federal veterinarians responsible for the program will not go on strike?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, no agreement has yet been signed with the veterinarians but the minister will be making a statement soon on the subject.

[*English*]

Mr. Patterson: Has the Minister of Agriculture passed along to the President of the Treasury Board his views concerning the importance of these veterinarians so that the latter might reassess his pathetic 8 per cent wage increase offer to these underpaid veterinarians?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture always passes his comments on to the President of the Treasury Board.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC WORKS

DATE OF PUBLICATION OF ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1974-75

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. Is the minister aware of the fact that the last published annual report of his department was for the years 1973-74? In the committee, on May 12, six weeks ago, I asked the deputy minister what the status of the 1974-75 annual report was and he replied it was due and was presently at the printers. I am sure the minister is aquainted with the situation. Could he confirm that the report is in fact at the printers and advise us as to when we might receive it?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I think that if the hon. member would consult the records of the House, he would discover that the Clerk of the House has received the 1974-75 report.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR OPENING OF TRADE MISSION IN TAIWAN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On April 2, as recorded at page 12406 of *Hansard*, I directed a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce with regard to the possibility of opening a trade mission in Taipei so that we could assist Canadian exporters to improve their trade opportunities in that area. The minister referred the question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that the Republic of China's foreign trade during the first four months of this year totalled $4,500 million, when rated in U.S. dollars—an increase of $1,300 million, or almost 40 per cent more than during the same four months in 1975, has the minister met with members of his party concerning the possibility of securing some of this increased trade, as promised in his reply recorded at page 12407 of *Hansard*; if so, what are the results of this discussion?

[Mr. Patterson.]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, at present we have no intention of opening a trade mission in Taiwan, not only because of the general political situation but because of the announcement that was made by the Prime Minister to the effect that for the next period of time no new posts would be opened abroad.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STATUS OF NEW OFFER BY LOCKHEED FOR SALE OF "ORION" AIRCRAFT

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Defence. On June 22 I asked the Acting Prime Minister about what might be called the possible revival of the deal with Lockheed for the purchase of Orions, and he replied that the government had received an offer. In another place it was disclosed that Lockheed had said that the offer required to be made definite by the end of June. As the end of June is now very close, and I also hope that the end of the session is fairly close, will the minister tell the House what is the status of this offer and whether a statement with regard to the negotiations will be made in the House before it recesses?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the new proposal has been received from the Lockheed company. It is now being studied by cabinet. I do not expect that a decision will be announced before the House rises, but I cannot of course be certain of that because I do not know exactly when the House will rise.

Mr. Brewin: May I put this question by way of a suggestion to the minister? Even if the deal is not completed, in view of all the surrounding circumstances he should make a statement to the House about how the negotiations are progressing before the House recesses.

Mr. Richardson: I will be pleased to answer any questions, as always. I have already done that.

* * *

● (1450)

HEALTH

POSSIBLE EFFECT OF PROGRAM AIMED AT REDUCING CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and it arises out of an answer he gave to a question I put to him yesterday concerning his plans for advertising of alcoholic beverages. In view of the fact that Canadian cigarette manufacturers initiated the practice of putting a health warning on packages of tobacco on April 1, 1972, and in view of the fact that the minister's own department made a press release on January 2, 1975 and again on January 7, 1976 containing figures that indicated the number of smokers has remained exactly the same

since the beginning of this warning program, would the minister care to revise his grossly arrogant and flippant answer of one day ago?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the answer is not at all, for the good reason that if the hon. member refers to the press release in question, he shall realize that if the trend which was apparent several years ago had been maintained, there would be in Canada 500,000 smokers more than there are now. Moreover he would realize that during the same period the number of smoking adult males decreased by 12 per cent. Therefore I would suggest that he look very carefully at the press releases issued on the subject.

[*English*]

Mr. Yewchuk: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister would agree to look at his own figures. He would see that the trend has not changed since 1972.

* * *

STATISTICS CANADA

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE OF BENEFITS FROM 1976 CENSUS—SUGGESTED RETURN TO INTERVIEW SYSTEM ON TEN-YEAR BASIS

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that the budget for Statistics Canada has increased substantially this year, and in view of the criticism by Canadians who either refused to answer the complicated questions on the 1976 census forms or are questioning the necessity of such an intricate and costly system of instructions, particularly relating to agriculture, can the minister unequivocally assure Canadians that there will be benefits in return for this inconvenience and added expenditure?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that there has to be very definite benefit from this kind of survey and this kind of census. The statistics are clearly necessary in the judgment not only of Statistics Canada but of this House and all the other bodies that have asked for and have from time to time endorsed this kind of census taking. I am not sure if I got the real point of what the hon. member was asking, however.

Mr. Towers: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that census takers who worked in earlier years as well as in the current census say that in their opinion the previous method was much superior, will consideration be given to reverting to the interview system on a ten-year basis rather than the five-year, or to, having the census taken in conjunction with the provincial or municipal census to avoid duplication and thereby cut administrative costs?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the most I can do at the moment is to say that I will be glad to consider it. I think the fact that it is being done on a five-year basis, at least to some degree in order to supplement the ten-year census, is an indication that a great many people including literally thousands of representations from outside, argue that the ten-year time span was too broad. I will be glad to take it as a representation and give the hon. member an answer from the people at Statistics Canada.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

ALLEGED DELAY IN RECEIPT OF OLD AGE PENSION CHEQUES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare is in respect of the tardiness of cheques, both for old age benefits and supplementary benefits, which are now late. This is said to be as a result of a foul up in the computer. Have the brain surgeons in the computer field been able to put this thing back together and when can the beneficiaries expect to receive the cheques up to date and in proper amounts?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for bringing this case to my attention. If it is a situation that is particular to his region or riding, I will be glad to look at it specifically, but I was under the impression that the problems which cropped up a few months ago had been solved for some time. If there are specific cases the hon. member would like to bring to my attention I will be glad to examine them carefully and see that measures are taken to correct them.

* * *

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST THAT MINISTER INTERVENE IN CASE OF AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS GROUP

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Will the minister contact the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board on behalf of the aircraft operations group, many of whom are still on strike, as the minister must be aware, because their contract was negotiated in good faith and by mutual agreement with the government? I wonder if the minister is also aware that in Toronto alone 600 aircraft are grounded because certificates cannot be issued?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, parliament has enacted the Anti-Inflation Act for the purpose of controlling prices and also incomes, in particular in the public sector. I would have to say that the view I have generally taken is that parties who feel aggrieved by the decision of the board should resort to the procedures that parliament has provided. I, as minister, should not deal with the various individual decisions affecting parties by directing the manner in which the Board should dispose of the matter.

Oral Questions

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR MORE INSPECTORS AT TORONTO TO TAKE CARE OF BACKLOG OF WORK

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport. I hope when the office is open again the minister will give consideration to having more inspectors in Toronto to look after the backlog of aircraft that are grounded. Perhaps they could be transferred temporarily from some of the more remote offices where they are not overworked.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to be able to do that but unfortunately backlogs exist almost everywhere. I hope when we get back to normal operation some provision may be made for some extra time and special efforts in order to catch up the backlog.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPORT FROM UNITED STATES ON KILLING OF ANNA MAE AQUASH—STATUS OF INVESTIGATION IN UNITED STATES AND AVAILABILITY OF RESULTS

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In light of the fact that the Canadian government is said to have received a report from the United States government concerning the killing of Anna Mae Aquash in the United States, can the minister tell the House whether such a report has been received and if so, what information was contained in it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, from the State Department we received a report prepared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the circumstances surrounding the autopsy and identification of the person in question, as well as an explanation of the procedures that were employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. From memory I can recall that the Federal Bureau of Investigation said that it did use procedures in the identification which were clearly used in similar circumstances and of course at a time when it was impossible to know the identification and obviously the citizenship of the person in question. Subsequently, Anna Mae Aquash turned out to be Canadian. Nevertheless, at that time that fact was not known to the United States authorities. In addition I should comment that the United States authorities are continuing their investigation into the circumstances of what is now considered to be death by foul play.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question and may I first thank the minister for his answer. The Mountain States Regional Office of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, an agency which reports to the President and Congress on matters relating to human rights, recently stated in an internal memo that there is sufficient credibility in reports reaching that office to cast doubts on the propriety of actions of the FBI and to raise questions about the impartiality and focus of their concern. In view of this and the fact that the minister stated the United States Attorney General has launched an investigation into this incident, can the minister inform the House whether he is aware of the status of the investigation at the present time and if the Canadian government has received assurance from the United States authorities that the findings will be made available to this government?

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to advise the hon. member on the state of the investigation but I shall follow up the second part of the question.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

DEPARTMENTAL REPRESENTATIVE ON MANAGEMENT BOARD FOR PURCHASE OF LONG-RANGE PATROL AIRCRAFT—MR. STOPFORTH'S NEW DUTIES

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services? In view of the costly blunders made by his department in the LRPA program to date, can the minister tell the House what steps he has taken to reorganize his department? Specifically who is the department's representative on the LRPA management board, who is the replacement for Mr. Stopforth and at the same time, could he tell the House what Mr. Stopforth's new duties are?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I really cannot see the need to accept the suggestion of the hon. member. As for the representative of the department on the board of management, he was appointed by the deputy minister according to the normal procedure.

* * *

● (1500)

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the following communication has been received:

June 29, 1976

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Wishart F. Spence, O.B.E., Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 29th day of June, at 5.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière
Administrative Secretary
to the Governor General.

[*English*]

Order, please. With respect to the order of the day, hon. members will notice that by special order of the House a copy of a special addendum to today's order paper has just been distributed. It is a collection of report stage amend-

ments on Bill C-84. This one copy has been available even though by special order the deadline for filing such amendments or motions was noon today. One copy of it has been made available to each party and as other copies are made available they, too, will be distributed. We hope to publish an order paper in proper form, despite its volume and the shortness of notice, as quickly as possible. I hope hon. members will bear in mind the shortness of time and importance of the subject and will join me in recognizing that the staff, who worked most diligently to produce this document in a short space of time, deserve our congratulations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I always hesitate to rise on a point of order to question Your Honour's ruling, and I do so reluctantly today. My point of order relates to the question I asked the Minister of National Revenue in which I referred to serious allegations regarding a massive tax fraud. If the allegations are correct, it would be cheaper for Canadian taxpayers today to defraud the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member's point of order relates to his inability to be recognized for a third question, he has lots of company in that regard today. If his point of order is to that effect, I will be glad to hear it. But if it is simply a disagreement with the answer given by the minister, it does not constitute a point of order.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, perhaps a question of privilege might better identify my concern. I asked the minister whether an investigation into this serious matter is under way, and the minister, in answering my question, did not say whether such investigation was under way. Surely to God it is the right and privilege of members of this House and the Canadian public to know whether such an investigation is under way. I see the minister has left the House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The substance of the ruling was that the hon. member had asked the question and received a response from the minister. If the hon. member is not satisfied with the answer to the question, that is a matter of disagreement.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM TOGO

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all my colleagues on both sides of the House will want to join me to welcome and acknowledge the presence in our gallery of an official delegation from Togo, the Hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ayi Hunlede; the Minister of Economy and Finance, Mr. Kodjo and the Minister of the Plan, Commerce, Industry and Transport, Mr. Dogo.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF JOINT DECLARATION OF PARTICIPANTS IN SUMMIT CONFERENCE AT PUERTO RICO

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table a copy of the joint declaration issued yesterday at the conclusion of the summit meeting held in Puerto Rico on June 27 and 28.

* * *

PENSIONS

TABLING OF REPORT ON PRIVATE RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table two copies, in both official languages, of the report on private disability retirement and survivor programs, submitted by the Canada Pension Plan Advisory Committee in May 1976.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, in his question, managed to make two statements which, if left on the record, would not be according to fact. I point out, first, that we do not have in Canada a demonstrated case of Minamata disease; there is a suspected case which is not yet confirmed. The Indian concerned is being examined today in Winnipeg and we will have a report on that subject later.

Second, the survey made in Indian reserves is not a random survey. The two reserves concerned have a population of 954. In early May we had already examined over 800 people—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Frequently I recognize opposition members to give a minister the opportunity to correct an impression which may be left on the record. The first part of the minister's point of order surely may have something to do with that, that is to say, whether or not there has been an established case of the particular disease mentioned. The second part was simply an amplification of his answer and ought not to be permitted at this time.

Mr. Symes: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on the same point of order, I do not know in what kind of hair-splitting the minister is indulging since my question was strictly limited; I was asking whether the ministry is taking blood samples on an ongoing, continuing basis. According to my information, this is not taking place with respect to every individual on the reserves, and I was asking about that.

* * *

HALIFAX RELIEF COMMISSION

TABLING OF FINAL REPORT

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies, in both official languages,

of what may ultimately be the final report of the Halifax Relief Commission.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REPORT STAGE AND THIRD READING OF BILL C-84

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest a change in the notice of motion appearing on today's order paper at page VII in my name. There seems to be a typographical error in it which changes the meaning of the proposed motion. That it is an error is confirmed by a reading of the French version which appears on the opposite side of the page, where "et" appears.

The motion as it is now on the order paper reads, in part:

That any recorded division requested during the consideration of the report stage of the third reading stage of Bill C-84—

Obviously, one should read "or" instead of "of". If that is acceptable, I should like to see if there is unanimous consent to proceed with this motion as it would be amended today. When I put it down on the order paper yesterday, I did not know that we would reach the report stage of Bill C-84 today. That was a subsequent decision of the House. I think it would be desirable, if the House is ready to proceed today, to accept this order so that there is some certainty about the taking of votes both at the report stage and at third reading.

● (1510)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Beaudoin: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The question, therefore, is: Mr. Sharp, seconded by Mr. Allmand, moves:

That any recorded division requested during the consideration of the report stage and the third reading stage—

Some hon. Members: "Or."

Mr. Speaker: The text I have here reads "and". However, it is agreed that it should be "or". Mr. Sharp, seconded by Mr. Allmand, moves:

That any recorded division requested during the consideration of the report stage or the third reading stage of Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and other serious offences, shall be held at a time to be fixed by the House leaders, provided that that time shall be not more than one week after the request for the division.

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

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I would like it to be clear with regard to amendments at the report stage. Is the minister talking about five days for amendments, or will these be voted upon as they come up for approval?

Mr. Speaker: The motion has been introduced for debate. The hon. member has raised a question. I would assume, by way of answer, that the deferred divisions will likely be dealt with in the usual course with respect to the report stage motions.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much time of the House, but it seems that this strips away the whole façade of a free vote on the capital punishment matter. Here we have a motion introduced by the House leader on behalf of the government—

Mr. Sharp: On behalf of all parties.

Mr. Lawrence: —in respect of a matter that is supposed to be a free vote according to the free will and conscience of individual members. In other words, there is not supposed to be any party discipline. There are not to be any whips on, or any such matter in relation to this bill. I can certainly see an informal arrangement being worked out for the better dealing of the matter in respect of a formal vote on third reading. However, I must request a far more detailed reason in respect of the amendments which may or may not be found in order with regard to the report stage of the matter.

I feel that on a matter that is supposed to be absolutely free of party discipline, and free of party whips, this is a wrong move. The onus should be on the government House leader to indicate in a far more complete way than he usually reports to the House on a procedure such as this. For example, all these matters have to be voted on in respect of the report stage before we can get into third reading.

Mr. Blais: Of course.

Mr. Lawrence: All right. However, that may unduly delay the rising of the House for the summer recess. Hon. members should think about that. I can see an informal arrangement being worked out for the third reading vote. However, it is a backward step, on an issue as touchy as this, to begin having the party whips or party leaders, no matter what their party, invoking a little bit of discipline in respect of the votes at report stage. Quite frankly, I would like a full explanation before we vote on this motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it was not my understanding that this was a government motion. I thought it came out of discussions that had taken place among the House leaders and that its purpose was simply to make the necessary provision so that neither side would be caught with a snap vote.

Whatever our views may be on Bill C-84, I think we all agree that what we did on second reading was a good idea, namely, that we designate when the vote will take place so that both sides can make sure their supporters are here. The only difference between the proposal in this motion and the proposal we had previously is that the previous one related to only one vote, namely, second reading, but this relates to the votes at the report stage and at third reading.

In response to the point raised by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham, may I point out that under Standing Order 75(11) it is already in the power of the Speaker to defer any or all recorded votes on report stage amendments. I realize there are now 46 amendments. If they are all allowed, that will accumulate a rather massive number of votes. However, I suspect there will not be 46 recorded votes. Let us say there will be three, four, five, or

whatever the number may be. The Speaker already has authority to defer the taking of those votes until the debate at report stage is over.

As I understand it, this motion says—and this is what we were talking about as House leaders—that when that point is reached, when the debate at the report stage is over, the House leaders will meet and suggest a day, not more than a week later, when those votes should be taken. After the report stage comes third reading and we go through the same process again. Quite frankly, I do not see anything sinister or out of the way about it. When the four House leaders meet, we represent both views of the question of capital punishment. This motion represents what both sides would like, namely, a clear understanding as to when the votes will be taken. I hope, therefore, that the House will accept this motion.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham was quite right when he indicated that this was a completely free vote situation. I have said before that as far as this party is concerned, that is so, making no comment about any other party in the House of Commons.

As opposition House leader, I have felt a certain duty to the members of my caucus. That duty, in terms of a free vote situation, is to ensure, to the greatest possible degree that I can, that members who have business elsewhere, regardless of what their position might be with respect to legislation before the House, will know when they are to vote. This is a way of bringing certainty to the vote, not to end or foreshorten discussions, as you will notice from reading the motion, as to the time of the vote. The purpose is to benefit all members of the House, particularly my colleagues.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on this because it marks a very important milestone with regard to what is becoming an established precedent in the House of Commons, namely, the forecasting of when votes will occur. It makes it easier for each one of us to represent our constituents. We can play golf. We can be away. We know when the vote is coming. I read from time to time in the press that parliament has lost its aura, that it no longer really matters, that is has become humdrum, that no one attends, that no one is interested. The purpose of the bells ringing is to summon members to vote. Members are supposed to be within the call of the bell. That is the principle. It is your job, Mr. Speaker, to ring the bells until all members who can possibly be summoned have been summoned, and a vote is then taken. We shall abide by whatever the House decides on this issue, but I believe I would be remiss in my duty if I allowed this matter to pass as an accepted principle.

● (1520)

That great expert on the rules who has spoken—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: —believes he is a protector of parliament. How many times have parliamentarians given him that credit? I hope the good Lord strikes me dead if I ever do. He believes he is a protector of parliament, yet in his endorsement of this motion he is in some small way contributing to the erosion of the importance of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: I have watched this practice grow in the last three or four years, this postponing of votes to deal with amendments. It is one which, for example, links my amendment with five or six others, something which detracts from its importance; it becomes one of a hodge-podge of amendments on which votes are taken. If parliament is to regain any importance in the minds of those who sit here, and in the minds of the people, votes must be recorded with respect to these amendments. It is an important part of a member's duty. If this process of erosion continues, before too long there will be proxy voting in the House of Commons. It would be easier that way. Members would not need to bother to go to Ottawa at all; they could just send in a signed statement.

As I say, I will abide by the wish of the House on this issue, as will all members, but I cannot allow this point of order to pass without putting on record my view that it is a contribution to the erosion of the importance of parliament and of our parliamentary system.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: I, too, would like to take exception to this proposed motion. In addition to the arguments which have been advanced by several of my hon. friends in the opposition, I would point out that it would be most unfortunate if you, Mr. Speaker, were to follow this procedure during report stage, because many of the amendments which will be before us are interrelated and it might well happen that if a particular amendment were carried, further amendments would not need to be debated. In the long run, an arrangement of this type might even delay the proceedings, rather than expedite them. This is a dangerous precedent and I do not think it is called for in the circumstances. Surely members who are interested in this debate should be in their place ready for a vote, whenever that vote might come up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, to explain my approval of the special order put forward by the government leader, I have to say that my understanding is that there will be a vote at report stage and another no more than five days after the conclusion of the debate on third reading of Bill C-84. I am not speaking on behalf of my colleagues since this will be a free vote, but I should like to say that it would be better if we knew when the vote on third reading and the vote at report stage will be held.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta has already spoken in the debate, although it was a very short speech. He might have been under the impression he was raising a point of order rather than making a speech on a debatable motion. In any event, if he is to speak now, unanimous consent will be necessary. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Reynolds: I merely wish to support the position taken by the hon. member for Crowfoot. Members from British Columbia will be here next week and they will be listening every day to speeches made on the report stage and third reading of this important bill. They will not be in their ridings; they will be attending and voting on this bill. I see one difficulty here. When we reach report stage it will be necessary to give members notice to enable them to get here. What shall we do between-times before we reach the debate on third reading? Maybe the bill will be defeated at the report stage. I shall vote against this proposition.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, this is partly for clarification somewhat along the lines mentioned by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham relating to the various amendments which might be brought forward either at report stage, which we now have, or at third reading. Does this involve deferred votes for individual amendments during the report stage, or just on third reading?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, allow me to make one or two very simple points. First of all, in support of the House leaders of the other parties in their statements that this was a proposal put forward as a result of discussion among the House leaders, it was not specifically a government proposal but it was one put forward on behalf of all the House leaders who felt, as I did, that it would be undesirable to have snap votes without notice on a measure which is not a government bill in the ordinary sense because no question of confidence is involved.

The views of members are being sought as individuals, not as members of parliament, and that is why this sort of provision is being made, just as it was on second reading. It would, of course, be possible that any of the amendments at the report stage could change the whole nature of the proposal which is being debated in the House, so the voting at the report stage is almost as crucial as the vote on third reading. That is why we have had to include report stage amendments as well as the vote on third reading. We considered this matter at some length, and the conclusion we reached is one which is, in my view, irrefutable.

May I say, in response to the hon. member for Crowfoot, that as far as I know I have not been party to a proposal of this kind in relation to an ordinary government bill. This is a special procedure which relates to a measure which is of a different character, one in which each member has an equal interest. It is not a question of partisan support or party loyalty, but a matter of individual conscience, and for this reason I hope the House will support the motion.

● (1530)

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

[Mr. Speaker.]

And more than five members having risen:

● (1550)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is upon the motion of Mr. Sharp, seconded by Mr. Allmand, who has moved that any recorded division requested during the consideration of the report stage or the third reading stage of Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and other serious offences, shall be held at a time to be fixed by the House leaders, provided that that time shall be not more than one week after the request for the division.

In line with the proceedings adopted at second reading, which seemed to meet with the approval of members on all sides of the House because of the special nature of the vote, the vote was taken in a special manner at second reading, it would seem that we should take our votes at this stage in the same manner. I would therefore ask all those in the first row to my right to please rise.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Sharp) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 144)

YEAS

Messrs.

Abbott
Alexander
Allard
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Caron
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Drury
Dupont
Dupras
Ethier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Fortin
Fox
Francis
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the
Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
McCleave
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Pelletier
Penner

Messrs.

Peters	Rodriguez	Stollery
Philbrook	Rompkey	Symes
Pinard	Roy (Timmins)	Tessier
Portelance	Saltsman	Trudeau
Poulin	Smith (Saint-Jean)	Trudel
Prud'homme	Stanbury	Turner
Raines	Stanfield	Watson
Reid	Stewart (Cochrane)	Yanakis
Richardson		Young—148
Roberts		
Robinson		

NAYS

Messrs.

Andre (Calgary Centre)	Jarvis	Murta
Bawden	Kempling	Neil
Beatty	Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	Nowlan
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)	Lambert (Edmonton West)	Oberle
Coates	La Salle	O'Sullivan
Cossitt	Lavoie	Patterson
Crouse	Lawrence	Reynolds
Darling	MacLean	Ritchie
Diefenbaker	Malone	Roche
Dinsdale	Marshall	Rynard
Ellis	Masniuk	Scott
Elzinga	Mazankowski	Stevens
Halliday	McCain	Towers
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)	McKenzie	Wagner
Horner	McKinley	Wenman
Huntington	Muir	Whiteway
	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)	Whittaker
		Wise
		Woolliams
		Yewchuk—53

● (1600)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As the result of the change in the time of voting, there seems to be some confusion. I should like to indicate to the House that we will be voting this evening, at 8 p.m., on Bill C-68.

Some hon. Members: Now.

Some hon. Members: Here's Mitch.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to welcome the government House leader back to the fold. It is obvious, from the vote, that he would have been the only one to have voted against the motion, and therefore, because of the freedom that was so obvious on the other side, he was left outside, behind the curtains. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there would be a disposition in the House to consider taking now the vote which would be postponed until eight o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The status of the vote at eight o'clock this evening is enshrined in a House order which was made last night. I wish to make it clear that really there is no procedure even for seeking the unanimous consent for any departure from this order. I think it would be contrary to our procedures to even ask for this at this moment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the order for the vote to take place this evening was made after much consultation and after certain hon. members had made plans. We do not wish to see it changed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Speaker: May I remind the House that we are still in routine proceedings; we are still on the taking of motions. We have yet to take questions on the order paper to finalize routine proceedings, following which we will proceed to orders of the day, which will bring about the calling of the report stage of Bill C-84.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Before we proceed much further, I wonder if the government House leader, or you, Mr. Speaker, could explain the motion on which we just voted. Exactly what will take place, and how?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: As I understand it, all amendments accepted by the House will be dealt with at the report stage. Then, before a vote is held on them, they will be set aside and we will debate third reading of the bill.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think we should get into a discussion on how the proceedings will take place at the report stage of Bill C-84. We will be in the report stage on Bill C-84 in a few minutes. When we come to that point, there can be some clarification, but first of all there will be a point of order on a number of the motions appearing in the order paper. Surely the intended arrangement is to follow the practice in the past of deferring divisions. The difference here is to have them come forward at some agreed time. That will be clarified as we get into the report stage of the bill.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 5,110, 5,213, 5,240, 5,241, 5,242, 5,246, 5,399, 5,453, 5,488, 5,502, 5,505, 5,551, 5,554, 5,638, 5,685, 5,689 and 5,695.

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

[*Text*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE—MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Question No. 5,110—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What are the major military bases and installations in Atlantic Canada and how many (a) civilian employees (b) regular force members were employed at each in (i) 1967 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1972 (iv) 1975?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) and (b). The major military bases and installations and the number of civilian and military employees at each as of December 31, 1967, 1969, 1972, and 1975 are tabulated by provinces in the following Annexes: Statement A—Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. Statement B—Nova Scotia. Statement C—New Brunswick.

Order Paper Questions

Statement A

Location	1967* Military	1969 Military	1969 Civilian	1972 Military	1972 Civilian	1975 Military	1975 Civilian
Newfoundland							
Argentia	—	—	—	21	—	33	—
Cornerbrook	—	—	—	—	1	2	1
Gander	163	194	76	347	138	318	112
Goose Bay	63	60	7	245	107	214	84
Grand Falls	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
St. John's	221	197	28	181	56	208	39
Prince Edward Island							
Charlottetown	12	13	—	31	7	37	8
Summerside	1,306	1,028	275	1,038	357	992	307

Statement B

Location	1967* Military	1969 Military	1969 Civilian	1972 Military	1972 Civilian	1975 Military	1975 Civilian
Nova Scotia							
Amherst	2	4	—	—	5	4	4
Antigonish	11	7	—	4	—	2	—
Barrington	129	129	57	144	84	131	66
Cornwallis	1,081	1,200	371	1,106	623	1,068	483
Shearwater/Dartmouth	2,275	2,245	470	1,917	700	1,550	630
Debert	104	93	19	97	102	132	92
Greenwood	1,981	1,765	376	1,757	555	1,533	431
Halifax	4,272	3,327	4,845	3,035	5,188	2,870	4,715
Kentville	—	—	—	—	10	6	7
Mill Cove	19	144	9	155	33	148	43
New Glasgow	14	—	—	—	8	6	2
Newport Corners	19	30	—	38	15	33	9
Shelburne	161	170	—	58	53	126	49
Sydney	171	151	90	176	136	164	103
Wolfville	11	6	—	22	—	6	—
Ships	4,284	5,075	—	4,212	—	3,427	—

Statement C

Location	1967* Military	1969 Military	1969 Civilian	1972 Military	1972 Civilian	1975 Military	1975 Civilian
New Brunswick							
Bathurst	29	5	—	20	1	21	1
Chatham	1,167	1,042	390	1,163	400	988	358
Edmunston	—	—	—	—	1	1	1
Fredericton	149	64	—	21	38	19	28
Gagetown/Oromocto	3,751	3,336	630	3,199	920	2,720	783
Moncton	272	283	399	127	484	142	394
Renous	—	1	—	4	194	4	123
Sackville	14	—	—	4	2	2	1
Saint John	79	29	—	51	30	56	23
St. Margarets	115	145	2	159	50	173	44

*NOTE: Civilian Figures are not available for 1967.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—OVERSEAS TEACHERS

Question No. 5,213—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Since 1970, did the Department of National Defence hire Canadians to teach overseas and, if so, (a) how many (b) in what countries (c) at what salary range?

2. Do they have to sign a contract and, if so, for what period?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes. (a) and (c).

Year	Numbers of Teachers	Salary Range From	Salary Range To
1970	102	$5,985	$15,780
1971	144	6,225	16,160
1972	105	6,663	17,250
1973	154	7,341	19,300
1974	110	7,867	18,810
1975	96	8,325	24,610
1976	101	Figures not yet available	

[Mr. Richardson.]

(b) nine schools in Germany; one school in Belgium; one school in Holland.

2. Yes, two years.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—DESIGN WORK FOR SHIPS IN FLEET REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME

Question No. 5,240—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What companies in Canada does the Department of National Defence consider capable of doing the design work for the ships in the fleet replacement programme now underway?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): See reply to Question No. 5,241 answered today. The consideration of companies for design work will not be undertaken until the studies of the fleet replacement needs are completed.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—TENDERS FOR SHIPS DESIGN

Question No. 5,241—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Will the Department of National Defence invite tenders for the ship design work for the fleet replacement programme from Canadian situated firms and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, on what date are they likely to be sent to such firms?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes. (a) Not applicable; (b) Not known. Studies of the replacement needs of the fleet are still in progress.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—FLEET REPLACEMENT DONE OUTSIDE CANADA

Question No. 5,242—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Is the Department of National Defence under any specific instructions to have the design work for the fleet replacement programme done outside Canada and (a) if so, who issued such instructions (b) if not, is DND under any instructions which would deny its ability to invite tenders on design work from Canadian firms?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No. (a) Not applicable; (b) No.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

Question No. 5,246—**Mr. Marshall:**

What are the provinces and the cost-sharing arrangements under the Department of Transport and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion with regard to highway strengthening programmes or for assistance in reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is concerned: Nil. DREE has no Highway Strengthening Programme as such, nor does it provide assistance in reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway. The Department does assist some provinces in respect to specific highway projects necessary to regional economic development. In so far as Transport Canada is concerned: A Primary Highway Strengthening Programme is in effect in three provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. There is no cost-sharing under this programme as such but an agreement under which the three provinces have increased load limits on the primary highway network to 110,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight, to correspond with prevailing limits in British Columbia and Ontario. In return, the federal government is providing base payments for the three provinces of $78.5 million, spread over five (5) years commencing in fiscal year 1974/75. An additional indexed payment is also made to offset the rising cost of asphalt paving material and placement. A second phase to the programme, if warranted, is expected to be negotiated prior to the end of the first phase. Transport Canada has no assistance programme for the reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway.

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

Question No. 5,399—**Mr. Beatty:**

In 1975, which were the ten countries whose diplomats most often invoked diplomatic immunity to avoid being prosecuted for violations of Canadian law and in how many instances was diplomatic immunity invoked by each of the ten?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The following is the list of the ten Commonwealth and foreign posts in Ottawa whose officers and staff were accused most often in 1975 of violating Canadian law, and the number of instances attributed to each embassy or high commission: Uganda, 611; Nigeria, 328; USSR, 256; Ivory Coast, 226; Arab Republic of Egypt, 212; Gabon, 198; Tunisia, 197; Zaire, 185; Italy, 182; France, 151.

CEMA

Question No. 5,453—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Were three carloads of eggs, imported by CEMA in the week of April 25 to 30, 1976, sent directly to the distributors to whom they were ultimately destined and, if not (a) was the Porter Produce Company paid a handling fee (b) for what reason were they not sent directly, thus avoiding handling fees?

2. In the past year, has the Porter Produce Company been used as a first receiver for western eggs shipped into Ontario and, if so, how often and how many eggs were involved in each case?

3. Has the Porter Produce Company received handling fees for eggs imported into Ontario from Western Canada and, if so, what was the amount in each case?

4. In the past two years, what other companies have been used as first receivers for western eggs shipped into Ontario and, in each case (a) on what date (b) how many eggs were involved (c) what handling fees were paid (d) what (i) was the transportation cost (ii) was the name of the transportation company who shipped the eggs (e) by whom were the transportation costs paid?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. CEMA did not import three carloads of eggs in the week of April 25 to 30, 1976, but the Porter Produce Company imported eggs on behalf of CEMA. (a) Yes; (b) Upon entry to Canada, Revenue Canada allows movement in bond to importer for inspection by Agriculture Canada inspectors prior to official entry into Canada. Eggs are off loaded for inspection and then reloaded for delivery to customers whether in truck load or less-than-truck-load quantities.

2. Yes (a) Respecting Toronto area, Porter has been used most frequently because of his facilities and the service provided. Another dealer has been used when volume moved requires additional capacity for segregation into requirements of final receivers (by grade and by volume). Respecting other areas different first receivers are used; (b) Shipments are by truck load of 1,500 boxes of 15 dozen each.

3. Yes, 3 cents per dozen for handling case space and re-sorting truckloads into requirements of buyers—the same fee for all first receivers.

4. Since the appointment of the current General Manager of C.E.M.A., this national agency has had the responsibility of coordinating the sale of Canadian eggs surplus to Canadian table egg requirements in the area of surplus. Since January, 1976, four Ontario firms, in addition to Porter Produce Co., have been used as first receivers. These are Loughcrest, Hallview; McCartney, Ottawa; Bradford Cold Storage, Forrest; Winchester Storage, Winchester. They respectively handled 5, 2, 4 and 4 loads of 22,500 dozen each. A uniform handling fee of 3 cents per dozen was paid to each firm. In each case, the transportation cost of 3½-4 cents per dozen was paid by C.E.M.A. The transportation companies used were: Atomic, Mid-West, Quinn, Millar & Brown, and C.P.

HEADLINE IN "OTTAWA CITIZEN" OF MAY 12, 1976

Question No. 5,488—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the Prime Minister aware of the eight column headline which appeared on the front page of *The Ottawa Citizen* of May 12, 1976 and which reads "Trudeau's Popularity Hits Record Low" and, if so, is it his intention to make a statement concerning it?

2. Is the Prime Minister or his office (a) in the possession of information indicating the state of the Prime Minister's popularity (b) conducting an investigation into the matter of Prime Ministerial popularity and, if so (i) what has the investigation shown (ii) will all information resulting from such investigations be made public?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): 1. It has always been government policy to comply with the rules and practices of Parliament. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms has for many years been considered to be an authoritative guide in these matters. Citation 171 of the fourth edition of Beauchesne clearly indicates that "in making a question, observations which might lead to debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limits of a question".

2. See answer to part 1 above.

JACQUES CARTIER TERMINAL

Question No. 5,502—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How many gantry cranes are to be provided at the Jacques Cartier Terminal and at what cost?

2. (a) Will contracts be placed without first obtaining a long term commitment to use the facility from terminal operators or shipping lines and, if so, will this terminal be the only container terminal in Canada where container cranes are now owned by, or on long term lease to, the user/operator (b) what other examples of similar situations exist in Canada (c) if there is no precedent, what is the justification for the situation at the Jacques Cartier Terminal?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. Two container cranes are proposed for the Jacques Cartier Terminal at an approximate total cost of $4,500,000.

2. (a) The Terminal is intended to be operated by the National Harbours Board as a public terminal. The ownership and operation of the cranes are presently under consideration; (b) Other examples of similar situations existing in Canada are as follows: Vancouver, B.C., (Vanterm) Two cranes owned and operated by N.H.B. Vancouver, B.C., (Centennial Pier) One crane owned and operated by N.H.B. Halifax, N.S., One out of three cranes owned by N.H.B. and on long term lease to operators; (c) Not applicable.

MONTREAL PORT AUTHORITY—LABOUR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Question No. 5,505—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Are any members of the Montreal Port Authority engaged actively in labour management relations at the Port of Halifax-Dartmouth and, if so, who and for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: Yes, Arnold E. Masters discharging his responsibilities as President of the Maritime Employers Association which represents management at the ports of Montreal, Trois-Rivières, Quebec, Halifax and Saint John.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS BY 1973

Question No. 5,551—**Mr. Horner:**

In regard to the programme announced by the Secretary of State on September 9, 1970, to provide three hundred million dollars to the provinces for bilingualism education in the schools by 1973, how many students in each province took (a) English (b) French courses and, in each case, what was the cost involved?

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

(a) English courses

	Number of students			Federal contribution		
Province	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73
Québec	846,666	854,730	855,900	$5,697,495	$6,516,569	$6,016,159

(b) French courses

Provinces	Number of students			Federal contribution		
	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73
Newfoundland	59,730	62,445	67,592	$ 114,841	$ 168,406	$ 185,146
Prince Edward Island	14,355	13,122	13,596	43,641	49,938	46,814
Nova Scotia	72,597	77,812	74,589	300,782	360,125	340,501
New Brunswick	80,013	76,407	72,429	221,680	318,576	294,827
Ontario	779,034	809,290	814,916	2,797,812	4,388,251	3,876,272
Manitoba	101,044	93,803	92,833	373,805	474,933	415,637
Saskatchewan	84,878	76,401	68,148	447,797	324,580	350,997
Alberta	138,842	136,579	130,572	571,137	693,883	582,196
British Columbia	145,851	155,063	135,527	830,545	958,770	769,026

PERU—COPPER

Question No. 5,554—**Mr. Bawden:**

Since 1970, has the Canadian International Development Agency spent or committed funds to support copper production or other copper research in Peru and, if so, in each year, what was the amount of such expenditure?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): The Canadian International Development Agency has not spent or committed funds to support copper production or other copper research in Peru. However, in 1975, CIDA signed two loan agreements with Peru as follows: (a) a loan of three million dollars to finance a program of pre-investment studies in which Peru is attaching a priority in the polymetallic sector; (b) a loan of five million dollars to be used exclusively for the purchase of Canadian equipment and material. Peru has indicated that it intends purchasing mining equipment in Canada.

CUSO

Question No. 5,638—**Mr. Horner:**

1. How much government money has CUSO received over the past five years?

2. How many Canadian government employees are in Vientiane, Laos, at the present time?

3. Is Mr. Peter Royle still employed by CUSO?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. CIDA grants to CUSO/SUCO over the past five years amount to $37,395,400. Volunteers, $31,205,000; Project Fund, $3,106,000; Education, $226,900; Contracts, $2,857,500.

2. There are no Canadian Government employees in Vientiane at this time.

3. Mr. Peter Royle is a volunteer with CUSO working at the École Normale de Vientiane. It is expected that he will be returning to Canada this summer following completion of his work.

BEAUPORT FLATS, PORT OF QUEBEC

Question No. 5,685—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What tonnage by commodity was shipped over Berths 53 and 54 in the Beauport Flats area of the Port of Quebec since 1970?

2. (a) From what source was landfill obtained to create the back-up area for the berths (b) how many cubic yards was required (c) how much per cubic yard did the National Harbours Board pay?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. Dry Bulk, 911,479 tons; Liquid Bulk, 2,163,827 tons; Containers, 129,712 tons; General Cargo, 103,985 tons. Total: 3,309,00.

2. (a) Material dredged in constructing berths and other free sources; (b) 5.8 million yards were used; (c) No amounts were paid to third parties for the purchase of fill as the dredged material was utilized instead of transporting it to a dumping area.

CBC—EXTENDED COVERAGE IN CONSTITUENCY OF HUMBER-ST. GEORGE'S-ST. BARBE

Question No. 5,689—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Has the CBC applied for extended television coverage under CRTC's accelerated coverage plan in the constituency of Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and (a) if so, for which communities (b) if not, on what date do they intend to do so?

2. Presuming such application will be approved, what necessary work has to be carried out and what equipment is required?

3. What is the expected date of TV coverage coming on stream for those communities for which application has been made?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: The Accelerated Coverage Plan was devised by the CBC and approved by the government. The role of the CRTC in the Plan is to take action on applications submitted by the Corporation. 1. No. (a) Not applicable; (b) During the latter part of 1976 the CBC expects to submit applications for English language television transmitters designed to provide service to the areas around Cow Head, Port Saunders/Hawkes Bay, Portland Creek and Trout River.

2. Acquisition of land—including surveys; improvements to properties—site clearing, road development, power line construction, etc.; erection of buildings; installation of mechanical equipment; installation of electrical equipment; installation of technical equipment; erection of towers; erection of antennae; erection of transmission lines; transmitter equipment; test and ancillary equipment.

3. Once the applications have been submitted to the CRTC, the CBC has no jurisdiction in regard to when the applications will be scheduled for a public hearing. Regulations require that a transmitter be put into operation within one year following approval by the CRTC. The Corporation endeavours to meet this time frame or improve upon it.

Capital Punishment

CORRESPONDENCE WITH PRESIDENT OF C.T.C.

Question No. 5,695—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. Did the Honourable Edgar Benson, P.C., President of Canadian Transport Commission receive a letter from the honourable Member for Kootenay West on April 9, 1976 and a further letter on May 5?

2. Has the CTC acknowledged or replied to the letters and, if not, can the Commission give an indication as to how long it routinely takes to respond to correspondence from Members of Parliament?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. Yes.

2. The letters were replied to June 4, 1976. It is not possible to estimate how long it may take to respond to correspondence on a subject (as in the case in point) which bears on questions of jurisdiction and constitutionality.

* * *

● (1610)

[*English*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-94, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1977.

And also, a message informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-93, an act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1977.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I point out to the House that in the short time that was available, one motion, motion No. 1, was placed on the special order paper in error. It stands in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). It was never his intention to move an amendment to delete clause 1 of the bill; therefore, the motion has no status whatsoever and ought simply to be deleted from the order paper. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Miss Campbell (South Western Nova).]

Mr. Speaker: Rather than renumber all the motions on the order paper, I wonder if we might simply agree that motion No. 1 has been withdrawn and that we will therefore proceed to take the rest of the motions as they are presently numbered, without changing any of the numbers?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The obvious point, before proceeding with all the report stage motions, is that a glance will indicate that a number of them would propose to reinstate or return to the Criminal Code some form of death penalty under different curcumstances or to make amendments which would in some way relate to the death penalty. Before getting into report stage, setting up the amendment for discussion and ordering any discussion and vote, surely the first point the House ought to address itself to, and certainly that the Chair would want to hear argument upon, is whether any amendment—this being a bill which has the effect of eliminating capital punishment from the Criminal Code—which would in fact re-establish capital punishment, in any sense contravenes the principle of the bill. That is the point at issue.

If the Chair were to find an amendment in this way contravene the principle of the bill, obviously the order of arguing and dealing with amendments would be drastically affected. There are so many of them that I would feel it quite proper to call upon any member interested in developing arguments in that respect to do so now. Then perhaps I will have an opportunity to carefully consider such arguments and reserve decision while the House goes on with some other amendment, and I shall deliver the decision as soon as possible.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, the amendments, which now amount to 45, one having been deleted, concern the question of the penalty for various kinds of murder—whether the sentence or punishment should be a life sentence or in some cases, in reference to the amendments, the death penalty. I should like, first of all, to develop the argument of whether the amendments are against the principle of the bill. In developing the first argument, may I refer to the title of the bill which is as follows: "Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences". I should like to draw attention to the fact that this bill, like many other bills in reference to part retention and part abolition and abolition or retention, is an amendment to the Criminal Code. The big point in reference to the principle of the bill is in relation to the punishment for murder.

My first point is whether the punishment for certain kinds of murder—whether it be first-degree murder, second-degree murder, or whether it is categorized as capital murder or non-capital murder—should be life imprisonment or the penalty of death. I say that the title of the bill itself, which says "punishment for murder and certain other serious offences" shows that punishment for murder could be life imprisonment, could be a term certain, or could be death, and therefore I say at the outset that it does not change the principle of the bill.

I want to refer, first of all, to May's Parliamentary Practice, the eighteenth edition which was issued in 1971, at page 494, the section under the title "Functions of a committee on a bill". Of course, the same rules would apply in reference to amendments in the House. Before I commence on that argument, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the same point was raised by the chairman of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs who ruled against the amendment saying it was against the principle of the bill. I submit that the first course of the committee or the House is to go through the bill clause by clause, but that only applies in committee itself. The question at report stage—and I am going to ask that question again—is whether substituting the death penalty for life imprisonment is against the principle of the bill. I submit that by having regard to the title of the bill, which is "an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences", moving an amendment in reference to changing the punishment does not change the nature of the bill.

The second argument I should like to bring to Your Honour's attention is that Bill C-84 is not totally an abolition bill. I believe this argument was presented to the committee by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). Under the National Defence Act we still have the death penalty for certain offences, whether Bill C-84 passes or not, so it is not totally an abolitionist bill; it is still partly retentionist.

It is interesting to note, and this will please my good friend, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), that Senator Argue's Bill S-23 presented in the other place, a bill entitled—and it is in order—"an act to amend the National Defence Act and the Criminal Code (total abolition of capital punishment), confirms this position. In other words, Mr. Speaker, my point is that this is not totally an abolitionist bill; it is part retentionist because there are still certain offences under the National Defence Act where the death penalty applies. That was pointed out by Senator Argue in the other place, and that is why he presented Bill S-23. The title of his bill is "an act to amend the National Defence Act and the Criminal Code", which confirm this position. This proves that Bill C-84 is partly a retentionist bill, and therefore amendments are admissible. That is my second argument.

● (1620)

I come to my third argument. I refer the House to Volume V of the *Debates of the House of Commons*, of 1967. On November 23, 1967, the House was considering Bill C-168, which was partly a retentionist and partly an abolitionist bill. I was a member of the House at that time, and I remember that we treated the bill then under consideration in much the same way as we had treated the previous bill on the subject. We acted according to law, and that law still stands.

The Speaker at that time, Mr. Speaker Macnaughton, who subsequently became a senator, permitted amendments, as becomes obvious if one reads page 4629 of *Hansard*. For example, he allowed an amendment providing that if a victim who was being raped was murdered, the death penalty should apply. I moved that amendment. It was seconded by Gordon Churchill, who was then a member of the Privy Council and a member of this House. Mr. Speaker allowed the moving of another amendment saying that anyone convicted of murdering a police officer was subject to the death penalty. The reason for that amendment was this: as Your Honour knows, if a police officer or a group of police officers asks a citizen for help and assistance, the citizen must help. Failure to provide help and assistance is an indictable offence.

We moved an amendment to cover a person in that position, because the death penalty applied to the convicted murderer of a policeman or prison warden. I maintained at that time that if a person is acting as a police officer or warden, the same penalty should apply to his murderer. Those amendments were allowed to be put by Mr. Speaker Alan Macnaughton. If the Speaker allowed those amendments to that bill which was partly retentionist, partly abolitionist, I say that Your Honour ought to allow amendments to this bill which is also partly abolitionist, partly retentionist. That is my third argument.

I come to my fourth argument, which I borrowed from the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). He drew attention to a similar bill being dealt with by the British House on December 25, 1965. It is interesting to note, from what happened in committee and in the House, that the sorts of amendments we are proposing at the report stage were permitted and declared admissible by the Speaker of the British House. For example, the following was proposed:

> That the death penalty should be retained for a person who committed murder a second time . . .
>
> That the death penalty should be retained for the murder of a police officer acting in the execution of his duty . . .
>
> That the death penalty should be retained for a convicted murderer who in the course of life imprisonment murdered again—

I will not read the entire list of amendments; it is enough to say that they were allowed. That bill was practically on all fours with Bill C-84 presently before the House, with one exception: the British parliament retained the death penalty for high treason and other offences of treason, and those penalties are still retained.

I might mention that the chairman of our committee, in making his decision, admitted that he was intrigued by the argument presented, and particularly intrigued by facts we had mentioned concerning the other bill considered in the Senate. But he said, with the greatest respect to you, Mr. Speaker, that he was faced with your ruling on the former bill given when you were the distinguished chairman of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. As you will recall, the abolitionists had moved an amendment which was to do away with the death penalty for all offences, but you ruled that it was against the principle of the bill. I realize that since you made that decision you have distinguished yourself even more. I am sure that since you are now the Speaker, and since you have had the experience of being chairman of the justice and legal affairs committee, you have grown wiser and will be able to reverse your previous decision.

I think the chairman of the standing committee handled himself with distinction. This is not an easy subject, being charged with emotion as it is. There were, on the committee, abolitionists and retentionists. I felt he was most fair in his decision, and if one can disregard that one decision which Your Honour made when you were chairman of the

committee, he was pretty sympathetic to the arguments we presented. But, faced with your previous decision made when you were chairman of the committee, he felt that Your Honour had set a new precedent and that he could not follow the authorities I had mentioned.

I ask Your Honour in all seriousness to consider the precedent I mentioned, to consider arguments relating to the title of the bill which mentions the punishment for murder, and to consider arguments relating to what May says about the principle of the bill. Although one cannot move amendments which change the principle of a bill, surely the title has something to do with the principle. I pointed out that in 1967 Mr. Speaker Macnaughton allowed amendments and told Your Honour what the British did with regard to a similar bill. In light of those authorities, I ask Your Honour to give serious consideration to all amendments calling for the substitution of the death penalty for life imprisonment. I ask Your Honour to permit such amendments to be debated in this Chamber and to be brought to a vote so that decisions on them can be made.

This bill is very wide, Mr. Speaker. It abolishes the death penalty for treason. I think we are one of the few countries to go this far. Also, it abolishes the death penalty for all who murder a second time. In this regard I will not quote any pertinent statistics in my possession. This bill provides for those guilty of planned and premeditated capital murder to be sentenced for 25 years, a provision which will cause grave anxiety to those whose responsibility and duty it is to guard those unfortunate enough to be sentenced to 25 years of incarceration. I ask, in light of the facts just mentioned and in light of the seriousness of the bill, that Your Honour reverse himself and permit these amendments to be debated and voted on at the report stage. I thank Your Honour for hearing me, and I thank all hon. members for paying such close attention.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to traverse the ground covered by my colleague from Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). Bill C-84 amends certain sections of the Criminal Code. If an amendment to modify a clause of Bill C-84 were to carry, since Bill C-84 is to modify the Criminal Code the amendment as proposed would, of course, be in order; because a section of the Criminal Code is the basis of the amendment and anything which serves to amend the pertinent section of the Criminal Code in any way whatsoever must be acceptable. There is that basis for the change; and if the House is prepared to accept that change, that modification is made.

If, on the other hand, an amendment as proposed, if carried, merely negatives a clause of Bill C-84 but leaves the section of the Criminal Code unchanged, then I say that is merely an expanded negative. It should not be accepted, because the same result is achieved by voting and defeating the clause in the bill. As my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North pointed out, there is no other principle to Bill C-84 than to amend the Criminal Code with respect to certain offences. The fact that they are related in some ways to capital punishment cannot hold. There is, for example, the introduction of the penalty for high treason. It does not exist in the present Criminal Code. Therefore, there is no other principle to Bill C-84 because there is treason in the Criminal Code.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

• (1630)

Let us look at those clauses which deal with high treason. They are entirely new. There are other features in Bill C-84 which introduce new considerations into the Criminal Code. I therefore state, with the greatest respect, that it is wrong to say that the principle of Bill C-84 is the abolition of capital punishment. Nothing is further from the truth. It is a bill to amend the Criminal Code in certain features.

In some instances the bill changes the nature of the penalty from a capital sentence to varying categories of terms of imprisonment, but only in certain respects. As my colleague said, and I will repeat some of his argument, capital punishment will not be abolished in this country until it is done under the National Defence Act as well. Bill C-84 does not touch that. Therefore, one has to be very careful about these amendments and simply say that if the same result can be achieved by voting and defeating the clause in Bill C-84, all well and good. That does not, then, amend the Criminal Code. However, if the purposes of the amendments now before the House for consideration are, if carried, in any way to serve to modify even a colon, to introduce even a semi-colon, or introduce a preposition into the Criminal Code, the amendments must be attacked. I put it to Your Honour that such should be the case.

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I am sure the thought that is going through Your Honour's mind, even questioning some of these amendments—as I certainly believe that proposition will be made from the government's side—is that the main principle of the bill is the abolition of capital punishment and, therefore, any amendment which has the effect of retaining or reinstituting capital punishment is out of order because the main principle of the bill was discussed and voted on in this House on second reading. My submission is that the abolition of capital punishment is not the main principle of this bill. The main concept and the main thrust of this bill is simply the reorganization, in a far more logical way, of the homicide sections of the Criminal Code.

I merely point out that where before there was a blanket provision for activities relating to treason, there is now a differentiation between high treason as a crime and treason as a crime. We never had that differentiation before. To my knowledge, this is the first time we have had that concept in the Criminal Code, certainly in recent years. It is a logical and sensible differentiation.

With regard to murder, for the first time we have a differentiation between first-degree and second-degree murder. My submission is, quite simply, that the main principle behind the bill is a complete reorganization of the classifications of homicides in the Criminal Code, and in the Criminal Code exclusively. If that is so, the penalties for those reclassifications of various types of homicide is ancillary to the main principle. If that is the case, they are debatable and amendable at the report stage. It is as simple as that.

Let me put the hypothetical position to Your Honour. Even though one or two members of the House earlier publicly indicated they were going to amend certain other

penalty clauses, a brief look through the motions before Your Honour indicate there are no amendments along those lines. However, let me just put the hypothetical proposition. In two of the cases, for example, in first-degree murder and second-degree murder, there are penalties that mention a 25-year period of imprisonment and a 15-year period of imprisonment. If there were an amendment before Your Honour to change the 25-year period to 30, 20, 40, or 15 years, would that be out of order?

I cannot believe that would be out of order. I believe the Chair would rule that the penalty clause was ancillary to the main principle and, therefore, amendable and debatable at the report stage. Similarly, the question of life imprisonment and the death sentence for certain of the reclassifications of homicides is a referral to the penalty clause only. If it is a referral to the penalty clause only, that is ancillary to the main principle of the bill and, therefore, it should be debatable and amendable at report stage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, following the question raised by the Chair as regards the acceptability of amendments dealing with capital punishment and its enforcement, in putting the problem as if Bill C-84 in its principle dealt only with capital punishment, I think I should join the previous speakers in contending that the principle of Bill C-84 as such has nothing to do with the abolition or retention of the death penalty. In Bill C-84, the government seems to be dropping capital punishment as a means of fighting crime. As was said earlier, through Bill C-84 the government tries to amend the present outdated and obsolete Criminal Code, to reclassify the order of crimes and to provide for a new class of crimes; therefore—and this is only the result of such reclassification—unmistakably the government also provides for a degree of sentence in relation to the crime. In Bill C-84, one can find sentences such as commutation, detention for a specified period and even some provisions for parole after a given number of years in prison.

Mr. Speaker, as the title of the bill indicates, the bill before us is designed to amend the Criminal Code. This is the principle of the bill. I wish to make a comparison in support of my argument by referring first to the Fourth edition of Beauchesne, citation 246, paragraph 3.

It deals with a precedent relating to "money" bills, bills which aim either at spending some money, or at reducing or increasing expenditures. As the House and the Chair surely know, a member of Parliament cannot introduce a bill aimed at opposing the government's view, or involving public expenditures; but this would not prevent any member of Parliament from introducing an amendment providing for a different distribution of taxes that would be raised through the government bill.

In other words, a member of Parliament cannot reduce a tax on his own initiative through an amendment, but he can amend the legislation so that the distribution will be different from the one proposed in the bill. I will not read paragraph 3 of citation 246 of Beauchesne, but this is precisely the principle it puts forward. This is where I relate it to Bill C-84. I have in my name in the order paper a number of amendments that are being considered by the Chair and I suggest that those amendments, particularly No. 37, are simply designed to classify in a different way from that provided by the minister—the Solicitor General, who sponsored this bill—the penalties which will be involved in relation to a first or second degree murder.

I shall also refer to citation 276 of the same edition of Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, paragraph 1, which reads:

> In early editions of this book (Sir T. Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice), it was stated that "the Crown has no concern in the distribution of taxes." Hence amendments were at first pemitted which proposed the substitution of a different tax for a tax proposed by the Government . . .

I shall refrain from reading the whole paragraph, but I wish to show once more that a member of Parliament has some power. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if your decision were that any amendment aimed at changing the way the sentence is to be carried out, the sentence being either life imprisonment, or life imprisonment with possible commutation, or death with possible commutation, or again imprisonment with possible parole, one readily sees that that enumeration deals with the consequence of an act that was committed.

What the government is interested in is fighting crime. That is the principle in the bill which indicates the government has decided to revamp the Criminal Code as a whole. I for one say that the means proposed by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) in his bill, not the itself, are inadequate, and I suggest that one of the means to achieve the objective of the government happens to be the death penalty. What inspired me when I drafted motion No. 39—which I will simply recall without quoting—it to say that in the amendment I want to extend imprisonment in certain cases, rule out parole in others or simply deal with the sentencing to life imprisonment in yet other cases.

Well, Mr. Speaker, and that boils down to the opinion expressed by the hon. member who spoke before me, if that kind of amendment is out of order it means the bill itself is strictly a bill to abolish capital punishment, regardless of the crime rate in Canada, regardless of the categories of murders, regardless of the categories of crimes and regardless of the means used. That is why I say that the House of Commons should not become entangled in this kind of procedural snare because hon. members would have no other choice but to vote on a principle that would be either abolition or rentention of capital punishment. I say for my part that as a Parliament we have the power to go further in the same way we do with bills dealing with public outlays in the sense that we have the power to suggest to the government amendments to distribute its taxes in a different way, and then there is a vote. I say that the purpose of Bill C-84 which is to revise the Criminal Code is commendable, that the purpose of fighting crime is also commendable but that the means proposed by the Solicitor General are inadequate. That is my opinion. That is why I am taking positive action in not touching the bill, nor its title nor its basic principle but rather the means the government intends to give itself to fight crime, to control crime or to penalize a criminal convicted of first or second degree murder.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that the principle of Bill C-84 is not to establish the mode of punishment but to catalog a number of crimes, establish categories and therefrom establish penalties. The

principle of the bill, as I said, is not to establish a mode of punishment, but rather to catalog and specify a type of crime and give the government tools to fight that crime. That is why I am moving this kind of amendment to give the government an additional tool, a serious tool—the death penalty.

● (1640)

[*English*]

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): In speaking on the admissibility of the amendments which are before you, I would draw Your Honour's attention to two facts. One of them has already been referred to by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). First, the impression hon. members may have that this is an abolitionist bill, in the true sense, is not a sound one. This is a bill to amend two existing statutes, the Criminal Code and the Fugitive Offenders Act. I refer to the schedule on page 16. Though it amends those two acts, it specifically does not amend the National Defence Act, and the National Defence Act does contain extensive provisions covering situations where the death penalty applies in the event a person is convicted of certain stated offences—and I am referring to literally dozens of cases under the National Defence Act where the death penalty can apply.

It is, therefore, my submission that this bill is simply a modification of existing law with respect to the death penalty; it merely suggests that the death penalty with respect to certain offences be removed. On the other hand, the offences referred to in the National Defence Act are not covered. In short, it is simply a question of degree. In these circumstances I maintain that the argument put forward by various hon. members that the principle of the bill being abolition, the Chair cannot accept any amendment which goes against that principle, falls to the ground. To strengthen this contention I would draw attention to a bill presently before parliament, Bill S-23, introduced for first reading on March 13, 1975. That bill, I suggest, is a true abolitionist bill. It is entitled "an act to amend the National Defence Act and the Criminal Code (total abolition of capital punishment)". We are in an odd position in that we do have a truly abolitionist bill before parliament at the same time as a limited retentionist bill or a limited abolitionist bill. Any amendment to the limited abolitionist bill, C-84, should be found by Your Honour to be in order.

● (1650)

I will go further and refer Your Honour to a ruling of your predecessor that appears in the House of Commons *Journals* for February 13, 1969. That is a ruling which turned on an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman). In those proceedings he proposed that a private bill, known as S-6, which was then before the House be amended by deleting clause 1. The odd fact was that that was the only clause in the bill.

There was a lengthy debate on the issue, to which I hope Your Honour will refer, as reported in the Debates for February 13, setting out the arguments pro and con as to whether it was in fact in order to delete a clause which, in effect, negatived the whole bill. During the argument, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who is still with us, very effectively argued that it was quite in order that this deletion be proceeded with, and he won his case. If I may, I should like to refer to certain observations made by the Speaker in his ruling. I point out that this ruling was given shortly after the rules that now exist were agreed upon. The paragraph in the existing Standing Orders which was referred to was Standing Order 75(5).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is now, it seems to me, on a point which will be more relevant to the next argument that we are going to face since we have a number of amendments deleting clauses in the bill which have the effect of re-establishing clauses that now exist in the Criminal Code, obviously without the effect of the amending statute. The problem that now arises is one that the Chair is very much aware of, and it was referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), if I recall his words, as being an expanded negative.

As I say, that point is one that we will face in the motions to delete clauses. I understand that the hon. member is drawing a parallel to the effect that if you can do it that way, you ought to be able to do it in the way that is now before the House. I appreciate the point, but in terms of a full development of the point I would ask for further argument since there is a series of amendments before us which proposes to do precisely what the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Stevens: If I may, Mr. Speaker, the main thrust of my argument is that I hope that the ruling by your predecessor to which I have referred will be considered a precedent to follow in regard to motions 7, 11, 13, 36, and possibly others. In addition to that, if we read the full wording of the Speaker at that time, I think that what is before us today in regard to all these amendments is equally true, and that that precedent can be used not only to indicate that motions Nos. 7, 11, 13 and 36, which delete clauses, are in order but to justify Your Honour's finding all of the amendments before you in fact in order.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I agree with Your Honour that the question of how the Chair should rule on report stage amendments that seek to delete certain clauses of the bill is a separate issue from the one before us at the present time. The issue that has been raised at this time is a fundamental one, namely, whether it is in order to move amendments that seek to set aside a decision which is the main thrust of the bill.

I recognize that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) in particular have argued that what we have before us is not an abolition bill but a bill to amend the Criminal Code. I should like to remind them and Your Honour of the title of the bill, which reads, "an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences".

I submit to Your Honour that Bill C-84 is not just a bill containing routine amendments to the Criminal Code. That argument might have been made about Bill C-83, but it certainly does not apply to Bill C-84. Bill C-84 is directed

specifically to the question of what the punishment should be for murder and certain other serious offences.

At the present time, the Criminal Code provides that the punishment in some of those instances is death. Bill C-84 changes all that and provides that the punishment for these offences cannot be death but can be, at the most, life imprisonment. I submit that is a very precise proposition and that the vote of the House on second reading for the principle of this bill was a vote in favour of abolishing death as the punishment for crimes set out in the Criminal Code. It was a vote in favour of other degrees of punishment. I submit, therefore, that an amendment that seeks to bring back what the House voted against on second reading should be declared out of order.

I was interested in the fact that my hon. friend from Calgary North read a bit from page 494 of Erskine May's eighteenth edition. I wish he had gone on to read one or two more paragraphs. In the middle of the page I find this paragraph:

(1) A committee—

I realize that this is the British practice in committee, but I think it can be applied to the report stage.

—is bound by the decision of the House, given on second reading, in favour of the principle of the bill, and should not, therefore, amend the bill in a manner destructive of this principle.

I do not see how we can get away from the fact that the principle on which we voted on second reading was on the question whether to retain capital punishment for murder and certain other offences, or whether to change to life imprisonment or certain terms of imprisonment. That decision having been made, it seems to me that amendments which seek to reverse that decision are not in order. I am not suggesting that it is not open to the House to change its position by defeating the bill at the report stage or at third reading. It can go back on that decision. But the principle having been approved on second reading, I submit that all the arguments on page 494 of May's eighteenth edition are against amendments that seek to bring back the death penalty.

I would also point out, just to read a Canadian work, that at page 170 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition is a very well-known citation, citation 202(12), which reads:

An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order.

Surely, an amendment that seeks to negative directly a decision made by the House on second reading is a direct negative or an expanded negative and therefore should be ruled out of order.

In his remarks, the hon. member for Calgary North referred to amendments that were allowed by the Speaker of the day to one of the previous bills; I think he was referring to the legislation of 1967. In any case, he pointed out that amendments to extend the death penalty to some other crimes not already in the bill were allowed. I would point out, with great respect, sir, that the bill of 1967—indeed, all the bills we have had in this sphere up until now—was a bill that only partially abolished capital punishment. The death penalty still existed, and I think the Speaker's rulings on those occasions were that since the death penalty still existed it was in order for members to move an amendment applying it to some other crimes than those set out in the bill. This is a vastly different bill which we now have. Those previous bills were bills that did include the death penalty and, indeed, were also bills covering only temporary five-year periods. We now have a bill which is for total abolition of the death penalty on a permanent basis and approved by the House on second reading.

● (1700)

Some hon. members have tried to say, and I think the hon. member for Calgary North used these words—I hope I am not twisting them at all—that this is not a total abolitionist bill but it is a partial retentionist bill. I do not think the member should be allowed to get away with that. It may be that with the National Defence Act being unchanged, our total law is not totally abolitionist. There may be provision for my friend, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) across the way, to conduct a firing squad, or what have you. However, he comes from Winnipeg and would not do that. Even though there might be the provision for a form of capital punishment in another act, namely, the National Defence Act, as far as the Criminal Code is concerned, as far as civil law in this country is concerned, this bill before us is totally abolitionist. There is no provision in this bill, anywhere, for the penalty of death to be applied in respect of any crime set out in the Criminal Code.

Like my friends who have taken part in this debate by referring only to procedural matters, I shall try to stay away from the substance of the bill. It does seem to me that this is a pretty important issue in procedural terms. The principal point is that it is a bill to make a change in punishment for murder in so far as the Criminal Code is concerned. The House has made a decision on that point, and I confess to a little bit of surprise that some of my friends who voted against the bill because it was for total and permanent abolition should now say it is not a total and permanent abolition bill because of certain provisions in the National Defence Act. Perhaps this is a bit of an aside rather than an addition to the argument.

I think I have made the case as I see it, Mr. Speaker. What is before us is not just a set of routine amendments to the Criminal Code. It is clearly defined in the title as a bill to amend the Criminal Code in relation to publishment for murder. The present law says that the punishment for murder in certain cases is death. This bill abolishes death as an instrument of punishment for crimes under the Criminal Code and, the House having made its decision, I do not think it is open to members to move amendments that would either reverse or alter the result of that decision already taken.

It is open to hon. members to argue for their amendments. It is open to members to try to defeat some of the clauses, and it is open to members to try to defeat the bill on third reading. In other words, the second reading vote does not stand for all time. Some of us are very conscious of that, and will be until the issue is over. But an attempt to amend the bill and by that method to bring back the death penalty which was voted against on second reading is something that I submit would be out of order at this stage.

Capital Punishment

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I listened to all the persuasive arguments made this afternoon, but I was most impressed with those made by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). I will deal with them in a moment, if I may. First of all, I should like to address myself to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I find myself in agreement with many of the things he said.

Those amendments which purport to substitute for that which the government has clearly put forward in this House, that is, that capital punishment shall hereafter and always be abolished, would be clearly out of order. To substitute the death penalty in certain circumstances for that which the government has suggested would clearly be against the principle of the bill. That is the matter to which I would address myself and that is the subject matter of many of these motions. May I indicate the motions that would attempt to amend and substitute death for what the government of Canada, and this House on second reading, have determined should not hereafter exist. They are motions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 35, 37, 38 and 40.

It is clear to most people on this side and, indeed, on the other side of the House, that those who argued against the bill with great conviction because they were for the retention of capital punishment in this land were arguing against the principle of total abolition of capital punishment as a sanction in respect of murder and other serious crimes as they exist in the Criminal Code. That is the principle against which they argued so vehemently for 17 days of debate in this House, in 119 speeches. Had they not believed that was the principle, I think they would have voted for the bill on second reading, particularly if it was only a bill to determine what ought to be done with persons who had committed the most heinous crime, namely, murder. They did not do that. They addressed themselves, in each and every speech from this side and the other side in respect of abolition and in respect of retention, to the issue of capital punishment.

In my humble submission, the matter which Your Honour ought to address and concern himself with in determining whether these amendments are or are not in order is whether the principle of the bill is total abolition of capital punishment as a sanction for murder and other serious crimes as found in the Criminal Code.

As the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) indicated both in the committee and here, we are addressing ourselves to an issue of parliamentary procedure and how it affects the issue to which we are addressing ourselves—and that is the bill now before this House. It is a bill to amend the Criminal Code, not a bill to amend the National Defence Act or any other act. It is my submission that within the four corners of the bill it is clear, not only in the words of the bill but in the reactions of the people of this country and members on all sides of this House, that the one and only fundamental issue is whether this House and this country will abolish capital punishment at this time.

Therefore, I say to you, sir, that any amendments, and specifically those which I have enumerated, are out of order because they go beyond the principle of the bill. In support of that I should like to refer to some precedents,

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

some quoted by the hon. member for Calgary North and included in the *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence* of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for June 20, 1973. At that time we had a most distinguished chairman who said, among other things, when he was discussing the rules that the chairman of a committee ought to consider:

> The third rule is that they must be within the scope of the bill or they must come specifically within the four corners of the statute that we are dealing with. This is particularly so—and this is perhaps a refinement of that rule—when you are dealing, as we are now, with an amending statute which seeks to amend the Criminal Code because it is clear that amendments to such a bill must not go beyond the amending statute and try to amend the Code, which we are doing, but must strictly deal with amendments to Bill C-2 itself.
>
> There are restrictions on how far amendments can go; they cannot delete clauses in a bill. That obviously must be done by negativing the clause when it comes to a vote, and if it is negatived, by replacing it with another clause.

● (1710)

Further, that most learned chairman said, as recorded at page 20.5:

> In other words, depending on your view, as it has been said many times in the argument, one of the principles of the bill is that there shall be a partial retention or a partial abolition of capital punishment in Canada. I think it is valid to say that if the view of the government which put forward Bill C-2 was different than that so that it favoured a total abolition of capital punishment, that was the principle which should have been put in the original bill.

Mr. Speaker, may I humbly say that that ruling and the subsequent reasoning from it was sustained in this House by your most distinguished predecessor in the chair who found that indeed the ruling of the chairman of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs was proper and right in the circumstances. In the Debates of the House of Commons of July 20, 1973, as recorded at page 5841—I am sure Your Honour is well aware of this, so I shall not go into it—Mr. Speaker sustained the ruling by the chairman of the committee on justice and legal affairs.

Subsequently, when Bill C-2 went from this House to the other place, the chairman of the committee on the judiciary of that House, whose name has been referred to here as having been a Speaker of this House in 1969, I believe, when a similar question was before the House, sustained the decision made by the very learned and distinguished chairman of the committee on justice and legal affairs of this House and the Speaker of this House with regard to the decision he made on the amendments proposed in respect of Bill C-2. I am not unduly flattering you, Mr. Speaker, but I am referring to these very recent precedents to indicate that they are far more powerful than anything that may be quoted from other jurisdictions or from this parliament in earlier times.

Without going into detail in respect of what was said at those times, with which I am sure you are most familiar, the fundamental principle and rule is that there is no amendment acceptable in this House, in committee or at the report stage, which would violate the fundamental principle as defined at the time of passage of second reading. All those motions I enumerated violate that fundamental principle, as argued on both sides of this House with great sincerity but nonetheless passed, which is that capital punishment at this time as a sanction for capital murder and other serious crimes as defined in the Criminal

Code, not in other statutes or other bills but within the four corners of that statute, shall now be abolished at this time in Canada. In that respect I submit, very respectfully, that all these amendments are out of order.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty at this time, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes)—Environmental Affairs—Request that English and Wabigoon Rivers be declared water quality controlled zones; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Extension of coverage to isolated areas—Reason for delay; the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway)—Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation—Alleged Failure to comply with provisions of act—Government action.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I am not one of the legal minds in this House, so I have not been up on one of these things before. However, I have some deep concerns about the possible ruling you may make on this decision, because I know we have some members here who might switch their vote and I would hope they would have an opportunity to debate what they think are legitimate motions in respect of this bill.

I have done some research and have dug up some arguments relative to this bill which I think show that members have a right, on a bill of this type, to get their arguments before the House and have a vote. I did not hear the whole of the speech of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), but I believe he brought up the point I raised in the committee yesterday, that in the United Kingdom in 1955-56, amendments were put at the committee and report stage which were very similar to the types of amendment put forward today. The Speaker did not make a ruling at that time because there was no argument. It was, therefore, impossible to come up with anything from that ruling, so I went to the library and, with some assistance from the kind people there, I dug up some decisions, some of which were made by yourself, sir, which I think are relevant to this bill. I should like to quote one by you, Mr. Speaker, on Bill C-58:

> My view is that the bill is a bill to amend the Income Tax Act. Pursuant to the Income Tax Act as it now stands, without passage of Bill C-58, it is possible for taxpayers to advertise in foreign broadcasting undertakings and deduct those expenses from their income. The purport of Bill C-58 would be to change that and take away from those advertisers the opportunity to make those deductions from income. Whether it be that clause 3 contains an actual provision or not, the fact of the matter is the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) would in fact propose what seems to me to be middle ground—

Mr. Speaker, my argument is that on that bill you took the middle ground. I would say, in respect of this bill, that the abolition of capital punishment is one ground on which part of the House is voting, that the retention of capital punishment is the other ground, and yet the amendments which relate to this bill—some of them, certainly—are the middle ground. I know that some people who have voted for abolition may change their vote if they cannot get one or two of those amendments on middle ground. I should like to complete the statement you made in this ruling:

> —that is, advertisers who advertise in foreign broadcasting undertakings would be permitted to deduct from income the expenses paid for those advertisements, provided certain conditions are met. The conditions are complex and will need some explanation, but that bears on substance and their acceptability to the House by way of a vote. It does not bear, in any way that I can see, on procedural regularity.
>
> It seems to me that the hon. member ought to be able to put that kind of motion by way of amendment to this particular clause. It would be my view that motions ought to be debated and voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, one of my arguments would be, in that situation, that you allowed a vote on middle ground and I would state that some, not all, of the amendments in this area which purport to retain capital punishment for certain offences are in the middle ground of that bill and I would hope you would allow them. There is another quotation here from November 28, 1974, on a bill regarding the B.C. Telephone Company. On that issue it was the Deputy Speaker who made the ruling which I should like to quote:

> The hon. member said to the House he has in his hand a letter from the company stating that it would be happy to have its name made bilingual. Of course, the normal channel to have that change made would be for the company to have a new private bill introduced to amend its name.
>
> Having said that, although hon. members do not doubt the word of their colleague, neither the Chair nor any member of this House have a copy of that letter, and the rules of this House do not provide for the tabling of such documents. I think everyone will agree to take the word of the hon. member. I must also refer him to different citations from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms respecting amendments, particularly citation 202 on page 169 and citation 203 on page 171 which state explicitly, and I quote:
>
> 203. (1) It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.
>
> The hon. member knows that the bill before us is a bill on the financing of the company, which has never been presented to the House to amend the name of the company or some other aspects of its administration.
>
> If the hon. member keeps on reading citation 203, he will come to paragraph (3), and I quote:

(3) An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

This being said, and considering that hon. members seem to be in a good mood and considering also the limited effect of the amendment the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) is proposing at the report stage, which nonetheless raised an important point as the hon. member said, the Chair would be willing to consider the motion and let the House decide. But that could be done only by unanimous consent.

I do not know whether all members followed my remarks, but the Chair feels that this kind of amendment should not be accepted in our general procedure. Noting that the intent of the bill is not to amend in any way the name of the company, or anything other than the financial structure, and noting the co-operation that seems to exist following the remarks of the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), if there is unanimous consent the Chair would be ready to accept the amendment for debate. Is that agreed?

It was agreed. Mr. Speaker, I would say, in that sense, that this House, in general agreement, thought that although there was an amendment that was out of order, it should accept it, and the Deputy Speaker at that time allowed that amendment to be put. He said: "... let the House decide". I suggest that the rejection of some of the amendments that are being put forward will have an effect on the bill, and I would not want to see that happen. I think that a member should be able to vote on it in accordance with his conscience, and I would not want to see members change their minds one way or the other because an amendment which they wanted to see brought before the House and voted upon was rejected. I suggest there are a number of people who will change their votes if they cannot debate some of these issues.

● (1720)

The last precedent appeared in *Hansard* of November 28, 1974. There were two in one day. This one had to do with Bill C-14, put forward by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick). Mr. Deputy Speaker said on that day:

I make this point now in order to clarify that in accepting the present amendment proposed by the hon. member I do not in any way intend to go contrary to the previous position taken by Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker said he had some reservations about the amendment on two grounds. He suggested first that it was contrary to the basic principle of the bill, and that the interpretation clause should not be used to enlarge on the scope of the bill in the way attempted by this amendment. He added that this was not the basic nature of a definition section, and that this would go far beyond the scope of an interpretation clause, usually being a simple definition clause as opposed to a substantive clause.

On the other hand, having listened to the remarks and the points made by hon. members, and particularly the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), Mr. Speaker indicated his desire to take into account those representations, and indicated that he did not want to deprive any member of the opportunity of discussing the important point in this proposed amendment, which was defective mainly because it was attached to the interpretation clause.

I feel it would be very difficult for me to question the amendment put before the House at this time by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton with the knowledge that Mr. Speaker, in his conclusion, said that if the House would give consent to the tabling of an amendment at eight o'clock he felt that might take the House out of the then rather awkward procedural position. Although I do not wish really to invite a debate on the procedural acceptability of the amendment, some hon. members might wish to suggest there is a substantive factor in it. However, on account of everything that was said by Mr. Speaker, I feel I should give consent to the hon. member to present his motion. Therefore I would be willing at this time to put the amendment unless there are strong objections.

[Mr. Reynolds.]

I use these three precedents from this session of parliament because they relate to the same type of bill, and I hope they will have some effect on your decision, Mr. Speaker, so that we can get down to debating the clauses of the bill and doing what the majority of members of the House want, that is, to debate some of the issues, vote on them and finalize this issue of capital punishment once and for all. If we do not get an opportunity to debate some of these issues, we will see this bill back before the House in five or six years' time, but if we can debate the issues and clear the air now, we might solve the matter once and for all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate since the beginning and I want to say that I do not belong to the group of lawyers who took part in the discussion this afternoon and I am quite glad of it. I think we are witnessing a legal contest among lawyers and it always happens when such bills are considered to decide what is the principle of the bill. I think the first mistake is found in all bills and that is they are not clear enough. Instead of "An Act to amend the Criminal Code" if it had been merely referred to as "Bill against the death penalty" it would be clear, everyone would understand and such a debate would not have been held this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

I recall that a few years ago a member of our party had asked that the texts of the bills be made clearer so anyone would understand. But then a lawyer had risen to say: "Mr. Speaker, if this is going to happen, what will lawyers do, how will they earn their living?"

I think we have another proof today of a protracted legal debate between lawyers. First of all, the principle of the bill is discussed; then, the amendments moved must not go beyond this principle. Well, I also have something to say about these amendments. We move amendments and the Chair rules them as contrary to the principle of the bill. Can you imagine that! Capital punishment is to be abolished and we are forbidden to talk about it! It is prohibited because abolition is sought, because a minister, the Solicitor General, wants to completely abolish the capital penalty.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said a few moments ago that he does not want to allow any longer this kind of slaughter. I ask the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre what he thinks about the slaughter of all the innocent victims of these hired assassins? What does he think of those slaughters? But I want to remark that you allowed him to say that. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot leave those words unanswered. I am talking against the decision made today that if we do not object 75 per cent of our amendments will be ruled out simply because we are not of the same opinion as the government. I say this is ridiculous and that once more we are witnessing party dictatorship and a minority trying to impose its will upon us.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I want to point out to the hon. member that we are simply discussing the question of order and procedure with respect to the amendments, namely whether the amendments are against the principle of the bill.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): I want to show that they are not against the principle of the bill, that it is the principle of the bill that is false.

I do not know if they will understand, but I would be very glad if hon. members were to quit calling me to order. It is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to call me to order and not up to hon. members. I want to say quite simply that these amendments are not contrary to the principle of the bill, as we understand it. Quite simply, the principle of the bill has to be changed, and then it will be possible to discuss on another level. As long as the principle of the bill remains what it is, we suggest that our amendments are in order.

Mr. Francis Fox (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I know that we have already debated this question of procedure in great detail this afternoon, and it is always interesting to take part in a discussion on a question of procedure because, of course, it is almost impossible to become inflamed when we simply deal with the Standing Orders of the House. It goes without saying that the decision you will make in due course, a decision on procedure and on the receivability of arguments, is one which will be yours and which the House will have to obey.

I think that during the debates this afternoon, we heard from various quarters, particularly on the part of the spokesman for the official opposition, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), arguments which admitted things which went so far that it was not even necessary to quote authorities or to talk about principles because, in all his arguments, the hon. member clearly admitted that if his amendments were against the principle adopted on the second reading, then his amendments should be rejected outright. He clearly admitted the principle, which is indeed well supported by authorities, yourself, your predecessors in this Parliament, as well as by the Parliament in London.

He also endeavoured to prove that the principle of the bill is not the abolition of the death penalty. And one of his colleagues, during the debate, referred to the fact that under the National Defence Act, the death penalty is maintained in specific circumstances. In short, what he forgot, Mr. Speaker, is that the House is now studying a bill that deals with a specific act of Parliament, a very specific statute, namely the Criminal Code. The fact is that this bill is intended to remove, everywhere in the Criminal Code, any and all mention of the death penalty and substitute other penalties for it.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, what we are now discussing in this House is the abolition of the death penalty in the Criminal Code and I do not think we have to concern ourselves with all the other acts passed by the Parliament of Canada at some time or other.

Mr. Speaker, as I have no intention of referring to specific authorities, my hon. colleague the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General (Mr. Poulin) having already done so, I merely wish to add that I consider that argument as basic.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I feel we must look into the arguments dealing with procedure, taking into account the consequences and effects, and that, with what I would call common sense. In short, if procedural arguments and legalistic considerations lead to an absurd situation, I feel we should come back to basic principles and interpret them, if possible, in such a way as to take common sense into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, to get their argument through, they have to say that this bill has really nothing to do with the principle of abolition or retention of the death penalty.

When I look back at what happened in Parliament during the 119 speeches which have been made, when I think of what happened since the introduction on first reading of Bill C-83 and Bill C-84, I realize, Mr. Speaker, when appealing to the common sense, that if some members opposite did not view the debate as one dealing with the death penalty and common sense, I wonder then what they understand and what they did talk about in their speeches.

Members on both sides of the House always considered that it was indeed a debate on the death penalty, on abolition or retention of the death penalty. All hon. members of the House were even called retentionists or abolitionists. Certainly information media viewed the debate in that perspective and so did the public itself.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to accept the interpretation of our opponents, we must then conclude that no one in this country understood the debate which has been taking place in the House for two months. Therefore I would be deeply concerned about the parliamentary institutions of our country.

This debate is directed to the public. Our constituents talked a great deal about it. What we are told today is that there is only a handful of lawyers in the House, particularly on the other side of the House, who seemed to have understood the debate as one whose goal was really to make a distinction between high treason and treason.

● (1730)

Their impression was that the debate did not have anything to do with capital punishment, that it was really incidental, not within the scope or principle of second reading. The actual purpose here would be to define first and second degree murders. Of course it is pure fantasy and it does not stand common sense scrutiny.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I think our conclusion must be totally opposite. Some have read the English version of the title of the bill but we could refer also to the French which reads "Loi modifiant le Code criminel (meurtre et certaines autres infractions graves)"—not a literal translation but both versions are official. Then, when we look at the bill, we see that there was a decision on principle, a position taken by those who introduced the bill which deals with abolition of capital punishment and according to what has been said, it is piece of legislation which considers abolition of the death penalty and proposes alternatives in the case of murder.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I support of course the argument put forward by my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General (Mr. Poulin). I do not intend to draw again to your attention the authorities of which you are already perfectly aware. Besides, I contend that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who was the official spokesman for his party, said there

was no dispute, no disagreement whatsoever as regards principles, but that the only matter of dissatisfaction was that in the 119 speeches that were delivered, here, hon. members have not really dealt with the abolition of capital punishment, but rather with a variety of other issues; in other words, the Canadian public as a whole were deceived about the nature of this debate, and himself and the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) as well as, perhaps, the members for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) and Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) are the only ones who really understood this debate.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is their interpretation, in light of the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General and others in this House, that their arguments should be rejected and most of the amendments which attempted to reintroduce the death penalty in the Criminal Code should be ruled out.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by a comment on amendments which attempt to remove a subclause of Bill C-84, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that usually one cannot do indirectly what cannot be done directly. Should you rule that amendments which reintroduce the word death in the Criminal Code cannot been retained, then the amendments which attempt to remove a whole subclause and which would result in reintroducing the death penalty in the Criminal Code should be rejected as well under the principle, Mr. Speaker, that one should not do indirectly what cannot be done directly.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The last point raised by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fox) is an interesting one. I am sure we are going to meet it later because there are a number of motions for deletion, but those motions really come under a special classification at the report stage, specifically under the terms of Standing Order 75(5), and are provided for at report stage as motions to delete. Therefore despite their effect, the analogous arguments that may follow from their effect, and although they appear to enjoy the same special status of protection which therefore makes it difficult to argue analogy, the point is by no means missed.

I notice that two other hon. members want to contribute to the discussion which has been rather full. However, if there is a necessity to add to the arguments that have already been made, which I think are rather complete, I do not want to shut any member out of the discussion. It is a very important one and, as the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) said, it can affect the opportunity of members to express themselves on specific points and bring the House to a vote. It is therefore a procedural question which has rather substantive overtones to it. I shall hear further argument, but I hope that hon. members who now participate will add to what has been said rather than repeat it.

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long. Basically I shall deal with the last point that you brought to the attention of the House and that was dealt with by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fox).

[Mr. Fox.]

When we look at the total number of motions presented we see that to all but eight of the clauses—and there are 30 clauses—there are substantive motions for deletion. When we look at the clauses that are left out of the motions for deletion we see that they are basically procedural clauses.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I have a mistaken impression of the remarks of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais), but we are now dealing only with those amendments other than motions to delete. After coming to a disposition of that series of motions it will leave a number of others that are clearly in order, plus a number of motions to delete. I think we ought to deal with the argument on all motions to delete at the same time after we have disposed of the argument before us now. That is only a narrow argument on whether or not amendments which propose to return the death penalty to the Criminal Code are out of order because of their contravention of the principle of the bill.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, the only aspect of the motion to delete that I want to draw to your attention at this time is the argument that I think could be made more fully later on. I support the members of the government who have spoken relative to the principle of the bill.

● (1740)

The total effect is an attempt to defeat the principle of the bill. In totality the motions presented, particularly motions relating to the principle, attempt to re-establish the death penalty. In other words their total effect is the attempted defeat of the bill. I am referring to motions containing substantive provisions which would change the principle and re-establish the death penalty, to motions dealing with deletion, and to other motions still to be debated. The point is that the total effect of all those motions is completely to obviate any necessity for third reading. Therefore they offend against the rules in much the same way as those motions dealt with in committee offended against the principle of the bill. They are disorderly, since the House is called on to deal seriatim with a series of motions the votes on which would duplicate any vote which may be required at third reading.

I shall return to this argument when we deal with the deletion motions. I wanted to give Your Honour notice of my intention to debate that particular point.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, I shall speak very briefly. I am surprised to realize that so far in this debate no one referred to the provisions of Bill C-84 as a whole in order to answer the very simple question: What principle is Bill C-84 based on? I suggest to you that each of the 30 clauses of this bill has a direct impact on the abolition of capital punishment. I think that it is by examining this very specific question of fact that you can come to a decision and to the application of the principle that you cannot bring an amendment that would change the principle of a bill which passed second reading.

Then, it is a simple matter of fact, and when you study Bill C-84 and consider, for instance, clause 1, that is the short title, no complication there, but clauses 2, 3 and 4 define treason, piracy and murder, that is offences which

were punishable by death under the Criminal Code. Those three changes have a direct influence on the abolition of capital punishment. Clause 5 amends section 218, which included a provision describing an offence explicitely punishable by death. Clause 6 amends section 511 which dealt with capital punishment. Clause 7 amends section 534 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 8 amends section 535 of the Criminal Code concerning capital punishment. Clause 9 amends section 538 of the Criminal Code dealing with capital punishment. Clause 10 amends section 562 of the Criminal Code which deals with capital punishment. Clause 11 amends section 589 of the Criminal Code dealing with capital punishment. Clause 12 repeals section 597 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 13 simply amends the sentence in accordance with the new definition of second degree murder, an amendment which results from the abolition of capital punishment. Clause 14 repeals section 604 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 15 deals with the sentence for first degree murder, resulting from the abolition of capital punishment. Finally, clause 16 amends section 607 of the Criminal Code dealing with capital punishment. Clause 17 amends section 609 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 18 amends section 618 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 19 repeals section 619 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 20 amends section 662.1 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 21 amends sections 669 to 681 all dealing with capital punishment. Clause 22 amends section 682 dealing with capital punishment. Clause 23 repeals section 684 dealing with capital punishment. Finally, clauses 25 to 28 inclusive are transition; the principle of Bill C-84 does not lie there. Clause 29 deals with consequential amendments. The principle of the bill does not lie there. And the last one, clause 30, deals with the commencement of the act. The principle of the bill does not lie there either.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, my contention is that there is nothing like reading a bill to discover its principle. It is erratic from the start to rely on its title, as some hon. members did, or to take some clauses out of the bill, to read them out of context to interpret them subjectively and to claim before the House that the principle of Bill C-84 is to redefine treason under two categories, high treason or plain treason, or to redefine piracy or first and second degree murder. I have just ascertained, simply on reading Bill C-84, that each and all of the clauses of Bill C-84 have a direct impact on the abolition of the death penalty and I think there is nothing more obvious than facts which speak for themselves and make it possible to come to a reliable decision, namely to invalidate amendments to alter the principle of a bill which appears plainly following the reading of each clause in Bill C-84.

[*English*]

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention a word of fundamental importance. We are told in the notice of motion presented to hon. members by the Clerks of this assembly pursuant to Standing Order 75(5) that we are to consider the report stage of Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences. I bring to Your Honour's attention the word punishment. Certainly, unless the House of Commons is not prepared to mete out certain forms of punishment, we should recognize that the key word in the title is punishment, I think this was brought to Your Honour's attention earlier this afternoon by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) who said we are seeking the middle of the road approach.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I say, while we await the messenger from the other place, that arguments put forward on this point have been most interesting and helpful. In every case the arguments were well put up and touch on the important decision which must be made with respect to further debate on amendments at this stage.

I shall reserve on this matter. I may be able to bring down a decision after the eight o'clock vote and will try to do so if I can.

I see the messenger from the other place is here. I repeat that I will take arguments presented under consideration during the supper hour and endeavour to bring down a decision after eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Bon appetit!

• (1750)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

• (1800)

[*Translation*]

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills.

Bill C-93, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1977—Chapter No. 102.

Bill C-94, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1977—Chapter No. 103.

Bill S-32, An Act to implement conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium and Canada and Israel—Chapter No. 104.

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

At 6.05 the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed, from Friday, June 25, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to the order made last night, the House will now divide on Bill C-68. Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Lalonde), which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 145*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Fox
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Harquail
Herbert
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lachance
Lajoie
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Yanakis
Young—123

NAYS

Messrs.

Allard
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Broadbent
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Ellis
Elzinga
Fairweather
Firth
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gilbert
Grafftey
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hogan
Holmes
Horner
Huntington
Jarvis
Johnston
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
Leggatt
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the
Islands)
MacLean
Macquarrie
Malone
Marshall
Masniuk
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinley
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rodriguez
Rynard
Saltsman
Scott
Stanfield
Stevens
Symes
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Yewchuk—77

● (2020)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

● (2030)

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: The question now is the determination pursuant to Standing Order 75 of the procedural acceptability of motions introduced at the report stage of Bill C-84.

This afternoon I indicated some difficulty with the long accepted axiom of the House which was referred to so frequently and clearly in arguments put forward this afternoon. I will point out for the sake of clarity that it is stated on page 509 of May's Eighteenth Edition that:

> An amendment which is equivalent to a negative of the bill, or which would reverse the principle of the bill as agreed to on second reading, is not admissible.

We have before us a number of amendments at the report stage of Bill C-84 and the Chair indicated this afternoon some difficulty with those amendments which would reintroduce into the Criminal Code some form of the death penalty. Because of the proposition that had been put forward in the committee and discussed quite generally that the principle of the bill was to abolish the death penalty, any amendment which would propose to reinstate the death penalty would contravene the axiom to which I just referred.

Many hon. members participated in the discussion this afternoon which lasted until almost six o'clock. There were interesting contributions from members on both sides of the question, although not so much on both sides of the House. Many argued that the principle of the bill was different from that which had been suggested by others, the principle being the abolition of the death penalty. The discussions were interesting and the contributions were well prepared and well thought out, but in the final analysis the question reduces itself to whether, when the House pronounced itself upon second reading of the bill, it pronounced itself on a question of principle and, if so, what that principle was.

With the greatest respect for all the arguments to the contrary, I have tried to conclude that the principle of the bill is other than the abolition of capital punishment for crime under the Criminal Code. However, I cannot come to that conclusion.

It seems to me, in respect of all the speeches and comments that have been made, that many members have addressed themselves, in the agony they feel in making this decision, to the fact that for the first time a bill has been put before the House which is different from those which have been put before the House in the past which have retained capital punishment for certain offences, and have been for a temporary period. The distinctive feature of this bill, which has caused so much concern and so much agony of decision, is that it proposes the total abolition of capital punishment for crimes described in the Criminal Code.

If the rule that amendments after second reading cannot contravene the principle adopted by the House on second reading has any meaning at all—and I know that in the past all the precedents, which strongly and clearly set out that axiom give absolutely no assistance in attempting to define what is the principle of a bill—maybe it is wise and intelligent, and certainly I accept the admonition, and will in no way attempt to generalize on that proposition. In other words, I have to decide whether this bill has a central principle and, if so, what it is.

Having regard to all the debates and comments, and all the circumstances of this bill at second reading, I can come to no other conclusion than that this bill has a central principle, it being the abolition of the death penalty for crimes described in the Criminal Code. Therefore I must conclude that any amendments at this stage which seek to reintroduce the death penalty under any circumstances contravene the principle and are out of order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: For the benefit of hon. members I will list the motions ruled out of order. They are Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8. Motion No. 4 in the name of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) introduces a rather novel proposition to the capital punishment argument in that it leaves the option to choose the death penalty to the convicted person. That is not, in the true sense of the word, imposition of the death penalty by mistake, but really leaves the option to the accused person to choose the death penalty or imprisonment for life. It has interesting implications, but in procedural terms—which is all with which the Chair is dealing at this point—I have some difficulty in classifying this amendment as proposing the reintroduction of the death penalty which would offend the principle of the bill. I will only say that I will not put this amendment and others related to it in the same category as others which I rule out of order. It may be that further arguments will convince the Chair that that amendment and others related to it put forward by the same hon. member giving the same option are in fact out of order. All I am saying is that, because it gives the option to the convicted person, it separates itself from all those amendments which seek to reintroduce the death penalty imposed by the state. Therefore I separate that motion from others.

Motion No. 5 is out of order. So are motions Nos. 6, and 8. Motion No. 9 is related to motion No. 4 and therefore is reserved for further discussion. Motions Nos. 14 and 15 are out of order.

Motion No. 16 in the name of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) would not, on the face of it, be out of order but seems to be consequential on the passage of an amendment which is out of order. However, on the face of it, it is not out of order and perhaps the hon. member should be left to proceed with it or withdraw it. Motion No. 17 is out of order.

Motion No. 18 is related to motions Nos. 4 and 5 in the name of the hon. member for Oxford in that it also gives the option to the imprisoned person.

Motion No. 19 is out of order.

Motion No. 20 appears to be in order but appears to be consequential. Again, on the face of it, it is not out of order and I will leave it to the hon. member to give the House some indication as to whether or not to proceed with it.

● (2040)

Motion No. 35 would be out of order. Motion No. 37 appears to be consequential again, and therefore it would be left to the hon. member to indicate whether it will proceed or not.

Motion No. 38, put forward by the hon. member for Oxford, relates to the method in which the death penalty will be carried out in the event that the accused person takes advantage of the option. Therefore I should not say that that motion is yet out of order; it will have to be deferred until further consideration.

Motion No. 40 appears to be consequential and it will be left to the hon. member to indicate whether it will proceed or not.

Motion No. 45 deserves some special comment, I think, because this motion in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) provides for certain circumstances under which the House might address itself in a special way to the reintroduction of a resolution which would—it mentions the death penalty but in fact it again is a rather exceptional procedure which I do not include in those amendments which would seek to reintroduce the total bill directly. While it might be subject to further discussion as to its procedural regularity, it is not struck down again by the recent ruling I have made with regard to those amendments which would directly seek to reintroduce capital punishment.

Therefore remaining in those classifications of motions is the very large group which seeks to delete clauses. Some

discussion was initiated this afternoon by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), or at least I think it was first mentioned by him, that in fact clauses to delete in those circumstances may be no more than an expanded negative. Reference was also made by many others who participated in the discussion this afternoon. Although almost precisely opposed to the view that I began with this afternoon, it is true that in many cases a motion to delete at this stage is in fact nothing more than a procedure requiring that a vote be made on an individual clause. It is in fact a negative, and the precedents clearly indicate if such a motion were to be put forward in the standing committee to delete a clause, the motion would be struck out on procedural grounds because it would be the reverse proposition of the carriage of the clause.

In standing committee, however, the clauses have to be voted one at a time. At report stage the clauses are not voted one at a time and Standing Order 75, particularly in subsection (5) says that means motions to amend or delete—the language is there. The whole of Standing Order 75 describes the report stage process, and therefore while motions to delete at this stage may in fact be simply a negative of the clause in question, and in fact by defeating or proposing the defeat of the amendment to a clause would have the effect of returning to the original clause in the Criminal Code which has in its provisions the imposition of the death penalty, therefore would accomplish what has already been struck down in the ruling I have just made. Be that as it may, the fact is that Standing Order 75(5) says that motions to delete are in order at this stage, and therefore while they may offend some other precedents they are in line with the Standing Order in that paragraph.

I would have the greatest difficulty in attempting to rule aside motions to delete, particularly in face of the precedent cited by the hon. member for York-Simcoe this afternoon which seems to me to be the extreme of this case, that is, at report stage a one clause bill was met with a motion to delete the one clause.

The motion to delete is envisaged clearly in the Standing Order. It may be that if the rule were abused the procedural committee might want to recommend an amendment to the Standing Orders or the deletion of Standing Order 75(5) so that it could not be used in an abusive way.

My duty is to apply the Standing Orders as they appear. Therefore, notwithstanding a number of inconsistencies with the precedents I have just cited in the ruling I have just made, motions to delete pursuant to Standing Order 75 appear to me to be in order.

I have some considerable sympathy with the argument put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond Delta (Mr. Reynolds), which was that it would be a pity to strike out the amendments—which I have just done—because it would deprive hon. members of addressing themselves to the motion on an individual basis. The fact is, whether it was intended to be so or not, that the effect of motions to delete at this stage is to do that very thing. I therefore would be inclined again to sympathize with the right of hon. members to take advantage of Standing Order 75(5) to put down motions to delete to force the House to go to a vote at report stage. Again I say if it is the wish of the House that the procedure be changed—then change it. The duty of the Chair is to enforce it as it exists, subject to argument which I will now invite. That is my initial indication.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would agree with you on that interpretation of Standing Order 75 (5) if the word "delete" were not accompanied by the words "amend" and "insert or restore". Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that any motion to amend at report stage that would seek to amend by introducing a principle which is foreign to the bill, would not be held by Your Honour to be in order. Your Honour has just ruled a number of amendments to be out of order because it was your finding that those amendments sought to reintroduce in the bill something which was repugnant to the principle of the bill at second reading.

If that is the case with reference to amendments, surely that should be the case with reference to deletion as well. When we are speaking of deletion, if the effect of that deletion is to bring back into the bill something which is repugnant to the bill at second reading, surely that deletion ought not to be allowed in the same way.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: If there were an attempt to restore an amendment that had been defeated in committee or that had been overruled in committee on the basis that it was unacceptable as being repugnant to the principle of the bill, surely that restoration or attempted restoration could be ruled upon on the basis of its acceptability.

My argument therefore is that Your Honour ought not to be bound simply by the wording of subsection (5) of Standing Order 75. Your Honour ought not to be prevented from making a ruling on the acceptability simply because of the use of the word "delete". "Delete" itself has no absolute magic. It must be construed as a procedural word in the same way as "amend" and in the same way as "restore".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: Therefore in itself it cannot have this concept of orderliness. To my mind that is self-evident. I know Your Honour is not served by a number of precedents in this matter, but I suggest that the report stage provisions in the Standing Orders are extremely difficult. That is my first argument. I point out that if my argument is accepted, clauses 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 23 all dealing with the principle of the death penalty in the original statute which the present bill seeks to repeal seek to make amendments in principle by way of deletion and therefore ought not to be allowed on the ground that they are out of order.

● (2050)

My second point may be unnecessary, since I am persuaded of the validity of my first point. I argue, Mr. Speaker, that wide discretion is given Your Honour under Standing Order 75 relating to the report stage. There is wide discretion with respect to the moving of motions, vote to be held, and so on. That discretion ought also to be exercised in cases of evident abuse of our procedures. It has been recognized in all parliamentary proceedings that,

basically, every bill is read the first, second, and third time. In this House there is provision for reference to a committee; that provision has been included in the Standing Orders since 1969. Mr. Speaker, the report stage was not intended to duplicate the committee stage. It was introduced to prevent abuse.

Mr. Horner: You were not here when that rule was made.

Mr. Blais: I was not born when the hon. gentleman was galloping over fences, either. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the report stage was introduced to permit this House to deal with specific amendments with which members of the committee ought to have dealt, but did not. It was not instituted in order to bring a fourth reading stage into the parliamentary process.

Mr. Horner: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Blais: There are before the House motions to delete every clause of substance; they go to the principle of the bill. If Your Honour finds that that is an acceptable procedure, you will invite members of this House every time a bill is brought forward at the report stage to move motions for deleting each and every clause of a bill. In effect that procedure would reinstate the committee of the whole in this House even though the bill has already been dealt with in standing committee. That would mean that we have passed a redundant measure. Surely it cannot be said that so poor is our judgment that we have increased the redundant processes of this House, because that, I suggest, would be the effect of accepting these amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind hon. members that it is not my decision whether Standing Order 75(5) can be taken advantage of in a certain way. The Standing Orders of the House are there. It would be equally applicable to suggest that Standing Order 43, providing for the introduction of certain matters into our proceedings upon unanimous consent, was originally included in the Standing Orders so that the government might intervene in regular proceedings, with unanimous consent, if there were an emergency and, therefore, that that rule ought now to be reserved for that purpose and not used by opposition members; yet that Standing Order is used almost exclusively by opposition members. It is not for me to interpret what the intention was, only what the letter of the law is at the present moment. Therefore if a certain advantage lies with members in proposing amendments pursuant to Standing Order 75(5) I say again, if that is to be changed, it will have to be changed by the procedure committee and not by the Chair. Does the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) wish to intervene on a procedural point?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, in commenting on proposed amendments you said you would reserve judgment on the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) and hear argument on the point. I respect the good will of the hon. member for Oxford in putting forward these amendments but feel that I should make the following comments—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not wish to interrupt the Solicitor General but wonder if we might not deal with the amendments of the hon. member for Oxford, in order, when they arise.

My only concern at the moment is whether the Chair ought to entertain that series of motions which seek to delete clauses, and no other question—should the Chair decide whether they should be ruled out of order at this time—I would leave any other amendments or any procedural argument on them to the moment when those individual motions are called.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from participating in the earlier procedural arguments because they were arguments which were placed before me last night and on which I ruled as chairman of the committee. But since this argument is raised for the first time in this House, and since the situation in the House is different from that pertaining to the committee, I think it might be appropriate for me to make some brief comments.

One could dispute the interpretation that Standing Order 75(5) makes a deletion in order. But I am prepared to accept that position this evening for the purposes of argument, to underline an argument which my hon. friend has already made. No matter whether deletions themselves are in order or out of order, and that is not the question on which Your Honour must rule this evening, surely any deletion which would contravene the principle of the bill falls under the ruling which Your Honour has just given. That ruling relating to the principle of the bill surely must govern all clauses of the bill, whether the proceedings be by way of deletion or otherwise. I therefore suggest that the previous ruling covers the situation with which we are dealing and that there is no necessity to rule at all on the question of deletions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Francis Fox (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): To sum up, my intervention closely follows the one just made by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan). Standing Order 75(5) reads as follows:

(5) If, not later than twenty-four hours prior to the consideration of a report stage, written notice is given of any motion to amend, delete . . .

First, I consider the wording:

. . . of any motion to amend, . . .

On the words motion "to amend" you just ruled that not all motions "to amend" are in order but only those motions "to amend" which do not go against the principle that what has been accepted by Parliament on second reading cannot be contradicted at this stage.

Well, if that principle applies to the words "to amend" it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it must apply all the more to the word immediately following, namely the word "delete". It is obvious that certain motions "to amend" can be rejected as you just did for motions aimed at bringing back the death penalty into the bill.

It then seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the same rule of interpretation must be followed for the word "delete" which comes immediately after the words "to amend", and then only motions "to delete" which do not go against the

principle of bill itself are in order. If the principle of interpretation that you applied to the words "to amend" applies to the words "to amend" it must all the more apply to the words "to delete" because if the other interpretation were accepted that would mean that all motions "to amend" a bill would be in order in the same way as all motions "to delete" a clause.

But, once again, if you say that certain motions to amend are not in order because they go against the principle accepted on second reading, the same ruling must apply to the words "to delete" which immediately after the words "to amend" and only the motions "to delete" clauses of the bill, that is motions which do not go against the principle adopted on second reading, must be accepted.

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I listed the clauses of the bill one by one to show that each clause had a direct relation with the abolition of the death penalty and with the principle of the bill.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, you could use this same argument this evening for not having made a ruling allowing to do indirectly what you have forbidden to do directly. By your ruling, Mr. Speaker, you have ruled out amending the bill in such a way that the principle would be affected. Whether the principle is affected by amendment or simply by the deletion of a clause, the result is the same. The proof of this, Mr. Speaker, is that the amendments, the provisions, the clauses that would be deleted from the bill are clauses 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 24. I do not want to repeat everything I said this afternoon, but what I say holds for every one of the clauses that would be deleted. If you accept the deletion of clause 8, for instance, you allow section 535 of the Criminal Code, which deals with the death penalty, to remain. This creates an absurd situation.

I therefore agree completely with the two previous speakers to interpret Standing Order 75 (5) in the following way. If it has been decided that during the report stage of the bill, the bill cannot be amended in such a way as to change its principle, I do not see why the deletion of a clause from the same bill should be allowed if the results are the same.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what is important here, the principle that we want to protect is the following: It is essential not to change the principle of the bill. You have just made a ruling on this matter. We must determine by what means it cannot be changed, and I believe that it cannot be changed either by amendment, or indirectly by the delection of clauses of the bill which would keep in the Criminal Code sections which would still provide for the death penalty in certain cases.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, as I am convinced that you do not want to allow to be done indirectly what you have just ordered not to be done directly, and that you do not want to create an absurd situation, I believe that the logical and reasonable way to interpret Standing Order 75 (5) is the following: To proceed so as to insure that this rule is applied without changing the principle of the bill by amending or deleting clauses.

[Mr. Fox.]

● (2100)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have made reference to the precedent cited this afternoon by the hon. member for York-Simcoe in which a one clause bill was met with a motion to delete. I listened carefully to the arguments by the Parliament Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) and the hon. member for Drummond (Mr. Pinard) who, incidentally, made a very effective and direct presentation in contribution to the debate on the point this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I would be prepared to accede to those arguments against motions to delete were it not for the fact that Standing Order 75(5) appears to give them a sanctity that does not extend to other motions.

It may be that that provision was inserted originally because the changes in the procedures adopted along with that provision had the effect of taking the committee of the whole stage of the bill out of the House and sending it to a standing committee. Therefore the House never really pronounced itself on clause by clause votes. That provision may very well have been inserted in the Standing Orders because of the power to introduce amendments at the committee stage. That power required a counterbalancing power of the House, really for the government I suppose, to introduce motions which would delete amendments which had been added to the bill in the committee stage. That is idle speculation at this point.

What I have to determine is whether Standing Order 75(5) and the precedents, particularly the precedent cited this afternoon by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, extend to hon. members who seek the opportunity to put motions to delete at the report stage.

If I were to rule out motions to delete at this stage on arguments that have been presented, namely, that they have the effect of contravening the principle of the bill, I would face a situation here where, for example, one member has put down only one motion to delete. Other members have put down several motions to delete. If I were to take those collectively and say that their effect is to change the principle of the bill, one member who put down a motion to delete would lose that right. It seems to be going far too extensively beyond the Standing Orders to suggest that, because the effect may be in sum or in their collectivity to change the principle of the bill, every member who wants to put down a motion to delete at this stage ought to be deprived of that right. I cannot accept that.

I must say again that there is an area here of some uncertainty as to what the rights are at this stage. In my opinion that uncertainty ought to be cleared up by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. In the meantime the benefit of the doubt will be given to the member who wishes to put down a motion at the report stage.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: It would be my proposal to find procedurally acceptable all of those motions pursuant to Standing

Order 75(5) which now seek to delete clauses. I think we ought to move on to the consideration of the report stage of the bill.

One area remains. That is the precise compilation of those motions which were ruled out of order as the result of my initial ruling this evening. Motion No. 39 would clearly be ruled out of order on that basis. What I might do while the House is in discussion on the first of the motions to delete that has been accepted is perhaps examine those for a moment to see where that takes us. I might ask that a precise compilation of all those amendments which have been ruled out of order be made so that I can give it to the House before we proceed with the debate. Motion No. 1 has already been set aside. Motion No. 2 is out of order. Motion No. 3 is out of order. That brings us to Motion No. 4 standing in the name of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). That again opens up a procedural argument to which the Solicitor General has indicated he wants to address himself. First, I will hear the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) on a point of order.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to withdraw two amendments standing in my name which for purposes of brevity I will refer to as motion No. 16 and motion No. 20. They are both dependent, I believe, on other motions that Your Honour has ruled out of order.

Will you please note, Sir, that I am not withdrawing Motion No. 40, which you indicated perhaps I would, because if the deletion clauses in relation to the treason and piracy sections remain, there is certainly room for an amendment in respect of the commutation of the life sentence.

I would similarly point out that Your Honour ruled out of order my motion No. 35, relating to the method of carrying out the death penalty. There again, if both the piracy and treason sections remain as a result of the deletion motions before you, I respectfully suggest that motion ought to stay in at least until that point in time.

Mr. Speaker: The last point of order raised by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham is well taken. To put it more clearly, while the motion of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) remains in question, and I have not made any determination procedurally, motion No. 35, which would seek to redefine the method by which people would be put to death, ought to remain. I am sure the House will accede to the suggestion of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham that motions Nos. 16 and 20 now be withdrawn. Motions Nos. 35 and 40 will remain for further discussion, as the case may be.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Your Honour could indicate at what point you may be exercising your right under Standing Order 75(10) which gives you the authority to combine certain motions, some for purposes of debate, some for purposes of voting. It seems that in view of Your Honour's ruling, which I have to think was procedurally correct, that the motions to delete are in order, maybe some consideration might be given to the possibility that in a number of cases they are related and might be combined for purposes of debate and for purposes of voting. I just wonder whether Your Honour is yet ready to do that or whether you may be in a position to do that tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am faced with a procedural argument in respect to the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Oxford. I propose to deal with that and see where that leaves us. After that, possibly we could get into some discussion with regard to the grouping of those motions which remain.

● (2110)

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the motions proposed by the hon. member for Oxford. I respect the spirit in which he has put them forward. These are motions 4, 9, and 38. In Motion No. 4 he says a person shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life or, if the convicted person so chooses, shall be sentenced to death. Then in Motion No. 38 he says:

> The sentence to be pronounced against a person who is sentenced to death shall not be that he shall be hanged by the neck until dead but shall be in conformity with any humane method of execution as the Governor in Council may establish by regulation.

In accordance with this amendment responsibility for the execution still rests with the state. The state would have to carry out the execution of the convicted person should he wish to be executed. In other words, the hon. member is not suggesting that the convicted person be allowed to commit suicide—I shall not comment on that aspect—but he is suggesting the state should execute that person should he wish to be executed.

I submit that such an amendment contradicts the principle of the bill, which is the abolition of the death penalty by the state. Were it adopted, the state would still have to maintain the whole apparatus for public execution whether the method were by injection or the administering of a pill, or by any other means. The state would have to maintain an executioner and draw up rules and regulations to cover public executions. I submit that this amendment, which places a burden on the state to carry out an execution, should a convicted person demand that he be executed, is in contradiction to the principle of the bill which is that we abolish the death penalty in Canada for all crimes.

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, may I first thank you for recognizing that these three amendments and the consequential amendment involve a different approach to this question and that they deserve consideration. Your Honour has ruled that the primary principle of this bill is the abolition of capital punishment, but inherent in that philosophy is the idea that the state imposes the decision. The Solicitor General takes offence because the state is called upon to carry out a decision made by the convicted person. In my view, as an abolitionist, the heinous part of putting a person to death is not the actual carrying out of the death sentence but making the decision that he should be put to death. I would hate to do that. It is probable that only a very few cases which will come before the courts—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is naturally tempted to speak in support of his own motion. My concern is whether or not the motion is procedurally acceptable. If there are others who wish to address themselves to the

procedural point I will hear them. Otherwise I will conclude that the basic principle the Chair ought to follow is that the right of members to put motions before the House ought to be interpreted in favour of those who want to put such motions forward.

I have already ruled a number of amendments to be out of order because there is a clear precedent that motions which offend the principle of a bill after the House has pronounced itself on that principle on second reading are out of order. I have said that the principle of the bill is the abolition of capital punishment. Do the motions put forward by the hon. member for Oxford impose capital punishment when the House has decided in principle against it? I would have to say, no.

There may be many arguments on the merits, but that is another question. I have to decide whether the motions offend the principle of the bill, and because they vest in the convicted person the option to ask the state that he or she be put to death it seems to me that the principle that the state does not impose capital punishment of its own will is not offended, and therefore I have to conclude that the amendments in the name of the hon. member for Oxford are procedurally regular.

These are motions Nos. 4, 9 and 38, I believe—I want to be sure that those are the only three motions to which he has addressed himself. I believe that motion No. 38 is consequential.

An hon. Member: Motion No. 18.

Mr. Speaker: So there are four in all. It is certain we have now brought ourselves to the threshold of motion No. 4, which obviously must be grouped with motions Nos. 9, 18 and 38. All those motions should be grouped and voted on together. If the House is prepared to turn to the discussion of motions Nos. 4, 9, 18 and 38, they could be considered. That would give the Chair the opportunity to give some thought to the grouping of the remaining amendments.

Mr. Benjamin: On a point of order, I appreciate Your Honour's ruling but on looking over motion No. 4 and the subsequent motions proposed by the hon. member for Oxford I have difficulty in understanding how that motion does not contravene the principle of the bill since in the last line it contains the words "shall be sentenced to death". Even if a person chooses—

Mr. Speaker: Those may be arguments upon the merits. The fact is that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Oxford contains the words "if the person so chooses" and this appears to avoid a course contrary to the principle of the bill. It seems to me that the principle of the bill is not offended when the thrust of the amendment is that the person himself should have the option. I have so ruled, and the discussion on that matter is concluded.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When Your Honour grouped motions 4, 9, 18 and 38 did you group them both for debate and voting purposes?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. All are founded on the same basic principle and they should therefore be grouped together for discussion and dealt with in one vote. The hon. member for Oxford.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I again commend you on your decision. I wish to preface my remarks by saying that for a long time I have been an abolitionist and that I still am. I do not want to be misunderstood. In the second place I want to acknowledge the fact that parliament has a responsibility to protect the citizens of this country. Because of this, I feel this motion must be introduced this evening. The third—

● (2120)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I should take this opportunity, while the hon. member is referring to the introduction of his motion to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the motions of the hon. member have not been really been put. Perhaps I should put them at this time and then let the hon. member complete his speech.

The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) moves:

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 37 to 45 at page 2 and lines 1 to 17 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life or, if the convicted person so chooses, shall be sentenced to death.".

Motion No. 9.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 23 to 24 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"able offence and shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life, or if the convicted person so chooses, shall be sentenced to death.".

Motion No. 18.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in Clause 5 by striking out lines 34 to 38 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"guilty of an indictable offence and shall,

(a) for a first offence, be sentenced to imprisonment for life, and

(b) for a second offence, be sentenced to imprisonment for life or, if the convicted person so chooses, be sentenced to death.".

Motion No. 38.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in Clause 21 by adding, immediately after line 43 at page 8 the following new subsection:

"(2) The sentence to be pronounced against a person who is sentenced to death shall not be that he be hanged by the neck until dead but shall be in conformity with any humane method of execution as the Governor in Council may establish by regulation."

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, you have now put us on the right legal track so that the rest of the discussion will be in order. I was referring to the fact that my theory behind these four amendments is based on the recognition of several basic premises. The first is that I am an abolitionist; I favour the abolition of capital punishment. Secondly, parliament has a responsibility to protect Canadian citizens, and I feel that this bill fails to do this in certain respects.

The third point I want to make is that it is claimed by many people that absolute life imprisonment, that is, imprisonment for the remaining days of one's life, is indeed worse than death. I am not here to judge whether or not that is so, but I am prepared to accept that that might

be true. If it is true I feel that most citizens in this country, and certainly I, would like to see the most humane punishment possible instituted, and some provision should be made for a person to choose a death sentence if that is his wish.

There is a fourth point which also involves a basic premise that I feel needs to be considered by members of the House. The laws of this country should reflect the same degree of compassion and consideration for the families of the victims of murders as for the criminals themselves. There is a feeling in this country today that we in parliament appear to have more concern for the welfare of criminals than for the welfare of their victims or their victims' families. On that basis I feel the amendments serve the purpose of recognizing these four tenets or premises.

I should say at the outset that as Canadians we have always felt that to be humane was one of our cardinal rules for life in society in Canada. Neither do we want to submit prisoners to any unnecessary cruelties. We in Canada also want to protect the public against any unneccessary hazard or risk that could fall their way.

I submit that Bill C-84 fails in several respects to meet these basic needs of the Canadian people. I sense this from talking to many constituents in my riding. During the last few weeks many have spoken to me and are very disappointed at the stand I took on capital punishment. I have stood very firm, explaining to them that I have a strong and intense inner feeling that it is wrong for the state to order the taking of a person's life. Many of my constituents respect my view even though they do not agree with it. But those same constituents are very quick to point out that we in parliament do not seem to be giving enough attention to the protection of society; hence one reason for these amendments. If I can elaborate on this point, Mr. Speaker, amendments Nos. 4, 9, 18 and 38 do exactly that.

What I am trying to do by way of these four amendments is to put some teeth into Bill C-84 in order to protect society against a few criminals. I would be the first to admit that everybody in society can make a mistake once, and I would be the first to give that recognition even to a person who commits first or second degree murder. I feel that such a person may be able to mend his ways with appropriate help, and that this is a sound approach to take.

On the other hand I have an entirely different feeling toward those people who have been given a second chance yet commit the same or a similar offence a second time, whether it be first degree or second degree murder. I have then very little sympathy for them. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I feel that such people have proven not only to themselves but to the citizens of this country, and to us as parliamentarians, that they are unable to learn a lesson. I think that society deserves to be protected against the sort of person in society who cannot learn a lesson. There is no provision in Bill C-84 as presently worded to correct this situation. I submit that by providing that such people spend the rest of their days in prison, this is the best way to protect society against a repeat performance on the part of someone who has already shown he will not learn a lesson. That is one of the main reasons that I feel motion No. 18 is essential.

In addition to that, I abhor the idea of the state taking the decision to invoke capital punishment. I feel that such action is inhumane. It is not the actual carrying out of the death penalty because there are other ways that are not inhumane at all. But the decision on the part of the state to take somebody's life is, in my view, unacceptable.

On the other hand I have practised medicine long enough to see plenty of cases of people who cannot tolerate any prolongation of their lives, and one cannot help but have sympathy for them when they are successful in taking their own lives in one way or another. We as physicians, all have inbred and inculcated into us the desire always to save lives, and that is what we do. There is an inner feeling that I certainly have as a physician, that when a person has tried several times, yet because of the failure or the inability of medical science to help them, the kindest thing is to have sympathy for that person when he is eventually successful. It is because of this that I feel some of these criminals are virtually in that state of mind and personally want to commit suicide. They are deranged people or they probably would not be attempting suicide. Out of kindness, compassion and humaneness we should at least provide them with the option if they wish no longer to continue living that kind of life in prison for the rest of their days.

● (2130)

Many people have said it is worse to be in prison for the rest of one's life than it is to be dead. I am not in a position to argue that one way or the other. I do not know the answer, but I am prepared to accept the fact that for some people it may well be true.

I should like to see this bill make provision that if an individual wishes to be relieved of his suffering in this world he can indeed be relieved of that suffering in a humane way. Of course that is the purpose of my final motion, No. 38, which is consequential on the other three. I have suggested that these three amendments are quite similar. I want to go on in a bit of detail about the fact that we have to consider a repeat murderer in order to protect society against further repetition.

Let me refer briefly to the other two amendments which deal with acts of piracy and high treason. Perhaps others would like to add to that list such things as kidnapping with force and so on. I was interested last night in the committee hearing on this bill. When I put this same proposal to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) he made one point that I thought was very significant. It was a point I had not been aware of, and not being in possession of the minutes of that meeting I will essentially have to paraphrase what the minister said, and I certainly will accept correction if what I suggest is wrong.

The minister took as an example those people who commit the act of piracy and intimated that studies had shown that these people seem to have some derangement of mind making them unamenable to the point that they cannot accept any type of deterrent. I would be the first to agree with the Solicitor General that this is probably true. There are those few people who are deranged mentally in a way that we do not really understand fully in a medical-scientific way. They have the emotional drive to commit some act of piracy, or some similar act which is abhorrent to society. There is no effective type of deterrent, even

capital punishment, which will dissuade them from their goal.

This being the case, I suggest the Solicitor General has played along nicely with my argument. There is only one treatment for that kind of criminal, particularly if you hold the stance of an abolitionist, and that is that the person must be removed from society for the balance of his days. If there is no possible deterrent, then in no way should that man or woman ever be allowed out in society again, particularly if we cannot change the personality of that individual to preclude the possibility of the individual commiting the same act again.

I submit that the only thing we can do is amend this bill to provide that those very few individuals, who admittedly are deranged, and who admittedly we cannot help at this present stage of our knowledge, be put in some type of institution for the balance of their days, purely for the protection of society. This is one of the issues my constituents are very upset about, and I think many of them are more upset about it than about the fact that according to my principles I am an abolitionist.

If we are going to show the kind of humanity and compassion I think all Canadians want to show, we have to give that poor criminal, that man who cannot be helped, the alternative of being allowed out of his suffering, whether we look upon his suffering as being free in society with the temptation to commit these acts of piracy or high treason and so on, or the suffering he will have to endure for the balance of his days in prison. Whichever it is, in a sense of compassion and humanity we ought to make the provision that such an individual may decide, not the state, that the kindest thing for him is to be out of circulation as a living being on this earth. We as a parliament here should make that provision for those few people.

I made reference to the fact that this applies to those who are convicted of piracy. I would want to include in that, as one of my three amendments does, those who are convicted of high treason. I realize that high treason has never been the subject matter of a charge laid here in Canada for dear knows how many years. However, the mere fact that the government has seen fit to include this in Bill C-84 suggests that it should also be included in the amendment to make it fairly complete. I intimated a few minutes ago that undoubtedly hon. members could cite other examples which might well be added to the list. I would welcome those suggestions from other speakers.

Let me reply to the comments made by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). I appreciate the fact that he finds some difficulty in accepting the amendments as they are written. I confess that these were not written by myself. Not being a lawyer it was my feeling I could not do this well, and I had some help at the last minute this morning. As a matter of fact these were turned in to Mr. Speaker about four minutes to 12. I was not completely satisfied with them. I anticipated exactly the question the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre raised with Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member suggested that it looked almost as though the wording suggested we will sentence these poor criminals to death. Of course that is not the intent. The effect is that the individual would be allowed to make the choice, and this would negate the argument of the hon.

[Mr. Halliday.]

member for Regina-Lake Centre. Nonetheless, I would certainly welcome any amendment or changes to the wording of these three basic amendments which would clarify that point.

I am the last one to want any suggestion in my amendments that the state will in any way impose capital punishment on these poor criminals. I want to make it very clear that my intent is that we must leave it up to the criminal, and if he so chooses the state will oblige him. That is my intent. I hope the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre appreciates that. I have made the suggestion in all sincerity, and I am sure his questioning of the wording of my amendment was done in all sincerity. I do not want to leave the impression that the state will in any way whatsoever invoke capital punishment.

It remains for me to comment on my last amendment, No. 38, which in fact is really a reassertion of my feelings, and I think the feelings of almost all the members of this House and of many Canadians who are in favour of capital punishment. If we need capital punishment there are more humane ways of carrying this out than by hanging. I am sure all hon. members realize there are painless ways which involve no suffering whatsoever. Perhaps the most effective would be the intravenous injection of a prescribed drug. Some have mentioned gas, and so on. I am willing to accept any suggestion in this regard. As my amendment suggests, this would be left to the discretion of the governor in council by regulation. I am prepared to leave this to the wisdom of the government.

Before I close I want to allude briefly to something which is not in this bill, but something on which I would dearly love to comment. I dare say it cannot be included for some technical reason. In fact it is the point I made reference to at the beginning of my comments. We must have something in the laws of this land that will allow for better provision or compensation for the families of those who are the victims of murder. We raised this point again last night in the committee. The Solicitor General did not have figures at hand at the time but took upon himself—and I thank him for it—to provide us later in the day with the best figures he had available on short notice in respect of this particular matter.

● (2140)

The information is that there is in fact a cost-sharing agreement between the federal government and the provinces of Canada whereby a certain sum of money is provided as compensation for the families of victims. I think it is desirable that we have this type of compensation. However, may I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House that if a citizen of Canada is working as a miner or as a logger and is somehow killed in the course of his work, society looks after his family much more effectively than it does now the family of a person who is unfortunate enough to be the victim of a murder. It seems to me that under the workmen's compensation provisions and so on, society adequately looks after the families of persons involved in that type of death, but for some strange reason which I cannot quite comprehend we seem to accept little if any responsibility for the families of victims of murder. This is incomprehensible to me.

I submit that it would be very difficult for me to vote for this particular bill if I do not see some real attempt on the part of the government to show that it does in fact care about the families of these victims. There is no such indication. I should like to quote the figures which the Solicitor General supplied. In the year 1974-75 I believe there were approximately 1,000 instances in which compensation was paid out in respect of some type of crime. The amount of the compensation paid by both levels of government amounted to approximately $2,300,000 in respect of approximately 1,000 cases. That represents about $2,300 per case. The Solicitor General was unable to provide us with more specific figures. Although I am subject to correction, I suspect that in fact we do not compensate the families of the victims of murder adequately. These figures seem to suggest that.

Surely the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) should be in a position, if he hopes to get some of the abolitionists in this House to support his bill, to give us some assurance that in actual fact the government does care about the families of the victims of murder. It would seem to me that the government has shown little concern for these families.

I shall summarize by saying that I am an abolitionist. I voted for this bill on second reading because as a new member of this House I was under the impression that second reading meant approval of the bill in principle. I am the first to agree that I do approve of this bill in principle. I approve of the abolition of capital punishment. I also approve, however, of the complete protection of society against repeaters of murder, people who would be intent on piracy and people who would be intent, if it should happen, on high treason. I submit that the government by way of Bill C-84 has made no effort to assure the people of Canada that it is concerned about this and does not want people to go on committing murder after murder after murder. I acknowledge that this does not happen often. I know there have been only two or three cases in a period of several years.

I refuse to accept the fact that a person who is unable to learn from having committed a heinous crime should be allowed, because of the very generous terms of the law, to be paroled after 15 years. If such a person is unwilling or unable to learn after committing a second crime, then there is a problem in respect of protecting society. I believe the government must give some assurance that it does care about the people in Canada who deserve protection against the worst offenders, those who go on committing murder after murder. As I say, I admit that there are only a few such cases. All of our constituents are upset about such cases. They keep bringing these cases to our attention and suggest that we are not concerned about protecting the average citizen of Canada when we let such people out again.

Although it might seem inappropriate, I should like to commend the government on the principle of the bill. However, I have grave doubt about the way I will vote on third reading because now we are in a different ball game. It is not a vote on principle. I am concerned about the provisions in this bill. I must reconsider my first vote because I do not believe the government is concerned about these two crucial matters; first, the protection of society against repeaters of murder and, second, the question concerning when the government will tell the Canadian people that it does care about the families of those who have suffered because of unwarranted murder in this land.

I would close by saying I hope we can hear from either or both the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice. I notice both ministers are here tonight. I hope we can hear from one or both of them that they do care about Canadians, that they do care about these two issues, and are willing to close the loopholes which presently exist. I think this bill is a disgrace to this parliament if it should pass as it is. Thank you.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would accept a question?

Mr. Halliday: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Beatty: I appreciate having the opportunity to ask a question of the hon. member. I share many of the concerns he has expressed. I appreciate that this is a very difficult decision for him to make. One of the bases on which the hon. member defended his proposal tonight in respect of in essence giving convicted murderers an option to commit suicide or receive a death sentence was that this would act as a deterrent against a second offence. Could the hon. member tell the House how in his mind he feels this would provide an additional deterrent because a person who is convicted for the first time of a murder and sentenced to life imprisonment, and in fact preferred to be killed, could only get that option by committing a second offence?

The other question is in respect of the euthanasia aspect of what he proposes. I think it is correct to paraphrase what he meant by referring to it as mercy killing. Would the hon. member indicate whether he would also propose in the case of the chronically ill and people in great pain that this be extended to them as well?

Mr. Halliday: I appreciate these questions from the hon. member. I think perhaps he has misunderstood me a little, or perhaps I have misunderstood his question. Obviously my amendment in no way would preclude, or is unlikely to preclude, a person committing a second murder. Being an abolitionist I am prepared to go along with the government in respect of first degree murder or second degree murder, but what happens then if someone at some stage, whether on parole or after release, commits another murder? To me there is no protection for society. What we must do then is see that they are in jail for the remainder of their lives.

The hon. member asked about euthanasia. According to my understanding this is not euthanasia. What I am proposing could be referred to as legalized suicide, but it is not euthanasia. Euthanasia is where society decides that another person should be put to death, for whatever reason. In other words the primary move is by society. It may be by a physician, but the physician represents society.

● (2150)

In this instance this is not euthanasia, it is more like legalized suicide when the state countenances suicide. But normally the state does not countenance any kind of suicide. As I explained in my earlier remarks, there are indeed a few instances of people trying suicide on repeated occa-

sions, and it becomes obvious to thoose involved in their care that the kindest thing for those people would be if they could only be successful. So my answer in short is that I am not talking about any kind of euthanasia but rather about legalized suicide.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a few brief words about these motions. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) proposes that for high treason, piracy, and for second murders there should be either a life sentence or an opportunity to be executed, which would be the choice of the person convicted of these three offences. In his amendment No. 38 he sets out the way in which the death sentence would be carried out.

He said he did not draft the amendments himself, and perhaps that is the reason for some of the loopholes in them. He says he put forward these amendments for humane reasons, because he feels that for certain offences a person should have the choice of either being put to death or being imprisoned for life. But what I think has been overlooked is that in the present bill a person, for the crime of treason, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life and would be eligible for parole in 25 years, and perhaps in 15 years if a jury agreed that his parole eligibility date should be shortened. So he would be sentenced to imprisonment for life subject to the minimum parole eligibility date.

With respect to piracy, when we discussed this in the committee last night the hon. member referred to the hijacking of aircraft. I made some comments with respect to people who are suicidal and had martyr complexes. A study was made with respect to aircraft hijackers in recent years—people who hijacked aircraft to Cuba, Algeria, and so on. The mistake he made was that his amendment was with respect to section 75 in the Criminal Code which deals with the piracy of ships. That section is a very old section in the Criminal Code and the death penalty still applied to piracy of ships. The sections relating to hijacking of aircraft provide a maximum life sentence, not a minimum life sentence. So in fact what he is doing is to say that for piracy we should have, instead of the death penalty, imprisonment for life, which, by the way, would be subject to parole in ten years, but the hon. member says that person should have the choice of being executed, if he wishes.

The third type of offence is a second murder. That is a difficult case. There are other amendments here also dealing with second murders. All I can say is that this is a very rare occurrence. In Canadian history we had only five examples of this. One of the five examples was of the second murder having being committed in the United States after the individual escaped from a Canadian prison.

The second one of these examples is of an inmate who killed another inmate who was his accomplice in the murder that brought them both to prison. In other words, these two individuals committed a murder and, when they were sentenced to prison for life, one of the individuals killed his accomplice.

The other three cases are of individuals who committed second murders, and in one of these cases an individual

was hanged in the early forties. So it is a rare occurrence. I am an abolitionist and I believe that the answer in case of second murders is a better security system in our prisons and a better parole system.

With respect to the principle in the hon. member's proposal, I do not question his sincerity but I feel that the very fact he says "execute these people" makes it a type of suicide. If you read his amendment No.38, it is the state that must do the execution once the convicted person decides he wishes to be executed rather than serve his sentence. This means that the state must provide all the apparatus for the execution—have an executioner available, and so on, and deliberately execute the individual even though he has agreed to it. It seems to me to be a cold blooded ritual and I would prefer that we do not accept that type of procedure.

The hon. member has made some other points with which I agree. He says that we should show concern for the victim. I have stated repeatedly that my first concern is for victims, or to ensure lack of victims. My first goal as Solicitor General is to do everything possible to prevent crime and to reduce the number of victims.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: Of course our programs for crime prevention and crime reduction are not in Bill C-84; they are found in many other bills. For example, Bill C-83 is directed to crime prevention. Bill C-71, passed by the House in January, was directed to crime prevention. When we submitted our estimates to the House for this department we provided an increase in the estimates for the RCMP, which is law enforcement and crime prevention. We were dealing with the protection of the public. There are many programs geared to crime prevention and public protection, but they are not in Bill C-84.

With respect to the compensation of victims of crime, we have a program now covering this. That program is under the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). Under the program he cost shares with the provinces in their provincial programs in that area. I believe that he has agreements with all provinces in Canada. Terms of those programs differ from province to province.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the minister but it is close to ten o'clock.

I said earlier that I would give to the House a precise compilation of amendments considered up to now. Three motions have been withdrawn: Motions Nos. 1, 16 and 20. The following motions have been ruled out of order: Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 39. Therefore remaining for consideration are the four that have been grouped for debate standing in the name of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), namely, motions Nos. 4, 9, 18 and 38. In addition to those are motions Nos. 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21 to 37 inclusive, and 40 to 46 inclusive.

● (2200)

In respect of the grouping of these motions perhaps House leaders might agree that the Chair should attempt to put forward suggested groupings of amendments tomorrow morning, which would only form the basis of discussion. The Chair would try to get these suggestions into

writing and into the hands of House leaders and into caucus before noon tomorrow. By three o'clock tomorrow when the order is called there could be comment on these groupings, and then we would resume discussion on the four motions before the House at the present time.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS—REQUEST THAT ENGLISH AND WABIGOON RIVERS BE DECLARED WATER QUALITY CONTROLLED ZONES

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to raise this issue on the adjournment debate because of a question I put to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) earlier today concerning the mercury poisoning in the English and Wabigoon river systems in northwestern Ontario. I was not satisfied with the answer I received. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) was also involved in some of the questions I asked earlier today and I thought his attitude typified the attitude of the federal government when he disputed the finding of the mercury poisoning specialist, Dr. Newberry, that the first case of the dreaded Minamata disease had been diagnosed in northwestern Ontario.

The attitude of the federal government in this whole matter of mercury poisoning has been one of extreme caution. Ministers will not take effective initiatives until in their own minds absolute proof is there that we have mercury poisoning among the inhabitants of these Indian reserves.

I submit the proof is staring the government in the face. The symptoms of Minamata disease and of mercury poisoning—that is to say, numbness of the limbs and lips, slurred speech, tunnel vision, difficulty in walking and co-ordination, and in extreme cases fits and ultimately death, are there and have been documented.

I fail to see how the federal government can persist in denying there is a problem with Minamata disease in light of the expert testimony of visiting Japanese doctors who are familiar with the problem, and of this most recent diagnosis by Dr. Newberry.

The attitude of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of the Environment astounds me. It is as if they want a victim from Grassy Narrows—as if they want someone to die first so that they can have an autopsy and conclude with absolute certainty that the person died of Minamata disease. This is little consolation to the victim, Mr. Speaker.

We are facing disaster in the English and Wabigoon river system yet the government persistently refuses to take effective action. It has done so little, which in my opinion is more despicable in the face of the evidence gathered

over the world, especially from Japan and Sweden, on the symptoms and lessons of the causes of mercury poisoning. No effective action has been taken. That is why I asked the Minister of the Environment to acknowledge federal responsibility in this matter and to exert some kind of leadership.

The provincial government of Ontario has a history of ineptitude and procrastination in dealing with mercury poisoning. In 1975 the province of Manitoba tried to sue the polluter of the river system but the supreme court ruled that because it was an interprovincial waterway, Manitoba had no jurisdiction. Therefore I suggest that it is clear that this mercury pollution comes under federal jurisdiction. We are dealing with an interprovincial waterway, and no longer can the federal government say that it is a provincial matter and pass the buck in this fashion. We have heard that only the federal government can take effective action and provide leadership.

What has the federal government, especially the federal Ministry of the Environment, done? May I quote from the submission prepared by the National Indian Brotherhood for the research directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare? I quote:

> On November 24, 1971, Minister of the Federal Environment set chlor-alkali mercury effluent standards. On March 26, 1970, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment issued a control order under section 50 of the OWRC Act re: Dryden Chemicals Ltd., stating that no mercury-contaminated brine is to be discharged to the environment under any circumstances . . .
>
> According to EPS of Environment Canada, no independent cross-check of effluent data (collected and analysed by the company and sent to the Ontario and then to the federal government) has been done.
>
> Therefore, on April 13, 1975, NIB sampled the effluent of Dryden and McMaster University analysed this sample twice giving values of 15.0 and 17.5 ppb mercury. NIB calculations based on company data for flow rates yielded a daily discharge of 7.46 pounds of mercury which is in great excess of the federal regulations of .005 pounds of mercury per ton of Cl^{o} per day.

We have seen in the past that the federal standards have not been lived up to by the company, yet the federal government has taken no effective action. I submit the Minister of the Environment has authority under the water management legislation to declare the English-Wabigoon river system a water control management area. Section 9 of the act says that in the case of any waters other than federal waters the water quality management of which becomes a matter of urgent national concern, the minister may set up water quality zones. If the incidence of mercury poisoning is not a matter of urgent national concern, I do not know what is.

The act is wide in scope, allowing the minister to set up water control areas, to design, construct and operate water treatment facilities, to collect charges from the company for the maintenance of waste treatment facilities, to monitor on an ongoing basis waste discharged into the river system, and to do such other things as are necessary to achieve effective water quality management in those waters.

The minister says that he is discussing in a broad sense this problem with the provinces. I ask if he will undertake, after discussion, to take action under the terms of the Canada water management legislation to resolve this crisis which ought not to be allowed to continue.

Adjournment Debate

I note that the government moved speedily to clean up environmental pollution at Port Hope resulting from radioactive waste.

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

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the particular chlor-alkali plant which was the major contributor to mercury contamination of the English-Wabagoon river system converted from mercury cells to membrane cells, terminating the use of mercury completely in October, 1975. Thus there will be no further mercury added to the system from that source.

In March, 1972, Environment Canada issued the chlor-alkali mercury effluent regulations under the Fisheries Act, limiting the quantity of mercury that could be discharged to receiving waters from these plants. Since then all the chlor-alkali plants have reported daily figures of their mercury discharges to liquid effluents as well as their purchases of mercury for any use. These records indicate that direct discharges of mercury to receiving waters, including the Dryden plant, have been reduced to a level of only about 1 per cent of that discharged prior to the discovery of the problem.

The whole process has now been changed in the Dryden plant. Unfortunately the vast amounts of mercury discharged to the environment in the past are now contained in bottom sediments from which they will continue to find their way into the food chain.

We have an estimate of approximately $350 million to dredge and dispose of the contaminated river sediments; however, physical removal of contaminated river and lake sediments may cause more release of mercury due to disturbance than would occur from the undisturbed sediments. On the basis of analyses over several years it now appears that the problem is decreasing year by year. However, estimates of time for complete self-recovery of the English-Wabagoon river system can be placed at 20 to 30 years.

We are actively continuing a policy of collaboration with provincial governments. As suggested by the hon. member, the Canada Water Act is one of the available strategies. However, that act is not normally used to deal with this type of problem and is not considered appropriate in this case.

● (2210)

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—EXTENSION OF COVERAGE TO ISOLATED AREAS—REASON FOR DELAY

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, the question I directed to the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner), who is responsible for the CBC, concerns the inefficiency and not upholding a promise to extend television coverage to remote areas of Canada.

I have been raising this matter for eight years. All I have received are tales of woe and excuses. If a CBC producer would look into my files, he would find the greatest story that could be told. It would not cost a cent for this story that could run for 13 weeks on television. It concerns the extension of television coverage to citizens in remote areas of Newfoundland. These people are Canadian citizens. They listened to promises when they came into Canada. They heard about the good things Canada offers all its citizens.

[Mr. Symes.]

After reading the speech by the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé), I was prompted to direct this question to the Secretary of State. It is hypocritical the way she agrees with everything I say. I am sure the parliamentary secretary will also agree because she lives in a rural area.

The minister indicated in her speech that the CBC signals can be made available to communities in the North Atlantic and that, as funds become available, and provided the people want it, there is no reason why any of these small remote communities should lack CBC radio and television. However, all I get from those concerned in the CBC are tales of woe.

In the 1974-75 annual report one of the excuses they give is a shortage in Canada of engineers and technicians specializing in broadcast transmission. If that is the case, why could a small satellite not be put up which would extend television coverage to northern Newfoundland? People in five small communities there have been waiting for years to get this public service which they deserve. They are denied this because of a lack of efficiency on the part of the CBC. I realize the problems they have, financial and otherwise. I can tell the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Baker) that the fishermen in northern Newfoundland know how to bring television coverage to that area, but no one will listen to them.

I repeat that I have been raising this matter for eight years. In have tried to be reasonable. I can only come to the conclusion that, as usual, we in Newfoundland are low on the priority scale. I hope the parliamentary secretary will have an answer.

I have one other grievance. I warned the minister about ten days ago that I would be asking him this question. However, the only answer I received the other day was that he would get a detailed reply for me. I hope the parliamentary secretary will have that answer and be able to give me a date, not in 1978, but within the next few months. I hope the CBC engineers will get off their fannies and realize that those in northern Newfoundland are also Canadians and are entitled to television coverage.

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, priorities in the implementation of the accelerated coverage plan are based on criteria which take into account population, isolation, geographic equalization across the country, engineering considerations, cost and operating factors.

As will be appreciated, the 600 engineering projects in the plan must be carried out on a tight logistical schedule, with the above priorities set on a national basis, using a formula considered to be as equitable as the CBC can make it. The CBC understands the wish of individual communities to receive service as quickly as possible, but the sheer size of the total project, and its attendant requirements for staff and the manufacture of the necessary equipment, must dictate the speed at which the plan can proceed.

As of June 16, 1976, the CBC had applied to the CRTC for 156 radio and television projects across this country. Of these, 103 have been approved and 40 are now on air.

With respect to the hon. member's constituency I would refer him, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the letters dated June 18 and March 29 which he presumably received from the Corporation and which indicated that the CBC expected to submit applications to the CRTC in late 1976 for those projects in his riding. It will be noted that this is a slight improvement over the time of application of early 1977 as was first indicated in a letter to the hon. member on November 20, 1975.

I should also like to say that I will bring the capabilities of the fishermen in the hon. member's constituency to the attention of the CBC. I am sure they will be interested.

FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING CORPORATION—ALLEGED FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH PROVISIONS OF ACT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I regret two things. First, I regret I should find it necessary to be here tonight. This is the third time this session on which I have had occasion to speak of matters relating to inland fisheries and the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. I regret, too, that this is the third occasion on which the Minister of State for Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) has not been present in the House to articulate his stand with reference to the matters I raised during the question period. I am making no reflection on the parliamentary secretary but he is no substitute for the minister, who ought to be a fully-fledged minister to begin with. But in whatever state we find the minister of fisheries, he ought to be here. I hope the parliamentary secretary will take my words tonight and underline them and convey them to his minister tomorrow, because the next time I do battle in this Chamber I expect to do battle with the minister, not with his lieutenant, good as that lieutenant may be.

My question to the minister was this:

> Mr. Speaker, my question . . . has to do with the matter I have brought to his attention on several occasions in this House. It has to do with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act, Part III, section 23(2). Could the minister now tell the House whether he has consulted the Solicitor General and whether the Solicitor General will proceed with charges because of the obvious violation of the law with reference to that section of the act?

This was the minister's non-answer:

> Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into the file to see what point this matter has reached.

After months and months of evasion he is finally going to look into the file. He did that. He did not offer a satisfactory explanation though, because again I had to raise the question. On June 14, as reported in *Hansard* at page 14452, in answer to a similar question, the minister stated:

> Mr. Speaker, I have consulted the legal advisors of the Fisheries and Marine Service, and their answer leads me to believe that the hon. member is either misinformed or is trying to distort the function of the corporation.

In all my dealings in this House I have never attributed to the minister anything but the most honourable intention, yet here the Minister of State for Fisheries is accusing me of intending to distort the functions of the corporation.

● (2220)

I wish to state in this House that I have neither publicly nor in this Chamber ever intended to distort what are the functions of the corporation. I wish to point out to the parliamentary secretary, in the absence of the minister, that the original concept of the agreement that was signed on June 4, 1969, was that the purpose of the corporation was to establish a single desk marketing agency for the purpose of selling freshwater fish. That is all I have ever said was its function. Is that the distortion of the purposes of the corporation to which the minister refers?

I have on numerous occasions asked the minister to initiate a cost-price analysis by species per pound of the cost of processing by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. The parliamentary secretary has assured me privately that this will happen. There were to be great plans. He was going to call a special meeting of the fisheries committee of this House and direct the officials of the corporation to attend to answer any and all questions put to them by myself or the representatives of the Lake Winnipeg Fishermen's Association or any other association that wanted to be represented.

I got home that night elated, Mr. Speaker. I phoned the fishermen in Manitoba, and they said it was great news. It was great news because, let me emphasize, that the money of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation is fishermen's money, not tax money. The corporation runs and functions as a co-operative. Any capital investment and interest on original capital investment are fishermen's money, not tax money, not government money. Surely the fishermen have a right to know what it costs to process fish. Is that the distortion to which the minister refers? I want the parliamentary secretary to stand in his place tonight and to tell me whether or not that promise of a special committee will be carried out, when, and what will be the terms of reference. I have not heard one peep from the minister yet in this regard.

Lastly, section 23(2) in Part III of the act passed by this House of Commons in 1969 clearly provides—and there is no difference of opinion among the legal advisers—that the price offered by the corporation to the fishermen must be decided on by the fishermen, in agreement with them. It is not to be decided dictatorially by the corporation; there has to be agreement with the fishermen as to price.

I ask this question of the minister: will he direct the corporation to follow the law? Is this what the minister means by saying I am distorting the purposes of the corporation or I am distorting the law? The law is clear. Will the minister or will he not direct the corporation to adhere to the laws of the land as passed by the House of Commons?

In conclusion, if I have inadvertently or otherwise attempted to distort either the function of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation or any of its activities, either collectively on the part of the corporation, or individually on the part of any officer thereof, I stand corrected and I apologize to all concerned, and I stand to learn. But if after close analysis it is found that I have not distorted the function, then I demand from the minister, or from his

parliamentary secretary since the minister is not here tonight, that he answer the queries of the fishermen—

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

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the minister finds the hon. member's questions by their nature difficult to understand. The hon. member seems to suggest that he should instruct the corporation on the prices that should be established for fish and that these prices should not necessarily take into account the eventual sale price that may be available in the market place. The minister is sure that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act did not contemplate that the FFMC should purchase fish at a price unrelated to the eventual price it can obtain in the market. To do as the hon. member proposes would surely be irresponsible management on the part of the corporation, its board of directors, and the advisory committee to that board.

The minister is advised that the FFMC prices are established by management as they relate to the market but are approved initially by the board who have four fishermen members out of ten, and they consult the advisory committee which has 13 fishermen on their committee out of 15 members. Everything possible is being done to ensure that the maximum return, consistent with the prices that can be obtained in the market place, is provided to fishermen.

I must repeat that these are guaranteed initial prices to fishermen before they commence fishing, unlike the system prior to the corporation when fishermen did not have any idea of the price they could expect for their fish. I might add that if returns are obtained in the market place higher than those originally set, the fisherman is also a direct beneficiary when final payments are made.

The minister has not consulted with the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) but he has consulted the legal advisers of the Fisheries and Marine Service and is convinced after reviewing this matter that the corporation is indeed operating within the spirit and conditions of the act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

DOMINION DAY

REQUEST FOR RESTORATION OF CELEBRATIONS ON PARLIAMENT HILL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. While all Canadians understand the necessity of economic restraint, there should not be government restraint on patriotism. In view of the fact that the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) has withdrawn funds from Festival Canada, and in view of the fact that the traditional fireworks display on the Hill and the national televised concert have also been cancelled, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan):

That the Secretary of State take immediate steps to restore celebrations on Parliament Hill that are consistent with and representative of the national pride and patriotism jealously guarded by all Canadians.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

FELICITATIONS TO PEOPLE AND CONGRESS OF UNITED STATES ON BICENTENNIAL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That the members of this House extend to the members of the United States Congress and the people they represent best wishes et félicitations on the occasion of their two hundredth birthday on Sunday, July 4, 1976.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, the unanimous consent of the House is required to put the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1410)

SUGGESTED PROTEST OF EXTENSION OF UNITED STATES FISHING ZONES INTO CANADIAN TERRITORY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. On June 20, 1976 the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio program, called "Maritime Magazine" reported that for purposes of effecting their 200-mile fishing zone the United States of America are claiming ownership of Seal Island, some 18 miles off the western coast of Nova Scotia. In view of the fact that the United States territorial claim comprises an area between New England and Nova Scotia, and includes important fishery grounds such as Georges Bank, and in view of the fact that the south shore fisheries of Nova Scotia could be severely affected, I move, seconded by the hon. member from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That the Canadian government make it clear to the United States government that they are treading on Canada's sovereign jurisdiction.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HEALTH

PROPOSAL TO BAN ADVERTISEMENTS THAT FISH FROM ENGLISH AND WABIGOON RIVERS ARE SAFE TO EAT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek unanimous consent of the House to put a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. I make reference to the disturbing fact that mercury poisoning is crippling many people who are eating fish from the English and Wabigoon River systems and that in one instance Minamata disease is highly suspected.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil):

That this House request the Minister of Justice, in collaboration with the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Indian

Affairs and Northern Development, to seek whatever methods are necessary to bring about a cessation of advertising by some tourist operators that the fish are safe to eat until a thorough and comprehensive study has been completed so as to ascertain whether or not safety can be assured to those eating fish from water systems with high mercury pollution.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE IN DAIRY POLICY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and is pursuant to the contents of a motion under Standing Order 43 which I had the pleasure of putting to the House last Wednesday, June 23. In view of the minister's remarks and the very orderly demonstration that is presently taking place on the hill, I want to ask when he intends to make an announcement regarding the changes in the 1976-77 dairy policy. There is an urgent and pressing need for the minister to take immediate action. Can he give the House, and particularly the dairy farmers of this country, some indication when such an announcement might be made—tomorrow, a month from tomorrow or not at all?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we met last Friday with the minister of agriculture for Quebec, the minister of agriculture for Ontario and the chairman of the Canadian Dairy Commission to discuss the proposals they had made to us. Today we have received further proposals from the National Farmers' Union and they have to be considered as well. These will be considered and I would hope that if we are going to make an announcement it would be made next week some time.

Mr. Wise: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister give consideration to the removal of at least a percentage of the $8.60 penalty and the return of at least a portion of the resultant holdback to producers in extremely difficult financial circumstances? I suggest this particular return could be based on the same relevant proportion by which production actually declined.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware that last year we asked for curtailment of production several times through the Canadian Dairy Commission and the market supply and management committee and did not receive it. They made the decision that they should take the drastic action to curtail production and production seems to be coming into line at the present time. We have not got the figures from all the provinces. Before we make any change we have to notify and discuss this with every province concerned with the dairy issue. This takes time. We cannot make it just because of the two major provinces wanting us to make changes. If this had taken place last year when we asked for curtailment of production, we would be in the position where we would not have had to take the drastic action that we took this year.

I want to make it clear that even if we do lift the monthly quotas and change the $8.60 levy, that does not mean that there will not be some unfairness or inequities still existing because of the way that the provincial boards allocate their quotas. I am sure that the hon. member is aware of that.

POSSIBILITY OF SHORTAGES IF NO CHANGE MADE IN DAIRY POLICY

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary question for the minister. Does the minister not realize that if immediate changes are not made we run a high risk of being short of product by as early as September?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I read—I was going to say what the "wise member of parliament" has said.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: What did the dumb minister say?

Mr. Whelan: Our reports show that even with the dry conditions in Europe they will probably just meet their targets for production. The last four months show that in Europe they have increased their surplus of skim milk powder by 200,000 tons. We met with the Australian minister of agriculture last week and discussed the same problem that they have. I say it would be wrong to intimate to the people that there could be a shortage of dairy products. We certainly know that there will not be any shortage of dairy products in this nation. One of our people from the dairy commission has just returned last week from Europe where he made a personal survey and contacted people there, and he gives us the report that there is not going to be the scarcity of dairy products that some people think there will be. If we could forecast as accurately as the hon. member suggests, then we probably would not have to be as harsh with the quotas as we are, but we cannot take the risk of just piling it up and hoping that somebody will buy it.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST TO DELAY IMPLEMENTATION OF DAIRY POLICY TO ALLOW ADJUSTMENTS BY PRODUCERS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Agriculture.

According to the statement he just made that if all industrial milk producers had reduced their production last year we would not have the difficulties we are now facing, the minister is fully aware that, in the present

situation, many farmers will go bankrupt if the government does not approve a new dairy policy. Under such circumstances, and in view of the recommendations made to him, is the minister prepared to delay the implementation of this dairy policy for a while to give industrial milk producers time to adapt to the new guidelines?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this representation was made to us by the minister of agriculture for Quebec and the minister of agriculture for the province of Ontario, but I repeat that our doing that alone will not alleviate the horrible situation that exists as a result of the way they allocate quotas within the provinces. It will not eliminate some of the problems of individual producers. I am sure that the hon. member is aware that there are producers who have not established quotas who have been producing milk for two years on the advice of the provincial milk marketing board, which told them: "Don't worry about a quota, you will be granted one". They have allowed them to get in debt by doing these things and now they want me to bail them out. If the hon. member is suggesting that I am totally responsible for this, then I hope he is suggesting as well that I have total authority. This I do not have now because we are letting them run their own business.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY IF GOVERNMENT PLANNING TO REDUCE PRODUCTION BY FORCING PRODUCERS INTO BANKRUPTCY

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

As the minister is fully aware that the government's objective is to lower production and that it means that a number of producers will go bankrupt, would the minister tell the House whether this is really how the government intends to meet its goal?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has misconstrued the facts. I wish he would study how the Canadian Dairy Commission operates. It is the producers organizations themselves that make these decisions as to how quotas are to be distributed and they have not done all that good a job. That is why the farmers are complaining about inequities. We have dairy farmers who increased their production less than 5 per cent last year; we have others who increased their production as high as 80 per cent, and that is the unfairness of the situation. We asked for a 5 per cent increase in production and we got a 15 per cent increase in production, with no market or no home for it. We were spending millions of dollars on interest and storage charges because we had to pile it up. I am sure the hon. member is not suggesting that we continue to do that. If the hon. member wants authority vested in the Minister of Agriculture, let him say so and tell the provinces to vest that authority in the federal government.

● (1420)

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DAIRY PRODUCERS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is also supplementary and is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. It is in relation to his announcement next week. In view of the fact that many farmers are facing bankruptcy, and the Farmers' Union said this morning that farmers are now suffering a net loss of anywhere between 20 per cent and 100 per cent of their incomes, will the minister assure the House that in his announcement next week he will be outlining some steps that will in essence provide immediate financial assistance to the dairy farmers of this country?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member means well in what he is stating. Again, I do not have the authority to get rid of all the inequities there are. He has eliminated part of it. The most important thing is if the dairy farmer is producing within a quota. They are doing what they were asked to do, and they are still the best paid industrial manufacturing milk producers in the whole world. We have a system of provincial allocation of quotas and how these quotas should be distributed, but we are faced with the fact that some provinces were encouraging production without any consultation, contrary to what we have been suggesting since last April. Those provinces have to bear some of the responsibility. It is not totally my responsibility, and any decision I might make would not alleviate that problem. If we completely eliminated the monthly quota system on which we are operating, and completely eliminated the $8.60, this would not mean there would still not be some in dire straits.

We have lent farm credit money to a total number, I believe, between 1,200 and 1,400, someplace in that area. This is in the minutes of the agricultural committee. We tabled this before the committee and it gives a list of the number of people to whom we have loaned these amounts of money. We have made the agreement that there will be no collections of these funds. I am sure if we all work together, the producer organizations, the provincial governments and the federal government we can solve this, but not in the way suggested, for instance, by the consumer critic of the official opposition, who said I paid the dairy farmers too much.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: That is wrong and you know it. I never said that.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I heard that same speech outside a few minutes ago.

An hon. Member: Why don't you listen?

Mr. Nystrom: I have listened many times and have not had the answer to my question. In view of the fact the minister is to make an announcement next week, I should like to know whether he can assure the dairy farmers in this country that there will be some immediate financial assistance for them. In view of the fact that many of them have debts they have to meet, some in respect of farm

credit and with other organizations in this country, will there be any immediate financial assistance?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, we have already made a statement about the debts in respect of the Farm Credit Corporation, and have said that if their income has been affected as a result of something that was not their own doing the Farm Credit Corporation will not even collect the payments and not collect the interest. There will actually be a moratorium in respect of those debts. If the lifting of the monthly quota program we have at the present time will alleviate any of the responsibility we have said we will consider it. We are considering that. The government has put $86 million more into this program this year than it did last year. We put in more money and that was contrary to what the dairy farmers of Canada had agreed to. They said they would get more in their returns from the market prices, and instead of that we are following a policy which is contrary. We increased the subsidy to dairy farmers and increased the total amount of money available for borrowing, thereby jeopardizing other agricultural programs in Canada, because we feel the dairy industry is that important.

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should direct my find supplementary question to the Prime Minister. I would ask that right hon. gentleman, if I may, whether, as a result of the over-supply of milk in this country and the drop in consumption of some dairy products, his government would give serious consideration to the introduction in this country, in conjunction with the provinces, of a school milk program, and at the same time reinstitute the five-cent subsidy that was on fluid milk until about a year and a half ago?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, any suggestion having to do with children of school age is worth considering. I just want to point out to the hon. member that this is essentially an area within provincial jurisdiction, and since it calls for an increase in spending I am not sure I would have the support of the provinces in advancing such a program. I will ask that it be considered.

[*Translation*]

PROPOSAL MINISTER CONSULT PROVINCES AND PRODUCER ORGANIZATION TO FIND SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS OF DAIRY PRODUCERS

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

The minister does not get his feet wet by saying that the blame rests either with the producers or with the provinces, but he still is the one who advocated this dairy policy. Given the fact that he has partners for the application and implementation of that policy, which are provincial governments and federations of fluid milk as well as industrial milk, instead of looking for someone to blame, would the minister be prepared today to undertake positive discussions with his partners in the application of that policy, in order to find, as the hon. member for Joliette said, positive solutions, since several thousand producers will have to give up that production if they do not receive some assistance? The minister, Mr. Speaker, has recognized the problem by freezing certain mortgage payments on some farms.

Is the minister prepared to take positive steps, along with his partners, to find a solution as quickly as possible?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the very fact that we met with the provincial ministers of the two largest dairy provinces last week and discussed this problem in great detail at a lengthy meeting shows the concern we have for this problem. I am ready to accept that part of the problem which happens to be mine, but the suggestion that it should be 100 per cent the responsibility of the federal government and myself, as some people suggest, I do not accept. That is not a fact. We did not encourage all-out production when some of the provinces told the producers to produce all they can because they will have a quota next year. We never suggested that. We can prove what we told them to do last April when we announced the program.

The policy is a good one. It is one they agreed to, and if they had adhered to that kind of policy they would have no problem. We are going to try to solve it as I said in a fair and equitable manner between the producers and the provinces and ourselves. I do not blame producers solely for that, as the hon. member said, because I said the producer organizations certainly knew well we wanted 100 million hundredweight of milk and no more last year. We said we had no money for any more milk than that and that to produce any more would be a waste of product. They had excellent growing conditions. A cow is a biological entity and responds to all good things.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: All these things compounded a situation that would be the envy of many of my colleagues in the cabinet if they could get the people they are responsible for to become so productive.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR INQUIRY INTO PROBLEM OF OVERPRODUCTION OF MILK

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Agriculture keeps on repeating that there is significant overproduction from which stems the disastrous policy that we must endure now. Is the minister in a position to order today or very shortly a very extensive and serious inquiry conducted by independent people into the real situation of that so-called surplus production in our warehouses? At the same time, could the minister determine the cost of warehousing the quantity in stock because, according to our sources of information, the government allegedly paid much more than needed for stocked surplusses, and is he prepared to let the House check on the facts that only the minister possesses?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I recently answered a question of an hon. member

in this House in which I outlined the storage facilities for storing surplus dairy products in Canada and all dairy products in Canada. It is on the record. So far as I am concerned, when he refers to "so-called surplus production", I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that 103 million pounds of skim milk powder unsold is not a surplus production.

MINISTER'S POSITION ON FEDERAL CONTROL OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same minister. May I ask the minister whether it is his personal belief—it may not be government policy at this stage—that the milk producers and milk consumers would be better served if the control, including quota allocation, were at the federal level whether it be producer-elective or government control. Is it the minister's view of the milk industry that those two groups, the producer and consumer would be better served by federal rather than provincial control of that industry.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): I can only say that at the meeting I had last week with two provincial ministers I said if you want us to disband the Canadian dairy policy and the Canadian Dairy Commission say so. They said, "Mr. Minister, the reason we are here is that we believe in it; we believe it can work and we want to make it work". I repeat, if they want to blame me for all this, let them give me the authority to run it and I can run it a hell of a lot better than it is run now.

● (1430)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jarvis: That is my question. May I ask the minister if he is presently of the opinion that federal government control of the dairy industry is in the best interest of producers and consumers alike, and did he advance that argument to the two ministers when he was having this discussion last Friday?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With due respect, that is a repetition of an earlier question.

Some hon. Members: He did not answer it.

DELAY IN RECEIPT OF MILK SUBSIDY CHEQUES FOR MONTH OF APRIL—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): I hope the minister will not say that this problem is partially provincial. The federal milk subsidy cheques for the month of April should have been received by the producers this month. According to producers in my area, they have not received them yet. Can the minister advise us when they can expect these cheques, because that would help the situation to some extent?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): I talked to the chairman of the dairy commission. I understand that the cheques have been mailed. If they have not been, I will want to know why. Also, the supplemental cheques, the final payment for the dairy year 1975-76, have been mailed.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGES IN PRICES AND PROFITS REGULATIONS IN VIEW OF OBJECTIONS FROM SOME SECTORS OF BUSINESS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. As the Minister of Finance and the Anti-Inflation Board have requested submissions from businessmen affected by the new draft regulations as foreshadowed in the May 25 budget, and considering that the substantially changed regulations, many of which are retroactive, could be unnecessarily disruptive to orderly business operations, would the minister tell the House to what extent he is prepared to modify the draft regulations in response to the objections of business? Specifically can he tell the House whether termination of the cost pass through method and the reduction of allowable margins to 85 per cent are policies on which the AIB and the administration are prepared to negotiate, at least with respect to certain sectors of the business community where there appears to be particular inequity if the new rules go into effect?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): In general terms we would like to have the regulations affecting everybody in the same way, so far as possible. We recognize that there are different types of businesses and different types of institutions as, for example, the financial institutions which must have necessary changes in regimes. Prima facie our preference is to do away with the cost pass through rule and to put all firms on the profit margin basis with 85 per cent as the percentage for the base year. I cannot be certain that in the finality there may not be a variant on that, but substantially that will be the principle to which we will adhere.

REQUEST FOR EXAMPLES OF INEQUITY THAT MIGHT HAVE CAUSED HARSHER PRICES AND PROFITS REGULATIONS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Noting that the minister in his budget speech indicated that the changes in the regulations were in response to perceived inequities in the control program, would the minister provide the House with an example of the sort of inequity which would have moved the administration and the AIB to impose a harsher regime on all firms?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Without mentioning specific firms, it was found that within the same competing parts of the industry there were some firms which, because of computer facilities or otherwise, were able to put their business on a cost pass through basis and therefore develop a profit margin that was much greater than the profit margin that the competing firm would have under the profit margin rule. That was the kind of inequity that was occurring, and it was to overcome that difference in treatment that we sought to move to a total profit margin rule.

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF PRICES AND PROFITS REGULATIONS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Since many sectors in the business community have expressed dissatisfac-

tion with the revised draft AIB regulations, would the minister consider a reference of the regulations to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs so that the objections may be heard in an open forum?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I am not sure how valuable that kind of reference would be at this point, with the anticipation that the House will soon be completing its work for the summer.

An hon. Member: Oh, no; we are here for a while.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I think the appropriate thing is to take account of the various representations that are made and to issue final regulations to meet the representations we have received from the business community. I would have to say ultimately of course that we should not be surprised to find that the system is more restrictive from the profit standpoint than perhaps the corporations would like. The point we would make is that they, as well as all other sectors of the community, must help to contribute to a reduction of inflation in Canada.

ALLEGED ADVANTAGE TO DISTRIBUTORS TO PURCHASE FROM FOREIGN SOURCES BECAUSE OF PRICES AND PROFITS REGULATIONS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the new AIB regulations, particularly the abolition of cost pass through, make it financially advantageous for distributors to purchase from manufacturers located in other countries rather than from domestic manufacturers, is the minister not concerned that the regulations will have a detrimental effect on output and employment in the Canadian manufacturing sector? If he is concerned, as he should be, what definite steps does the government intend to take to avoid further deterioration within the manufacturing sector in terms of employment and productivity?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): It is because we are concerned about the impact on the economy that we have gone to such trouble to consult with the business community before making the regulations definitive.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF POLICIES TO AID MANUFACTURERS AND SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address this supplementary question to the Prime Minister and ask him if the government intends to outline, perhaps in the forthcoming throne speech expected in the fall, definite long-range policies in respect of our nation's manufacturers and, may I add, to the often forgotten small business sector, as well as a policy that would replace the present harmful ad hoc attitude which has been in existence for some time in this regard. Would the government be prepared to back any such policy proposals with appropriate legislation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The question has an implication concerning ad hockery with which I disagree. The hon. member is making a suggestion for the Speech from the Throne. To the extent that the Speech from the Throne will deal mainly with the session which is to begin, I cannot promise to insert in it what the hon. member calls long-range policies presumably over a period of several sessions. But with this reservation, of course we will want to have the Speech from the Throne deal with matters to improve the economic situation in our country.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE AGREEMENTS WITH RAILWAYS AND LAKE CARRIERS MEET ANTI-INFLATION GUIDELINES

Mr. Joe Flynn (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Can he assure the House that the settlements or agreements in the rail dispute and the Lakehead carriers dispute fall within the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): No, I cannot, Mr. Speaker. However, I am very happy to see that the parties have come together in a settlement.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I might say that the settlement was based by and large on the recommendations contained in the report of Mr. Justice Emmet Hall. His conclusions were that his recommendations were within the guidelines. We will have to await a ruling from the AIB on that matter.

While I am on my feet I would like to advise the House also that the lake carriers on the St. Lawrence seaway arrived at a tentative settlement last night.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION TO NATIVES WHO HAVE MERCURY POISONING—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the fact that the Indians in northwestern Ontario are suffering from mercury poisoning because of the failure of federal and provincial governments to enforce proper environmental standards, is the federal government prepared to pay direct compensation to native people on reserves who have symptoms of mercury poisoning?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, of course, we pay social assistance to all Indian

people on reserves who are unable to earn incomes. In addition, we are working with the two chiefs involved on Whitedog and Grassy Narrows to develop what has been termed a band work program based on the work development program to try to create work for all people who have been affected by lay-offs and loss of employment resulting from the closing down of the commercial fishery.

ASSISTANCE TO ENABLE NATIVES TO SUE POLLUTERS OF RIVERS

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): I was not asking about the general social welfare compensation payments but about direct payments because of the sickness that has resulted. However, I should like to ask a supplementary question. Is the minister prepared to assist Indian bands financially—I think a precedent can be seen in the James Bay case—so that they may hire legal counsel to sue polluters of the river system on which their livelihood depends?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

● (1440)

[*Translation*]

AIR CANADA

SUGGESTED MODIFICATION OF ORDER IN COUNCIL APPROVING AGREEMENT WITH CALPA AND CATCA

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Prime Minister.

Following the pressures exerted this morning by the members of his caucus, especially those from Quebec, and also by other people, does the Prime Minister intend to change the terms of the order in council ratifying the agreement between the Minister of Transport and the representatives of CATCA and CALPA, which agreement has been interpreted in Quebec as a complete surrender and a step backward to appease the extremists as concerns the bilingualism issue?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is not an order in council. The agreement between the minister and the officials of CALPA and CATCA has not been ratified by an order in council. In reality, the minister had the authority to negotiate settlement of the strike. It now remains for the union people to see if they will support this agreement in a vote which will take place in about 10 days. We shall then know if they are in agreement. For the moment, it is obvious that the minister has done his best to do a difficult and thankless task in a particularly difficult situation. The government is glad that the strike is over. The principle involved in the government's committment to promote bilingualism everywhere, and in the case of the airline, everywhere this can be done while ensuring safety, remains intact. I believe we have the support of members on the other side of the House in this issue. It now remains to see whether CATCA and CALPA will sign the agreement. This is the situation. I have no doubt that support from the other side of the House would help solve this difficulty. But I do not know in what sense the hon. member would want to speak on behalf of his party.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT OF AGREEMENT WITH CALPA AND CATCA TO PROTECT INDEPENDENCE OF JUDICIARY

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

In the light of this agreement concluded by the Minister of Transport, obviously in the name of the government, has the Prime Minister been informed of the recommendations of the Chief Justice of the Superior Court aiming at protecting the independence of the judiciary, and is the Prime Minister willing under the circumstances to amend the agreement concluded to better protect the independence of the judiciary?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member must know that if we amended this agreement, the people with whom we have negotiated, that is to say the pilots and the controllers, would be justified in saying that there is no agreement, that it has been modified unilaterally, and what the hon. member is suggesting would risk causing a new strike. I do not know if the hon. member has thought about these consequences, and if this is really what he is suggesting.

As concerns the premise of the question, I have seen in the newspapers allegations concerning a letter from Chief Justice Deschênes. I have not seen this correspondence. If it exists, I am surprised that it has been published in the newspapers since this must be a matter between judges, and I would find it deplorable if such a letter from a Quebec Chief Justice to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court had been given to the newspapers, probably by indiscreet people.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

POSSIBILITY OF ELECTION ON THE ISSUE

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary.

In view of the general reaction in Quebec and in view of the reaction of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who wants to protect the independence of his judges, and in view of the pressing representations made by the Quebec caucus of Liberal members, does the right hon. Prime Minister, in view of all those extremely serious reactions, feel it would be advisable to carry out immediately his threat made a few days ago to call an election on the topics of bilingualism and national unity?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am sorry that the hon. member has interpreted in such a way the interview I had recently when I was asked whether the situation was as serious as it appeared and whether the next election could again be held on this problem. I answered that unfortunately that could still be possible,

but that it has never been contemplated to launch a general election on this topic.

As for the attitude in Quebec to which the hon. member is referring, surely there must be people who agree with the settlement. We do not know yet what the Progressive Conservative Party nor even the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe think about it. It might be interesting if, on behalf of his party, he were to suggest a solution to this dispute. And at the same time, I might remind the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe that when he tells us about Mr. Justice Deschênes and his judges, those are not his judges since no judge appointed to the commission comes under the jurisdiction of Chief Justice Deschênes.

* * *

[*English*]

ENERGY

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINE—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF NEW FINANCIAL TERMS

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Given the Associated Press report from Buenos Aires yesterday that Canada and Argentina have concluded "a satisfactory" agreement on inflationary adjustment for the supply of a Canadian nuclear reactor, the cost of which is now to be $500 million as against the original estimate of $160 million, will the minister table the new financial terms of this nuclear reactor sale so that we can see just what kind of commercial deal the government has negotiated in this regard?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to present the details of this new agreement to my cabinet colleagues very shortly. At some appropriate point in the future, perhaps before the standing committee or earlier, I will seek an opportunity to make as large a disclosure of the details as I can with respect to the mathematics of that particular transaction.

* * *

BROADCASTING

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE ALL CANADIANS WILL SEE CANADA CUP HOCKEY SERIES

Mr. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. In view of the fact that CTV has the exclusive rights to telecast the Canada Cup series this fall, and in view of the fact that there are parts of this country which have only CBC, would the minister ensure that all Canadians, particularly those in northern Canada, will get a chance to see this important series?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have had several representations from the hon. member for Restigouche and others on this side of the House who are concerned about this matter. I am not certain what can be done about it, but I will certainly look into it.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

DATE WHEN TELEVISION FACILITIES AVAILABLE IN NORTHERN CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the same minister. My question last week had to do with bringing any type of television to people in northern Canada and Newfoundland, and the minister had no details. Would he explain why some communities in northern Newfoundland will never have television unless the people responsible for the accelerated cost program in the CBC get off their fannies and do something?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was given an answer, although perhaps not to his full satisfaction, last night. I draw to his attention the fact that in the answer it was indicated to him that instead of 1977 being the date for television in his part of the world, the time has been moved forward to the fall of 1976. He should be grateful for at least that.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REASON FOR FAILURE TO LABEL POLYCHLORIDE PLASTIC AS HAZARDOUS PRODUCT

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Some days ago in answer to a question I put in the House the Minister of Public Works informed the House of the strict regulations under which polychloride plastics could be used. I then put a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to the effect that if this serious fire hazard product was only used under strict regulations, as pointed out by the Minister of Public Works, why was it not labelled under the Hazardous Products Act. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said he would inform the House in a few days about this, and I wonder if he now has an answer.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the hon. gentleman for his courtesy in contacting me on this subject some weeks ago.

Under our present regulations these flammable substances are not regulated, but as a result of the representations of the hon. gentleman and those of the Minister of Public Works we have been meeting with the plastics industry, and the polyurethene type of insulation will now come under a new set of regulations. In the meantime many manufacturers are voluntarily labelling their products accordingly.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROTECTION OF CANADIANS ON HIJACKED FRENCH AIRCRAFT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Has Canada taken any steps to contact big Idi Amin to see what he is doing about protecting the Canadians on the hijacked French airliner, or is the Prime Minister planning to make a statement today on this matter?

● (1450)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no to the second question. As to the first, I would have to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to report.

* * *

POST OFFICE

APPLICATION TO OLYMPIC STAMPS OF PROVISION TO WITHDRAW TWELVE MONTHS AFTER ISSUE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. Can the Postmaster General inform the House if the agreement with Canadian philatelists providing for withdrawal of new stamp issues 12 months following the original issuance applies to Olympic stamps?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, yes. The hon. gentleman has raised an important question. It is customary in Canada, after 12 months, to withdraw these types of commemorative stamps from circulation. After that they can be obtained through dealers and various private outlets.

Mr. Dinsdale: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Postmaster General's remarks, would he investigate why the Olympic statue stamp, which was originally issued on March 14, 1975, is still available at post office philatelic outlets?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I should have been more explicit. I meant, one year from the event. Olympic stamps, as we know, are designated by law for a specific purpose.The net revenue derived from those particular stamps is part of the financing of the Olympics themselves. That is one of our reasons for still selling them. But one year after the termination of the Olympic Games all Olympic stamps will be obtainable only through private outlets.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

MEDICAL CHECKS ON VISITORS FROM THE TROPICS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the galloping increase in the incidence of tropical diseases even among native born Canadians, proving that present controls are not controlling, may I ask what percentage of the 40 million people who visit Canada are from tropical countries and what small percentage of those remain for longer than the normal holiday? Also, may I ask if Canadians who have served their country for any length of time in tropical countries are checked medically when they return to Canada?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will try to obtain for the hon. member the statistical information he has requested. I think he is aware of recent measures involving the medical examination of visitors to more carefully monitor the possibility of such diseases being brought into the country. As for the final part of his question to do with the return of Canadians, that is not in my jurisdiction.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

STRIKE OF MINERS IN SOUTHEAST KOOTENAY—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Has the minister been in touch with his provincial counterpart with regard to the strike by miners which has continued for six weeks in the southeast Kootenay area of British Columbia contrary to the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of last week I met with the minister of labour for British Columbia. We reviewed all strike situations which were then troublesome in the province from the point of view as to how the federal department could co-operate and be of assistance to the provincial department in resolving these outstanding disputes.

SUGGESTED REVIEW OF APPEAL PROCEDURES AGAINST RULINGS OF ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Because of the number of similar strikes concentrated in the mining industry, is the minister taking steps directly to review with representatives of the industry, both management and labour, appeal procedures provided against rulings of the Anti-Inflation Board, or is he awaiting the decision of the Supreme Court on the constitutionality of the board itself?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, since many of the labour disputes in question including questions of labour relations and resolution of labour disputes fall within provincial jurisdiction, we are co-operating with the province to ascertain both from unions and companies the best way to work out practices—I am speaking in terms of resolutions—so that we can be constructive with regard to resolution of disputes. We are doing that in an active manner at present.

Oral Questions

PARLIAMENT HILL

COST OF REPAIRING DAMAGE CAUSED BY ANCHORING BARRIERS ON DRIVEWAY

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works, if somebody could wake him up. Having regard to the new security measures on the Hill, particularly the new method of anchoring barriers on the driveway in front of the House of Commons, I wonder if the Minister has an estimate of the costs to be incurred by the government to repair the many holes punched in the pavement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must rule that question as being beyond the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works. It is the responsibility of the Speaker.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

JURISDICTION OF BOARD OVER PRICE OF MEALS IN MONTREAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that a Montreal daily reported this morning that the cost of meals will allegedly jump by 40 per cent, especially in the Montreal area as the result of the 1976 Olympic Games, could the minister tell the House whether he intends to ask the Anti-Inflation Board about those increases exceeding the allowable percentage and, if he has already done so, can he tell the House what control mechanisms will be developed in that connection?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I must point out that small businesses do not come under the Anti-Inflation Board or the anti-inflation legislation. Large businesses such as hotels of railway companies, are under the control of the board and the kinds of control are indicated in the regulations proceeding from the anti-inflation legislation.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ALLEGED WEAKNESS IN HOUSING AND CONSUMER SPENDING SECTORS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance in connection with the data provided by the Royal Bank's tredicator, which shows that the economy is growing more slowly than earlier estimated and showing the smallest quarter to quarter increase since the index resumed its upward trend in the first quarter of 1975. As the trendicator also shows that there is weakness in housing and consumer spending, may I ask the minister, in light of the disappointing indications in the economy, whether he has taken additional steps to increase construction of housing and consumer spending in Canada?

[Mr. Munro (Hamilton East).]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the trendicator would appear to be directly contradicted by the national accounts for the first quarter which showed a growth rate of 2.7 per cent in the quarter.

Mr. Stanfield: No, no.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS TO ANGOLA TO COMMUTE DEATH PENALTY OF MERCENARIES

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister, please? Since it is apparently the will of the Canadian parliament that capital punishment in Canada is to be abolished, does the government intend to ask the government of Angola to commute the death sentences of the foreign nationals who were mercenaries there?

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall not take it upon myself to make remarks on the abolition of the death penalty in other countries. The fact is that, upon first reading newspaper reports on the condemnation to death of four mercenaries in Angola, some of us may find it revolting. We recognized the government of Angola and I shall convey the request of the hon. member and see if it might be possible to make representations, but I am not sure at all that we can.

* * *

[*English*]

POST OFFICE

ALLEGED BACKLOG OF FIRST CLASS MAIL AT VANCOUVER—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. In view of reports coming from the Vancouver post office to the effect that there is a backlog of at least one month's first class mail, that there is no indication of when or if it will be delivered and even if it is finally delivered, it will be delivered on a random basis, I ask what steps the Postmaster General plans to take to clear up this backlog and when he expects to be able to announce normal delivery of mail in Vancouver?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, we are reading different reports.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before calling routine proceedings, I might indicate that the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham raised a point a moment ago by way of a question which I set aside because it was addressed to the Minister of Public Works. In fact, what the hon. member raised is the responsibility of the Speaker. I do not by any means want to indicate that the decision taken today with respect to preparations outside was taken lightly or that hon. members ought not to be encouraged to seek information about those preparations. The decision was

based on previous experience. It is an experiment. The barricades will be removed as quickly as possible, as soon as it is seen they are not needed. I think that moment has arrived already. It is an experience which I hope we will be able to assess collectively, to see whether the same kinds of precautions are necessary in future, but it is not possible to put questions of the kind the hon. member raised here. I do want the hon. member to know, however, that his question was a very important one.

* * *

● (1500)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROTECTION OF CANADIANS ON HIJACKED FRENCH AIRCRAFT

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I directed a question to the Prime Minister. I had forgotten that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs was in the House. I understand she has an answer for me. This is a very important question about Canadians on the French airliner hijacked in Angola. As we will be recessing for a long weekend, I hope that she will be permitted to make some kind of statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a procedure requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

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

I thank the House and the hon. member. All I can add, Mr. Speaker, is that we are indeed very happy to be able to confirm that Mrs. Pearla Bitton was among the 47 hostages that were freed by the hijackers. I can also say that in addition to the four Canadian citizens being held, we believe there are five other persons who are connected with Canada, that is who are said to be landed immigrants or who have close relatives in Canada.

I believe the hon. member also wanted to know whether the right hon. Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs has been in touch with the president of Uganda. We have not operated that way to date. To protect the lives of all hostages still being held, the policy of the government has naturally been to say as little as possible about the transactions underway and for which the government of Uganda has assumed all responsibility.

[*English*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Outside the House of Commons today and again inside the House, as he has done repeatedly, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) stated that I said that under his dairy policy the farmers were being paid too much. The minister seems to think there is a conflict of interest between consumer rights and producer rights. What I did say in the House of Commons some weeks ago was that the Minister of Agriculture had attained—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Up to this point the hon. member is expressing a difference of opinion with the Minister of Agriculture. It is significant, of course. However, the trouble I have is whether it constitutes a point of order. If the hon. member has a point of order, I would ask him to please state it.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I regret having to take the time of the House, but this is most serious. The Minister of Agriculture said that I said that under his program the farmers were being paid too much. I challenge the minister to find out within the next three or four days where I said that, inside the House or outside the House. At no time did I state that the farmers were being paid too much under his program. I challenge the minister to stop playing petty politics and produce that statement that was made inside or outside the House, because it was not made by me.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEE REPORTS

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Sixth report of Standing Committee on Public Accounts in both English and French—Mr. Crouse.

REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker on behalf of the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) I have the honour to present the ninth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments. If the House gives its consent, I will move concurrence in this report later this day. The report is in French and in English.

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

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (for the Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-97, to amend the statute law relating to income tax, (No. 3).

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

* * *

REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

CONCURRENCE IN NINTH REPORT OF STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) indicated earlier that he would be seeking the

unanimous consent of the House which of course would be necessary to move concurrence in a report tabled earlier this day. Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move such a motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved that the ninth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 5,176, 5,180, 5,516, 5,517, 5,518, 5,557, 5,742 and 5,785.

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

[*Text*]

PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO TORONTO, APRIL 1976

Question No. 5,176—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the Prime Minister's visit to Toronto on or about April 2, 1976 (a) what specific means of government transportation was used from Ottawa to Toronto and from Toronto to Ottawa and what was the cost per hour of same including, while in use and any waiting time (b) what are the names and job designations of all those on the public payroll who were with the Prime Minister at any point and what was the entire cost of their presence to the taxpayer (c) what are the names and addresses of any persons other than the Prime Minister or members of the news media who travelled on the trip in the Prime Minister's party (d) were any of the Prime Minister's personal expenses paid from public funds and, if so, what are the various items and the cost in each case?

2. (a) Did the trip include attendance at a meeting in York-Scarborough under the auspices of the Liberal Party (b) will the Party be asked to reimburse from party funds an appropriate share of the cost of the trip and, if not, for what reason?

3. Are such expenditures of public money extended by the government to the Leader of the Liberal Party only and, if so, for what reason?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): In so far as the Prime Minister's Office is concerned: 1. (a) A MOT Jetstar was used at $970 per flying hour; (b) Bob Murdoch, Colin Kenny, Peter McGuire, Ralph Coleman; Prime Minister's Office $188.50. Senator R. Stanbury (Ottawa-Toronto); (c) See (b) above. M^me^ Trudeau and Sacha Trudeau were on the return flight only; (d) No.

2. See reply to question 69 answered February 3, 1976. (a) Yes. (b) No.

3. See reply to question 69 answered February 3, 1976.

Question No. 5,180—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Was the Prime Minister's trip to Toronto on or about April 2, 1976 publicly financed and, if so (a) did he confer with any Liberal Party officials during the trip (b) is he prepared to make public the names of those with whom he conferred and the subjects discussed?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Certain expenses of the trip were. See reply to question 5,176, part 1. (a) Yes; (b) No.

CHILE—LOANS

Question No. 5,516—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

1. Have there been any export loans concluded with Chile since the $5,000,000 agreement of January 29, 1974 and, if so (a) on what date was the agreement entered into (b) who was (i) the borrower (ii) the Canadian exporter (c) what was the product being financed (d) what were the (i) repayment terms (ii) proposed amount of financing?

2. Are there any applications currently under consideration by the Export Loans Division for exports to Chile and, if so, what is the (a) date of the application (b) name of the (i) borrower (ii) Canadian exporter (c) product being financed (d) proposed amount of financing?

3. At what rate of interest have loans to Chile between 1970 and 1974 been arranged and under what terms for repayment?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as Export Development Corporation is concerned: 1. No. (a) Not applicable; (b) Not applicable; (c) Not applicable; (d) Not applicable.

2. By tradition and as a matter of commercial principle Crown Corporations have not been required by Parliament to answer detailed questions on their administration and operations. This is of particular importance to EDC because of the need to protect the competitive position of Canadian companies bidding in world markets. In certain instances an announcement may be made when an export sale supported by EDC has been finally consummated. Those transactions appear in EDC's Annual Report. Otherwise in the interest of trade EDC does not publish.

3. EDC made one loan to Chile in the first half of 1970 and one early in 1974. Repayment terms were 21 semi-annual instalments in the first case and 10 semi-annual instalments in the second; it has not published the rate of interest on loans. To do so would impair its negotiating position in subsequent transactions.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT—CHILE

Question No. 5,517—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

1. What is the government's and/or Export Development Corporation's policy toward Foreign Investment Insurance Programmes for Canadian investments in Chile?

2. Have any Canadian investments been insured since 1970 and, if so, what (a) were the investments (b) is the name of the investor (c) was the project (d) was the total value of the investment?

3. Have any applications been made for Foreign Investment Insurance in Chile since 1970 and, if so, what (a) were they (b) is the name of the investor (c) was the project (d) was the total value of the investments?

4. Are there any applications currently being considered by the Foreign Insurance Division for Canadian investments in Chile and, if so (a) who are the possible recipients (b) what are the projects (c) what is the total value of the investments?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as EDC is concerned: 1. Its policy is established by the Board of Directors on the merits of particular cases as they arise,

and upon the Board's assessment of the economic factors and risk at the time.

2. EDC does not publish the particulars of its foreign investment insurance because of the nature and the confidentiality of many of the projects; the aggregate amount and the geographic areas covered are published in each of its Annual Reports.

3. By tradition and as a matter of commercial principle Crown Corporations have not been required by Parliament to answer detailed questions on their administration and operations. When an export sale supported by EDC has been finally consummated an announcement may be made. Those transactions are described in EDC's Annual Reports. Otherwise in the interest of trade EDC does not publish.

4. Please see Part 3.

EXPORT CREDITS—CHILE

Question No. 5,518—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

1. Have there been any Export Development Corporation Export Credits Insurance Division credits granted for exports to Chile since 1970 and, if so (a) on what date was the credit granted (b) what was the name of the (i) borrower (ii) Canadian exporter (c) what was the product financed (d) what was the amount of the financing?

2. Are there any applications currently under consideration by the Export Credits Insurance Division for exports to Chile and, if so, what is the (a) date of application (b) name of the (i) borrower (ii) Canadian exporter (c) product to be financed (d) proposed amount of financing?

3. Have there been insurance claims submitted to the EDC for export credits to Chile since 1970 and, if so (a) on what date was it filed (b) what was the name of the (i) borrower (ii) Canadian exporter (c) what was the product financed and, if the claim was paid, the amount paid?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Export Development Corporation states: 1. The Export Development Corporation's Export Credits Insurance Division does not grant credits; it does insure for exporters risks of non-payment for credits granted by exporters. It has written such insurance for exports to Chile since 1970. (a) Information as to the credit extended by exporters relating to EDC's insurance is received by EDC from them as confidential information and may not be published without the consent of the exporters concerned; (b) As indicated in the foregoing there is no borrower in such transactions and EDC may not disclose without the consent of the exporters, the names of buyers to whom the exporters extended credit; (c) Please see Part 1 (b); (d) As indicated in the foregoing it is the exporter who provides financing in such cases and EDC's information thereon is received as confidential information. From 1970 to 1975 EDC insured exports to Chile on which EDC's contingent liability was an aggregate of $8.8 million.

2. By tradition and as a matter of commercial principle Crown Corporations have not been required by Parliament to answer detailed questions on their administration and operations. In certain instances an announcement may be made when an export sale supported by EDC has been finally consummated. Those transactions appear in EDC's Annual Report. Otherwise in the interest of trade EDC does not publish.

3. Yes, (a) Please see the answers to Part 1; (b) Please see the answers to Part 1; (c) Please see the answers to Part 1; EDC has paid in insurance claims arising from sales to Chile since 1970 an aggregate of $3.1 million.

TRIP TO MEXICO—MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

Question No. 5,557—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Minister of Agriculture recently travel to Mexico and was he accompanied by his wife and, if so, on what date and by what means did the Minister's wife travel?

2. Did the public Treasury pay for her transportation and, if so (a) in what amount (b) did the Minister reimburse the public Treasury and, if so, by how much and on what date?

3. What is the total of all expenses, if any, paid by the taxpayer for the wife of the Minister of Agriculture other than transportation?

4. Will the Minister reimburse the public Treasury and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. The Minister of Agriculture recently travelled to Cancun, Mexico to attend the First Annual Meeting of Consultation of the International Group for Agricultural Development in Latin America and the Caribbean accompanied by his wife. The duration of the trip was from May 12 to 16 inclusive. Mrs. Whelan travelled with the Minister via DND aircraft.

2. As the Minister of Agriculture travelled by DND aircraft, there was no additional charge for his wife to travel on the same aircraft.

3. Mrs. Whelan paid for her own additional expenses..

4. As there were no additional expenses, there is no need to reimburse the Treasury.

PURCHASE OF HISTORICAL HOUSES IN QUEBEC

Question No. 5,742—**Mr. Matte:**

Have historical houses been bought in Quebec by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and, if so, in each case, what (a) is their name and address (b) was the amount proposed?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Yes. Details as follows: 1. (a) Sir Wilfred Laurier House, St. Lin, Province of Quebec; (b) $50,000.

2. (a) Sir George Étienne Cartier House, 456-462 Notre Dame Street East, Montreal; (b) $50,000.

3. (a) Lot 1, Sainte Jeanne de L'Île Perrot, Province of Quebec; (b) $60,000. This property has been transferred to the Province of Quebec.

NEW CROP DEVELOPMENT FUND

Question No. 5,785—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since the inception of the fund to create new crops, how many different research groups in Canada have (a) requested (b) been granted subsidies from the government?

2. For each year, what was the (a) name and address of those who received such grants (b) object of their research?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. (a) 14; (b) 14.

2. 1974: (a) (i) University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. (ii) University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario. (iii) Les Fermes Leclair et Frères Limitée, Sherrington,

Québec. (iv) Palliser Wheat Growers Association, Regina, Saskatchewan; (b) (i) A Program for the Establishment of Sunflowers as a Major Crop in Saskatchewan and Alberta. Research on the Production, Utilization, and Marketing of Field Peas. (ii) The Agronomic-Economic Feasibility of Peanut Production in Southern Ontario. (iii) A Study for the Establishment of Agronomic Practices for the Growing of Baby Carrots. (iv) A Study of Utility Wheats. 1975: (a) (i) University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba. (ii) Foothills Forage Co-op Association, Calgary, Alberta. (iii) Minas Seed Cooperative Ltd., Canning, Nova Scotia. (iv) Rapeseed Association of Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba. (v) Colonial Florists Ltd., St. Catharines, Ontario. (vi) Ontario Wine Council, Toronto, Ontario. (vii) CSP Foods, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; (b) (i) Nutritional Evaluation of Barley Cultivars. Nutritional Evaluation of High Fat Oat Cultivars as Animal Feed. (ii) Forage Oat Evaluation Study. (iii) An Evaluation of Machinery and Cropping Systems for Larger Scale Grain Crop Production in Nova Scotia. (iv) Rapeseed Varietal Development. (v) The Development of Nucleus Geranium Stock, Free of Fungi and Bacteria. (vi) Investigation of Possibilities for Expansion of Grape Production Beyond Current Grape Area. (vii) Investigation of Utility Type Wheats in Saskatchewan Agriculture. 1976: (a) (i) University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. (ii) Continental Grain Company (Canada) Ltd., Winnipeg, Manitoba. (iii) Kemptville College of Agricultural Technology, Kemptville, Ontario. (iv) Nova Scotia Blueberry Growers Association, Truro, Nova Scotia; (b) (i) A Project to Expand the Production of Winter Rye in Saskatchewan. A Program to Expand the Potential of Flax as a Major Prairie Crop. (ii) The Establishment of Mustard Crops in Eastern Canada. (iii) Mustard Seed Production in Eastern Ontario. (iv) The Establishment of Lowbush Blueberries.

* * *

[*English*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 29, consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motions Nos. 4, 9, 18 and 38 (Mr. Halliday).

[Mr. Whelan.]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Your Honour indicated yesterday that you would be dealing with the grouping of the motions. I was wondering if Your Honour is prepared to do that at this time.

Mr. Speaker: I prepared a draft of groupings which I circulated to the House leaders. If hon. members have any comments on it, I would be prepared to receive them at this time. It may be, however, that since we are into one grouping which will no doubt take us through this afternoon and into Monday, possibly a discussion on the matter ought to take place at that time, unless there is some discussion on the first couple of groupings which would follow the one with which we are involved at the present time.

Mr. Blais: I would agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make some comments on the groupings, but the grouping of motions on which I will have comments to make are Motions Nos. 35, 36, 37, 45 and 46. I am sure we will not reach those before Monday. The reason I suggested that Your Honour's suggestion should be agreed upon is that I have to absent myself in about five minutes. I hope those in the other parties who might be addressing themselves to this particular matter will permit me to speak to the questions that are of concern to me on Monday.

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. First of all I have already made a decision in respect of the motions that are before the House at the present time when debate will resume, the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) having the floor.

I doubt there would be much disagreement that motion No. 7 should be considered separately—that would follow these considerations—and motions Nos. 10, 11, 12 and 13 might be the subject of comment at this time. That would take us through until Monday, I think, and give us an opportunity to reflect on the groupings and to comment upon them.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to agree with your suggestion that this discussion be deferred until Monday. I simply want to say that there are two of the proposed amendments on which I should like to raise points of order. One is motion No. 35 to which the hon. member opposite already referred, and the other is motion No. 40, but as Your Honour pointed out all this can wait until Monday.

Mr. Jones: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, not being represented by a party leader or whip I wonder if I could be privy to this grouping to which you have referred.

Mr. Speaker: In line with the suggestion raised I have the intention before leaving the chair this afternoon of calling on the Solicitor General to resume the debate, but I should perhaps read into the record the suggestions that are here in order that hon. members will be able to read them in *Hansard*.

Following the discussion on the grouping that is on the floor at the present time, which is motions Nos. 4, 9, 18 and

38 it is suggested, subject to further discussion, that motion No. 7 should be debated and voted on separately; motions Nos. 10 and 11 could be grouped for purposes of debate, and a vote on motion No. 10 would probably dispose of a vote on motion No. 11; motions Nos. 12 and 13 would be grouped for debate but voted separately; motions Nos. 21 and 22 would be grouped for debate and would be voted together; motion No. 23 would be debated and voted separately; motions Nos. 24 and 25 would be grouped both for debate and for voting; motions Nos. 26 to 32 inclusive would be grouped for debate with only one vote being required; motions Nos. 33 and 34 would be grouped for debate and one vote; motion No. 35 would be debated and voted separately, again subject to discussion according to the caveat that has been put forward; motions Nos. 36 and 37 would be grouped for debate but a separate division would be required on each motion; motions Nos. 40 and 41 would be debated and voted separately subject to comment; motions Nos. 42, 43 and 44 would be grouped for debate and vote, and motions Nos. 43 and 44 might depend on the result of a vote on motion No. 42; motions Nos. 45 and 46 would be debated and voted separately.

Those are general suggestions and as we move along, after hon. members have had an opportunity to reflect and we might have an opportunity to engage in further discussion, the Chair would be more than happy to receive suggestions on any particular question. It would appear there is ample work for the House between now and Monday and this will give hon. members an opportunity to bring forward suggestions.

Order, please. The hon. Solicitor General.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I have finished my remarks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan).

Mr. Sean O'Sullivan (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, last night in this House I had the honour to second the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). He is an abolitionist and I am a retentionist. Last night he spoke to these amendments on the basis of compassion. I should like to speak as a retentionist, and as one who, while he might not be so presumptuous as to lay claim to the virtue of compassion might say at least that he aspires to it. It is on the basis of compassion that I support these amendments and urge abolitionist and retentionist alike to join in supporting them.

These are very straightforward amendments, three of which will allow inmates in particular circumstances to elect for the sentence of death by himself choosing it. Of course it would have to be carried out by the state but there is this essential difference which allowed Mr. Speaker to rule these amendments in order. The fourth amendment is conditional upon the other three and has to do with the means of capital punishment.

It might be said that my support for these amendments goes back some time even though they were only introduced yesterday. It goes back to the summer of 1973 when I was a member of a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs which was established to investigate the Canadian penitentiary system with particular reference to the matter of escapes and the need for

security. Other members of the House who participated were Doctor Reg. Stackhouse, who was then the member for Scarborough East, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald), who was co-chairman with the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin), and two other Liberals, the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Fox) and the hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier). I was privileged to serve on that committee along with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), and although a member of the Social Credit party was named I do not believe anyone actively participated.

We travelled from the Maritimes to British Columbia looking into the situation. The subcommittee was set up because my colleague, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), recognized a failure in the Canadian penitentiary system to provide adequately for the security of the Canadian population as was shown by the number of escapes which occurred. He moved a motion during the minority parliament to establish a subcommittee to investigate the Canadian penitentiary system, and the motion was accepted by all parties.

I have mentioned the people who served on the subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, and none of us had any professional experience within institutions. For all of us, therefore, the experience was an eye-opener, and I want to place on the record today some of the experiences we had so that I can put forward the case of compassion and of human decency in support of the argument of the hon. member for Oxford that his amendments to the bill should carry.

I should like to quote from a report of the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes to the Solicitor General in which he stated:

> In spite of the fact that the subcommittee had begun its work with much energy and vitality, the subcommittee was not able—due to the magnitude of the task it was entrusted with—to complete its work within the period set by the House of Commons. Subsequently, the co-chairmen of the committee . . . have attempted to obtain an additional delay which would have enabled us to complete our work and submit a report to the House, as a committee. Unfortunately, the co-chairmen were not successful in obtaining this.

Along with the hon. member I regret that we were not allowed to report to this House because we had put together individually, and we had hoped collectively to give in a committee report, documentation of the serious situation which faced the Canadian people if measures were not taken to protect them adequately, and also the serious situation within the prisons. The prisons offered no hope for those inside, and very limited protection for the innocent Canadian population on the outside.

I think of the impressions of the beginner and I refer to the words here of the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes which I think every member who saw the prisons would go along with. We visited the prisons without prior notice; we just knocked on the door and announced ourselves. He said that his very general observations were based on the first impressions of a beginner where visiting prisons is concerned. He went on to say this:

● (1520)

> If Lord Durham in his famous report came to the conclusion that in Canada there were "two nations warring in the bosom of one country", one has partly the feeling that in the Canadian penitentiary system there are not two but three factions whose relations, if they cannot be

called bellicose, are far from being harmonious. Obviously, it involves the inmates, the guards and the administration.

What were some of the findings of the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes? In the report that he prepared, which unfortunately was never tabled in the House, he said this:

The extent of idleness among the inmates is also striking. The work they are able to do is often repetitive and not very likely to inspire them. The almost complete lack of motivation for the work available in the institution is astonishing.

He was particularly upset by what he termed the "Chinatown" cells in a detention unit in the Kingston area.

Miss MacDonald: It was at Collins Bay.

Mr. O'Sullivan: The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) reminds me that it was at Collins Bay. They are used at the discretion of the penitentiary administration in order to physically isolate from the main body of the prison population those individuals who cause particular disruption that brings about a threat either to the lives of themselves or of other inmates, or far too frequently, to the lives of the guards and the administration. The hon. member had this to say in his report:

—the isolation cells known under the name of "Chinatown" in a detention unit in the Kingston area are a shame upon the Canadian penitentiary system. This kind of cell would be more suitable in a war film like "The Bridge on the River Kwai" than in a Canadian prison.

He then recommended to the Solicitor General:

I would recommend that you investigate the matter, and the destruction of those units.

The hon. member went on to talk about the women's prison at Kingston, a visit that none of us who went there will ever be able to erase from our memories. The hon. member said this in his report:

Nobody can visit the women's prison in Kingston without leaving it with the feeling of being morally impoverished by the visit... One finds in this institution students arrested for drug trafficking, inmates guilty of acts of violence... in short, people with extremely different mentalities.

In view of this great disparity and the atmosphere of potential tension which exists, at the very least, life must be almost unbearable for many inmates of this institution.

Those words of the hon. member who accompanied us on this special study tour reflect, I think, the feeling of the majority, if perhaps not all, of the members of the special sub committee. During the study we came to appreciate the difficulty that the Solicitor General and his officials face, a difficulty that all of those in the Canadian penintentiary system face, namely that of trying to balance, on the one hand, the need for the protection of Canadian society and the right of the Canadian people to the maximum amount of personal security and, on the other hand, the goal of rehabilitation, realizing that some day those inmates may be returned to Canadian society. It is in society's interests as well as the interests of the inmates that they be returned to society in a frame of mind, and equipped with an outlook and with skills, that will make them citizens who play a very active and positive role and who will not return to a life of crime. That is the goal of rehabilitation, and it is an admirable aim.

The search so far has been in vain. We have had a policy of rehabilitation that has not worked. That, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, is what we found. But trying to balance one against the other, we had to come down foremost on the side of ensuring the protection of the Canadian population. If you can meet both those aims, then you have achieved perhaps one of the most difficult quests in any society.

We learned from prison officials, as well as from talking to their counterparts in other countries, that there are no magic solutions. You cannot at one time ensure the safety of Canadian society and at the same time ensure that everyone will be rehabilitated and returned to society in a manner that makes them productive citizens, citizens who will not return to a life of crime. The recidivism rate running at over 80 per cent is alone proof of that statement. That is why we came to the conclusion that the emphasis must be first and foremost on the protection of the innocent population, people who are not behind bars since they have not committed any crime. We are obligated to ensure their safety and protection, their lives, their liberty, and their right to go about their daily living, not breaking any law but with security under the law. If there is some means whereby at the same time we bring about the rehabilitation of prisoners, it is also in the interests of society that we seek that means.

As we travelled about the country we conducted discussions in camera at three different levels. We talked with the administration of the prison, with the guards of the prison, and for the vast majority of the time with the prisoners themselves, with no guards present in the room. I recall vividly one scene where we were faced by "lifers", prisoners serving a life sentence, obviously for a capital crime. We were in a room with 20 of them and there were no guards nearby; that was one of the conditions we ourselves set. We did not want anybody listening in. We wanted them to be as free and open with us as they could, and they were, Mr. Speaker, I assure you.

It became apparent to us in our discussions with people at the three different levels that there exists, whether we like to admit it or not, an element within the population that is simply unable—unwilling perhaps, but certainly unable—to come to grips with personal problems and to make a positive contribution to society, and more basically, unable to live within the constraints of the law that is set down by society. These people represent a dangerous and incorrigible element.

I am sure most of us were brought up on the notions espoused in such movies as "Boys Town" with Spencer Tracy—all accolades to the contrary. Nevertheless there do exist such people as incorrigibles, people who are somewhat demented. It is a sad realization to come to, but any chance that these people will be safely and healthily returned to society simply does not exist.

I wish time would permit me to quote from the findings of other members of the sub-committee, Mr. Speaker. I filed a report, and a particularly moving report was filed by one of the co-chairmen, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert. As all hon. members know, she is a remarkable woman and has served in this House with great distinction. She went into that sub-committee with all the enthusiasm, dedication and compassion which we know her to have in abundance. Hon. members should take the time to read her report. She went into this study with an open mind, having had no previous experience, as was the case with other

members of the committee, and she reached the same conclusions we reached—that the present system does not work, that it does not allow for rehabilitation, that it does not provide the maximum amount of security for the Canadian people, and that all these goals must be pursued with more vigour.

Let me now turn from the sub-committee findings to the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Oxford. As he stressed last night, we are not talking here about a large number of people. We are talking about a very few cases of repeaters. We are talking about those convicted of high treason, or convicted of the stange crime in this day and age of piracy. These are people who obviously have shown they are not capable of living within society as we have set it up. We have established society and set up its rules, but these people have determined of their own will that they cannot or will not live within those constraints or those laws.

● (1530)

What we are saying to those who have been sentenced to life imprisonment is that if they so elect they may choose to be sentenced to death. Some may argue that technically you cannot sentence anyone to death, or a person cannot choose to be sentenced to death just after you have abolished capital punishment. There is another law still on the statute books which will not be affected by this bill, that comes under the jurisdiction of National Defence, which provides for the death penalty. It does not spell out in what way the death penalty will be carried out. It just says there shall be the death penalty. There are many bills passed by this House that do not spell out in chapter and verse how they will be carried out, but rather there follows the passage of a bill a set of regulations which allow for the interpretation of the bill and its being carried out.

Having visited prisons, I would argue that if a person chooses to be sentenced to death, perhaps having spent weeks and months living in horror, it may be a more compassionate thing to allow that person to make such a choice than to sentence him to a death that is surely more cruel and more inhumane, a sentence which would allow him to suffer the consequences of his actions by spending the rest of his life in prison. What I am saying is that if you have visited prisons, as we did, and you tell a man that he really is going to spend the rest of his days there, you will realize you are committing him to a sentence of death far more cruel and more outrageous than allowing him to decide to end his days on this earth. I would stress that I could only agree to this in terms that the sentence would be carried out in a way the governor in council would decide.

This brings me to the fourth amendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Oxford, that the sentence to be pronounced against a person sentenced to death shall not be that he be hanged by the neck until he is dead, but in conformity with any humane method of execution the governor in council may establish or regulate.

Those of us who seek capital punishment propose that there are more humane methods than the admittedly outmoded method of hanging. All of us who propose the return of capital punishment, or at least its reinstitution, and we appeal to all hon. members for its reinstitution in these particular cases, suggest there are more humane methods, such as my colleague who is a doctor has put forward. We should not continue with this system of hanging which admittedly is outdated.

All of us who support capital punishment, at the same time see no inconsistency in saying that we hope it will never have to be used. That is the very basis for having it. It offers a deterrent which may prevent some people from taking innocent lives. That is the reason for it, not for revenge or for getting even, and not for the purpose of inflicting some barbaric—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. O'Sullivan: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity given me by the House to complete my remarks, and I will attempt to do so briefly. Let me say simply that we have reached that point in society where we have to reconsider whether there should be capital punishment. A little over a week ago this House voted in principle that it wanted to do away with hanging. The hon. member for Oxford, who is an abolitionist, proposes that the bill should carry, but in certain particular circumstances capital punishment should still be allowed. All those who share in his compassion, be they retentionists or abolitionists, should support these amendments.

These amendments will allow a choice to the person we are committing to prison for the rest of his life, a sentence, I repeat very briefly, to a death far more cruel, more unusual and more inhumane than the termination of his life quickly and, given modern methods, with dignity.

Those are the reasons put forward by the hon. member for Oxford as an abolitionist in proposing these amendments. As a retentionist I second these amendments, sharing as I do his belief that whatever the decision of this House we must foremost ensure the Canadian people that their basic right to life is being given the maximum protection and, secondly, that if we are to have capital punishment there are more modern and humane ways of carrying that out. Thirdly, when you sentence a man to life, that is, to spend the rest of his days in one of those institutions we call penitentiaries, and really there are no words to describe adequately the nightmare they are, you are imposing upon that individual a far worse punishment than by allowing him to elect to end his days on this earth.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask whether the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) would permit a question?

Mr. O'Sullivan: Yes.

Mr. Stanbury: Let me say first, Mr. Speaker, how moving the speech of the hon. member has been, and how impressed I am as one member with his sincerity and his humanity in supporting the motions of his colleagues, although they raise some rather difficult questions. It does seem to me that the amendments suggest death by choice or, as the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth might call

it by analogy, suicide on demand. What I would really like to know in trying to assess this suggestion is whether the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth, as a declared retentionist, would feel that he could support the bill now before the House if the amendments moved by his colleague were accepted?

Mr. O'Sullivan: Mr. Speaker, I might first say that the question posed by the hon. member is one that he might wish to have put to the mover, the hon. member for Oxford, who has said that as an abolitionist he could not support the bill if these amendments are not carried. I must say that I will want to know the outcome of the other amendments being put forward by other members of my party before looking at the over-all bill and making that decision. If only these amendments were to carry I would have to say the bill does not, in my estimation, go far enough to protect the innocent lives of our Canadian population. However, recognizing what happened here a week ago with the vote, and the potential outcome being the same, I would say to the hon. member that, recognizing I was in the minority then and may be in the minority again, I would feel so much better about the bill being passed with these amendments, even though I cannot support it. This is the way I think Canadian people would generally feel.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on motions Nos. 4, 9, 18 and 38 I should first of all like to draw the attention of the House to the actual clauses in Bill C-84 that are affected by these motions.

● (1540)

Motion No. 4 affects the clause in Bill C-84 dealing with treason. As I read my colleague's motion he in effect is saying that some person convicted of treason as now defined in Bill C-84 should have the option, instead of accepting imprisonment for life, of accepting the sentence of death. In the case of motion No. 9 my colleague suggests the same option in the case of someone convicted of piracy. In motion No. 18 it is suggested that the option be open to a person who is guilty of either first degree murder or second degree murder. This is something I wish to go into more fully. I see that my colleague is in the House and perhaps he might be prepared to accept an amendment with regard to motion No. 18.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, motion No. 38 deals with a subject about which I think all of us in the House are undoubtedly concerned, that is, assuming the death penalty should continue would it be wise to choose a different form of execution than hanging. I think I am fairly safe in saying that virtually all members of the House would be sympathetic to a more humane method of execution than hanging.

I mention this because I think that unfortunately when we deal with this very serious question of life and death, and whether or not capital punishment should continue, people become overly emotional about the form of execution. In a sense I think abolitionists often play up this emotion and make the noose virtually a symbol of capital punishment. That is why, if I may, I should like to say first of all that I support the position of my colleague in respect of motion No. 38 without any question.

I believe that if the death penalty is to continue in this country it would be wise to change the method of execution and, as my colleague suggests, let it be set by the governor in council through regulation. This is not a unique suggestion. My colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan), indicated that under the National Defence Act the death penalty is prescribed in certain cases. I should like to direct the attention of the House to section 175 of the National Defence Act. It states:

> The execution of a punishment of death under this Act, whether the sentence was passed in Canada or elsewhere, shall be as prescribed by regulations made by the Governor in Council, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the regulations may make provision for . . .

Then the custody and treatment of the person under sentence in that case are specifically set out. In short, motion No. 38 suggests that in the Criminal Code we should have the same provisions with regard to the method of execution as now exist in the National Defence Act.

Perhaps I might go back and touch in order again the motions to which I have referred. The reason I have drawn the attention of the House to the clauses dealt with in these motions, particularly motion No. 4 and motion No. 9, is that I believe it is important that we honestly realize that the bill before us, Bill C-84, is not an abolitionist bill. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to emphasize this because in effect I think there has been a misrepresentation in this regard to the House and certainly to the Canadian public.

I should like to draw attention to the speech given at second reading by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) in support of Bill C-84. At page 13088 of *Hansard* for May 3, 1976, the Solicitor General said:

> . . . if we attack this question objectively, then we must, from a logical, ethical and public policy point of view, conclude that capital punishment must be abolished once and for all.

At the conclusion of the minister's speech as recorded at page 13091, he stated:

> When we examine the question objectively, and when we study the evidence closely, logically, and with an open mind, then the conclusion we must reach, if we are to discharge our responsibility to the Canadian people as legislators of sound and effective laws, is that capital punishment must be abolished in Canada now, and that this bill should be passed.

I suggest that many people who have voted on this bill that is before us took the minister's words literally, and voted believing they were voting for Canada to become an abolitionist state. They had every reason to believe that was the case. Did the minister point out that while he proposes abolition there are already in existence in the National Defence Act, so far as I can make out, 36 separate offences which call for the death penalty if someone is convicted? When we look at some of these offences I would say that we would become the laughing stock of the nation in that we pretend on the one hand that we are an abolitionist nation, that by passing this bill somehow capital punishment is rubbed out totally, when on the other hand there are 36 other offences for which the dealth penalty is still the prescribed punishment.

Let us look at some of the things one could be executed for in this country and that the Solicitor General is doing nothing about. I would refer hon. members to section 65(h) of the National Defence Act. It states:

Every person who

(h) when acting as sentry or lookout, leaves his post before he is regularly relieved or sleeps or is drunk;

is guilty of an offence and on conviction, if he acted traitorously, shall suffer death . . .

Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, it is well that that provision does not apply to this House. Again subsection (g) states that every person who improperly occasions false alarms is guilty of an offence and on conviction, if he acted traitorously, shall suffer death. Subsection (f) states that every person who, without authority, alters or interferes with any identification or other signal is guilty of an offence and on conviction, if he acted traitorously, shall suffer death. I could go on to cite the other 33 offences that are covered by this section of the act relating to the death penalty, but I would only be substantiating the point I am making.

I believe that in asking that this bill be passed the minister misrepresented the facts in the way I have indicated in order to win support. I would ask members to reconsider their position. If they, in sincerity, were hoping that this nation would become totally abolitionist, that is not the result of this legislation.

I should like to return now to more specific comments in respect of the motions before us. As I have stated, motion No. 4 deals with treason. While I am generally sympathetic with my colleague's proposal I should like to ask him—and if he is in the House he might reply to my question—whether he has thought of the possibility, if in the case of treason we gave the option of imprisonment for life or a sentence of death, there would be the danger or the possibility, particularly if we were dealing with some type of terrorist, that that person would opt for death feeling that somehow he might become a hero if he died in the name of whatever cause he was trying to support? We should consider that possibility in respect of the suggestion the hon. member makes here.

● (1550)

I would also like to mention, with respect to both motions Nos. 4 and 9 as they read at present, that in my understanding the person would have this option after conviction. He will have gone through the judicial process and presumably the jury would have found him guilty. If I read these two suggested motions correctly, presumably the judge would turn to the convicted person and ask "Do you wish me to prescribe the sentence of imprisonment for life or death?" In that connection I would ask the hon. member if he thinks that is the proper time at which the option should be put to the person charged?

Would it not be better—and I am not saying it is—to have the charged man asked whether he wishes to have his eventual sentence be imprisonment for life or death at the time when the trial is initiated? At that point I think all concerned, the jury, the judge, and the courts of appeal, know that they have either a case which will result in imprisonment for life or in death. That would be the more significant time at which to give the option to the charged person rather than after his conviction. I say that because I would hate to see the House pass a measure which would inadvertently be like euthanasia.

It may well be that after a person is convicted he would ask for the death penalty because he is in a state of depression or despair, but then upon reflection he would ask for life imprisonment. On the other hand, I think the person charged could weigh the two alternatives more objectively, with the advantage of counsel, at the time of the initial trial rather than waiting until he is convicted.

If I may, I should like to comment on motion No. 18, and again put a question to my colleague. As I read it, the present wording would affect not only first degree murderers but also second degree murderers. I wonder if my colleague would consider a subamendment which would make it clear that only in the case of first degree murderers this option would be given, and that those who are guilty or convicted of second degree murder would have no opportunity to opt for the death penalty as opposed to imprisonment for life. I say that because if we read the full section—and a clear distinction is made between the two types of murder—we would find it rather inconsistent to have both first and second degree murder treated the same so far as the suggested option is concerned.

The wording that I had in mind would be at the beginning of subclause (b). We would insert the words, "in the case of first degree murder" so that it would read: "In the case of first degree murder for a second offence, be sentenced to imprisonment for life or, if the convicted person so chooses, be sentenced to death".

I believe the motions that have been put before us are particularly helpful. I hope that others will join in the debate on these motions because I was frankly disappointed at the rather preemptory treatment given the bill in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Those who were present at the committee meetings know that the first step of the government after expediting the bill to the committee was to say that we would hear no witnesses other than the minister himself, which I think is totally inconsistent with a bill that is so controversial and with measures to which I would say 80 per cent of the Canadian public object. First the government says it will refer the bill to committee for full study, and then right off the bat government members use their voting majority to require that no witnesses be asked to appear before the committee. I say this was most unfortunate.

Again that majority was used to terminate the deliberations of the committee, and that is why the committee reported on Monday of this week. I believe that that is one reason why those who are concerned about this measure and those who feel that the bill, not only in its intent but also in its specific provisions as these amendments would alter it, is inadequate, have no alternative but to speak now at the report stage in the House and make their anxiety felt. In that connection I think there is considerable questioning among the public as to why various members have voted in the House in the way they have. I hope that during the report stage, and certainly at the third reading stage of this bill, members who, for some reason or other, have confused their constituents as to their voting pattern would try to put on the record why they happened to vote in the way they did or, to put it mildly, have voted in such a way as to create great surprise among those who elected them in the last election to sit in the House.

I notice the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) is in the House today. I read an article in the Hamilton *Spectator* which referred to the hon. member and

mentioned that the hon. member sent a letter to a constituent in which he stated:

I do believe that criminals convicted of the murder of policemen should receive the maximum penalty which is capital punishment.

The article implies that many people are now questioning why that hon. member happened to vote for abolition in support of the government bill. I believe that is an example—

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. I am rather shocked that the hon. member, like the reporter, is reading my mail of one and a half years ago written at a time when I returned from the funeral of two policemen in Moncton and pointed out to my constituent that I supported the law as it existed. As the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) could tell you, I have lived that way since I was eight years old. I have always been a law abiding citizen and an abolitionist, but if the retentionists carry the vote and that becomes the law, I will certainly support the law. I resent that being brought up by the hon. member, who should be more intelligent.

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

Mr. Stevens: At the conclusion of my remarks I will be very pleased to hear the hon. member's question and to answer it.

Mr. MacFarlane: The reporter withdrew; why don't you?

Mr. Stevens: I am pleased the hon. member has tried to clarify the article which appeared in the Hamilton *Spectator*. May I mention that the other quote appears in the same article. When the hon. member was questioned as to why he had taken the action he had, his answer was:

I had only been in parliament at that time (at the time of the letter) for six weeks. I was very new at the game.

Mr. MacFarlane: I think the hon. member should be extremely careful when quoting parts of a conversation which he did not hear himself. The reporter was not able to give me the name of the party whose letter he had, but since he had the date, I was able to go back in my files and discover that it was indeed January 22, 1975, we were talking about, and not January of this year.

● (1600)

In addition to that, the remark of the hon. member at the end referred to something I said about having written a letter when I had been in parliament only six weeks. It had nothing to do with my purposes, decisions, or anything else. I think the hon. member is complicating the matter further. I do not want to be as rude or as evasive as he is being by making accusations, but I think it is quite improper for a person who comes from a strange town a great distance away, after reading a strange newspaper, to make comments about a strange writer and a strange letter he has not seen.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) that his time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I would like to say to the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) that his point is not a point of order or a question of privilege, but a personal disagreement, and I would suggest that we get back to the terms of the amendment.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Stevens: I know that there are many who wish to speak this afternoon, and I will simply conclude my remarks—

An hon. Member: You have.

Mr. Stevens: —by stating that I would be pleased to hear from my colleague with regard to the three questions I raised concerning motions Nos. 4, 9 and 18, and perhaps if it is in order, after the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) puts his question to me, my colleague could be given the opportunity to answer the three questions I raised during the course of my remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Due to the fact that the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) has already spoken in this debate, he needs unanimous consent to answer the questions. Does the hon. member for Oxford have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): He will follow the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Kaplan).

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member suggested that certain prisoners who have committed serious crimes ought to be given the choice of life imprisonment or capital punishment. I could hardly believe what I heard when he said that, and I want to ask him if he does not consider that a form of suicide and the kind of immorality which should not be condoned by the laws of Canada.

Mr. Stevens: I believe if the hon. member had heard my remarks in full he would know that that question was raised, and I said in reviewing the motions of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), which provide for this alternative option in the case of persons convicted of various offences such as treason, piracy, and first and second degree murder that the timing of the option is most important. If a person has that option at the initiation of his trial, I think that is much more removed from any suggestion of a suicidal type of state enforced approach than if the option is taken at the time of conviction when the person is in a state of depression or despair. Perhaps at that low point the prisoner might say that he would rather be put to death than be sentenced to life imprisonment. That was really the point I was making, and that is the basis of one of my questions to the mover of the motion. Just what is his attitude with regard to the timing of this option? Should the option be at the beginning of the trial, or should it be operative at the conclusion of the trial when the man is convicted?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the hon. member for Oxford going to answer the questions now?

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to answer them now if that is your pleasure.

I appreciate the fact that my colleague, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), brought these three questions before the House because they are indeed significant. In attempting to answer those three questions I should first state very succinctly what my two objectives are in moving this amendment. The first objective is to provide a form of protection for the public against second offenders, those who commit treason and those who commit piracy. The House might wish to add to those. My second reason for moving this amendment is to provide some form of punishment which is adequate for the protection of society and which at the same time is as humane as possible. It was with that in mind that I chose to offer as an alternative death by some means other than hanging, at the choice of the convicted person. That is my prelude in answer to the three questions.

The first question related to the matter of punishment for treason, and the hon. member for York-Simcoe raised the question as to whether a hero complex or a martyrdom complex might be produced. I accept the fact that this might happen, but I submit that if in fact the people of Canada, as appears to be the case, by a majority favour capital punishment, I cannot think that that same majority would look upon this as an endeavour on the part of a criminal to be a martyr because the people think that that should be the natural course of events anyway.

On the second point regarding the timing of the option a criminal has for deciding whether he wishes imprisonment for the balance of his natural life or death, I introduced this part of the amendment for the simple reason that I thought this was a humane option to offer. I recognize the fact that there are many ways this could be presented, and I welcome suggestions from hon. members as to how this might be put into action. I commend the hon. member for York-Simcoe for making this suggestion.

The hon. member suggested that possibly the prisoner could make his election before his trial. An alternative would be that he might make the election after the trial, and I think there should be provision to allow him to review the matter years later. I will leave that to hon. members to consider because each alternative has some merit, and none of them should be turned down out of hand.

The third question raised by the hon. member for York-Simcoe related to—if I recall his question correctly, and perhaps he will correct me if I am wrong—the intent of motion No. 18, having to do with second offences. It was my intention in the wording of this, with the help I had from legal authorities, to have this apply to second offenders, whether they be second offenders for first degree murder or second degree murder. I hope that answers the questions of the hon. member for York-Simcoe.

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, those hon. members who we like to think grace and distinguish the fifth row on this side have a great spirit of camaraderie. Indeed there is some solidarity among us, but unlike some other sections of the House we do not allow our camaraderie or our closeness to overcome legitimate differences of opinion. I have great respect for the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) and his colleague on this occasion, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) and their views. I have considered the speeches both hon. members made in support of the thrust of this set of amendments, which I describe as death by choice. That would be the simple way I would refer to the basic intent of motion No. 4, which governs the thinking behind all the motions we are now considering.

Because I feel that a very important principle has entered into the debate, I feel that I would be remiss in doing my own duty not to make some comments with regard to death by choice. I thought the presentations both hon. members made reflected the deep sense of humanity and concern they bring to this issue. With respect to them, I feel at this point need to distinguish between the right of the state to take life and the right of the individual to take his own life, or to give instructions for his own life to be taken.

● (1610)

Let me put it this way. There is an important distinction to be made. I want my comments on these motions to be focused as sharply as possible so that the distinction between the right of the state to take life and the right of the individual to take his life should not be lost sight of or obscured by consideration of related issues.

Although the hon. member for Oxford did not spell it out in precise terms, I felt that his message, or rationale, was that the state did not have the right to take life, or that it should be of such restricted limitation as not to apply to the bill before the House. I suggest that the thrust of debate on Bill C-84, whether one is a retentionist or abolitionist, has been with respect to the usefulness of capital punishment as a deterrent. I understand that not many of us question the actual right of the state to take the life of a convicted criminal. Surely there cannot be any theological or moral argument to support the claim that the state has not the right to take that life. In this tortuous debate we are considering whether the state ought to exercise its right, and whether by so doing it would prevent crime or cure the escalation of crime about which members on all sides are concerned. I am dwelling on this point because I want to make it clear that I judge that the state possesses the right to take the life of a criminal convicted of capital murder.

I turn now to the right of the individual to take a life, including his own. The moral base underlying our thinking, thinking directed toward the common good of society, is that each individual has the right to life. That argument has been widely used in the abortion issue, but I will not go down that alley. I only say that the individual has the right to life, but an individual does not have the right to terminate his own life.

This leads us to the question of euthanasia, a question on which the hon. member for Oxford touched last night. Although the hon. member did not declare himself as a proponent of euthanasia, and I am sure he is not considering positive euthanasia, that is to say, steps taken to end a patient's life, he left the impression that because of his humanitarian concern for suffering it is his view that a

person may wish to take his own life. I interpreted the hon. member as saying that a criminal who faces 25 years in jail for murder, or the remainder of his life in jail for a second murder, should be allowed to terminate his own life by transferring the right to his own life to the state or to the representative of the state who would actually carry out the deed. The state would then end the life of that individual.

No matter how you look at it, you are considering an individual's surrender of his right to life; or, putting it more explicity, you are considering allowing an individual to end his own life. No matter how humanitarian the motive for allowing this might be, I have great reservations about the wisdom of bringing such a provision into the Canadian law. If such a motion were adopted as part of the bill and written into law, that first step which would allow an individual to take his own life would no doubt be followed by other, similar steps. One hon. member referred to this process as a kind of legalized suicide. I am most concerned about such legalized suicide. I am most concerned about the euthanasia aspect of the motion.

If this motion were included in the law, it would not be long before other groups would come to this House claiming for humanitarian reasons that euthanasia is a logical step forward for our society. All of us know of people who endure great suffering during their terminal illness, and they or their families, with the best of motives, want to end it all. I have no doubt at all that no matter what we decide with respect to this motion, before long this House will be asked to decide whether enthanasia shall become part of our law. The publicity surrounding the Karen Quinlan case in the United States is one illustration of the intensity of people's feelings on this subject. Several legislative assemblies in the United States have provided for the enactment of what is called the living will. Under such provision, a person may say in his will that if he reaches a certain point in illness, he gives permission for his own life to be taken.

There is no doubt in my mind that many people in society think euthanasia would be a step forward. I will not indulge in any deeper consideration of euthanasia, because I think I have illustrated how accepting motion No. 4 could open the door to euthanasia.

● (1620)

I will close on this note. The moral base of human life is extremely complicated. It will become much more complicated because of the distinctions that have to be made between positive euthanasia and negative euthanasia. Surely we as legislators would not want to be in the position of holding physicians accountable for the maintenance of an artificial life support system merely to keep a person alive when there is a natural decline and where a person should be able to go with dignity through the physical motions leading to death.

I am sure the hon. member for Oxford and other members have encountered situations whereby the artificial prolongation of life under the guise of humanity has been harmful to the patient. Therefore a distinction has to be made between negative and positive euthanasia; negative euthanasia being not doing something that artificially prolongs a life, which in my judgment is permissible and ought to be within the domain of physicians to decide, positive euthanasia the taking of a deliberate step to end a person's life.

I am using the illustration of negative and positive euthanasia to show the complexity of the morality involved. Taking motion No. 4 and allowing death by choice to become part of our law would be a dangerous step. It would be dangerous in writing the law of this country to create that precedent whereby an individual would be given the legal right to end his life when in fact he does not have the moral right to do so.

That is the thrust of my argument in trying to make the distinction between the right of the state to take a life, a right that I maintain the state has, as against the right of an individual, and I maintain the individual does not have that right.

The other parts of these several motions deal with life imprisonment for a second offence, treason, piracy and other heinous crimes. In deciding the validity of that side of the hon. member's set of motions, that brings us back to our fundamental reason for voting the way we did on second reading. During the report stage as well as on third reading each of us will have to consider whether we believe that at this moment the right of the state to take the life of a convicted murderer ought to be maintained.

The more I have reflected on this question in the agonizing way that I and other members of this House have done, the more I have maintained my conclusion that the state ought to maintain that right. It ought to maintain it at this moment in our history because of the prematurity for total abolition.

It is to be regretted that such a serious subject such as this is being rushed through the House and the Committee in such a heavy handed fashion. The manner in which the subject of abolition is being dealt with does not do parliament credit. It cuts to the core of our feelings about life itself, safety in society, and the escalating crime rate. All of those things should have been recognized by the government as being far more important than rushing this through in order that it will not have to face up to the existing law. I will not continue on that line of argument. I advanced it on second reading. If circumstances arise, I will advance it again on third reading.

I conclude by saying that we are facing a most difficult situation as we go through many of these amendments. I appeal to all members to look beyond the immediacy of the motions before us and see how they truly enter into our own well considered interpretation of the validity of the bill and the wisdom of the government in maintaining the right of capital punishment at this moment in our history.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments in connection with the amendments proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). He is to be congratulated on the presentation that he made to this House on his motions yesterday. The motions were well thought out.

I realize that the hon. member is an abolitionist. It must have involved some considerable soul searching on his part to bring forth these amendments. However, Mr. Speaker, he is a concerned individual. He is concerned about the safety of citizens in this country as well as the safety of

police and prison guards. I am not satisfied that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and the government are concerned about the safety of this country.

I note with considerable interest some remarks that the Solicitor General is reported to have made to the John Howard Society in Ottawa on April 8 last. It is my understanding that he was asked whether the 25 year prison term was too harsh. Apparently his reply was to the effect that the object of the exercise was first to obtain the abolishment of capital punishment by providing the alternative of a life sentence, and the authorities would then work toward the reduction of that sentence once abolition had been achieved.

Mr. Allmand: That is not true.

Mr. Neil: I hope that after I have completed my remarks the Solicitor General will rise on a point of order or question of privilege to clarify his position.

Mr. Allmand: I will send you a copy of the speech.

Mr. Neil: I would welcome a copy of the speech.

● (1630)

I should also like to quote briefly from a report in the Hamilton *Spectator* of remarks made by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane). I assume it was after second reading of the bill that the hon. member was reported as saying:

> Now that we've passed this bill we can move on to produce a more effective law and order bill.

It seems that if those remarks that are attributed to both these individuals are correct, the Solicitor General and the government have been less than honest with the citizens of Canada. I think it is important that, if the Solicitor General has a plan to bring in amendments to the Criminal Code some time after this bill passes, he should make this information available to this House and the public.

I am a retentionist; I voted for retention in 1973, I voted for it again on second reading of this bill a short time ago, but I have no hesitation in supporting these amendments of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). From observing the vote that took place on second reading, while it was proclaimed to be a free vote, I realize it certainly was not a free vote on the other side of the House. There is no doubt in my mind that the same situation will exist when we reach third reading stage, and that the bill will probably pass. For that reason I think it is important that we make whatever improvements we can to this bill, and I see the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Oxford in that light. I shall vote for these amendments but, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the bill.

I listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) and I should like to compliment him on his presentation. He had the opportunity of travelling to various penitentiaries in Canada with a committee which observed at first hand the conditions that exist in the institutions, and he tabled a report afterwards. Two other reports were also tabled, one by the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin), who unfortunately is not with us to participate in the debate on capital punishment, but I should like to quote briefly from her report which began:

> It has been said time and again in the past that it was very difficult to "experience" the true climate of a penitentiary and understand all the pressures that seem to exist there.

Later she said:

> During the 15 visits we made to the various penitentiaries across the nation, we could not help but notice the great lack of activity that exists in nearly all of these institutions.

And further:

> Yet evidence that has been collected points to the fact that this inactivity and idleness are a constant problem and lie at the root of all penitentiary discontent and dissatisfaction.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) was also a member of the committee that toured the penitentiaries, and he had this to say:

> Though the committee travelled a great deal and discussed prison problems with a great many inmates, both staff and lay people, it is almost impossible to develop any kind of consensus about the obvious malaise in the system.

His report finished as follows:

> I would like to go on record as saying I am most unhappy with what we found generally. We continue to operate maximum security institutions that are a disgrace to any civilized country and the continuing excuses that we haven't got the land, we haven't got the money to replace these archaic dungeons such as Prince Albert and the B.C. Penitentiary, are just no longer acceptable.

What these reports point out, and what the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth was pointing out, is that penitentiaries are inhumane; that the individuals who are confined to them for a long period of time become vegetables, people who are almost impossible to deal with. Yet these people who are sent to prison for a long period of time are people who have committed the most heinous crime of murder and, in my opinion, are deserving of capital punishment, but to the mind of the hon. member for Oxford deserve life imprisonment with the option he proposes.

It has been suggested that to allow the individual who has been sentenced to life imprisonment the option of asking the state to take his life is in fact suicide. I disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that this option is in fact suicide. Suicide is the taking of one's own life. There is no question that the state has the right to take life under certain circumstances. Under these amendments the individual would not be taking his own life; he would be asking the state to take his life.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): A great distinction!

Mr. Neil: A life that he has forfeited by committing murder. Mr. Speaker, to me this is not suicide. I do not see either how such an amendment can lead to euthanasia.

Mr. Cafik: It is a subtle distinction not worth making.

Mr. Neil: Euthanasia is a different situation entirely; it involves taking the life of an innocent person. In the case of euthanasia I am certain there would be a long drawn out debate in this House, much longer than the debate that has taken place on capital punishment over the years. I do not agree with the argument of the previous speaker that by passing these particular motions we would be opening the door to euthanasia.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief comment on motion No. 38 which provides that the governor in council may by regulation establish a means other than hanging to effect or carry out the death penalty. It is unfortunate that during this debate and prior to the bill coming into the House the media used the symbol of the rope to try to encourage people to oppose the death penalty.

Retentionists, in the majority, are not asking that the death penalty be carried out by use of the rope. People are more humane than that. There are many, many ways that the death penalty could be effected in this day and age. It could be carried out by the administration of a drug or a rapid-acting poison in the food in some manner so that the individual would not know what had taken place. This is an amendment that all retentionists support, I think, and one that many abolitionists in the House should support, along with the other motions presented by the hon. member for Oxford.

● (1640)

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

Mr. Neil: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanbury: I asked the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) this same question. In expressing support for the death by choice, or suicide on demand, option, is the hon. member who has just spoken indicating that he would support the bill if that amendment were accepted by the House?

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question in the course of my speech. I indicated that I was a retentionist and I was concerned about the fact that the vote on third reading might go a certain way. I would therefore support this motion for the specific purpose of improving this particular bill. But having supported the motion and voted for it when it comes before the House for decision, I will vote against the bill regardless.

Mr. Stanbury: Then would the hon. member explain to the House how this option or choice would be operative if his preference is carried out and the bill is defeated? How could a convicted murderer who has been executed have the choice that the hon. member wants to give him?

Mr. Neil: I do not quite follow the hon. member's question. Is it that the person who had been executed would have the choice?

Mr. Stanbury: If I understand the hon. member who has just spoken correctly, he expresses support for the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Oxford that provides that a person convicted of murder may have the choice of either hanging or not hanging, or being poisoned or not poisoned, or being put away quietly or not. I wonder how, if the bill is defeated and capital punishment is imposed, this option would be available to convicted murderers who, under those circumstances, would have been executed.

Mr. Neil: I would hope that if the bill is defeated the government would bring in an amendment to the Criminal Code to provide a more humane method of execution.

Mr. Stanbury: I asked about the exercise of the option that the hon. member seems to support.

Mr. Neil: I support the motion which gives the option to the individual which presumably, if the motion passes and the bill passes, will be effective. If the bill does not pass, of course we are back to the old situation where there is capital punishment in the case of murders of policemen, prison guards, and prison officials. As I say, I hope if we do go back to the old system the government will see fit to bring in an amendment to change the method of capital punishment.

Mr. Stanbury: Then I take it that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I find it difficult to allow an interrogation of a speaker. Hon. members have the chance of getting together and I am sure they can do so outside the House.

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I will just take a few minutes of the House's time to say a few words on this particular set of amendments. First of all, I hope there is not one member of the House of Commons who does not admire the sincerity and conscientiousness of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), a medical doctor, in bringing forward this particular set of amendments. Certainly there should be no question or any nit-picking or quibbling with respect to the intention and the purpose behind the hon. member's amendments.

In case there is any member from Scarborough here today who may want to question me about my statements of support for the amendments, let me say quite bluntly that I had hoped that this whole bill would never be brought before the House. I had hoped we would not have to go through the exercise we are now going through, simply because I relied upon the undertaking and promise of the government made in 1973 that we would have another six year period of trial to see what effect the current law, had it been enforced, would have had in respect to criminal statistics in this country.

My purpose in speaking this afternoon is to indicate my support for these amendments. However, I have of course a qualification or condition in respect to my support. I hope that the bill is defeated, if not in its entirety certainly in some of the more critical and crucial clauses that are being dealt with on report stage. If that is not to be, then I wholeheartedly support the amendments put forward in such a sincere and conscientious manner by the hon. member for Oxford. I must admit that in saying this I think this is a second best approach, but nevertheless it is a better approach than anything I have yet heard from any member on the government side in regard to this question. This is why I am indicating my support for the amendments this afternoon. I do not intend to go through each one of them line by line; I think that has been properly done.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will not rule me out of order if I refer to one matter which was in order when the hon. member who moved these amendments spoke, and this is

the question of compensation for the dependants of the victims of homicide. When the Solicitor General spoke, both in committee and in the House, he attempted to brush off this problem. First of all he said that the matter of compensation was not really a matter he had anything to do with because it more properly came under the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford); and in any event even the Minister of Justice did not have that much to do with it because it was a matter of provincial responsibility.

Unfortunately it is a matter of provincial responsibility. I think that if the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice, and for that matter the whole of the ministry, got off their apathy some changes could be made in this regard. I think that the whole question of compensation for the victims of crime, especially compensation for the dependants of those who are murdered in this country, is a subject that should be discussed here at the national level.

I give the federal government some commendation in this matter since a slight contribution has been made by the government in respect to various provincial criminal injury compensation plans that exist across the country. I must say to you though, Sir, that the federal government had to be forced into taking that position. It was the provincial government of Ontario which in 1967 first came along with a compensation plan for the victims of crime and showed the way. They pioneered this field in this country, and it was only later, when the then federal government saw the wisdom of such a compensation plan, that the government got into it and changed a number of the then provincial statutes in this country to try to bring about more uniformity—I am not arguing with it—across the country for compensation for criminal injuries.

● (1650)

I think we would all agree that the various compensation plans which exist, administered at the provincial level and mainly paid for out of provincial taxpayers' funds, are simply not sufficient. I think this should be tied in with this whole package of Bill C-83 and Bill C-84, peace and security and capital punishment. If there is to be a package point of view, an over-view or a global view by the government in respect of this matter, one of the things it should address its mind to is the whole question of compensation to the dependants of murder victims. This really should be a federal responsibility. It is a very onerous financial yoke on the shoulders of the various provincial governments across the country, and the whole matter should really be handled by the federal government.

Certainly in most of the provinces there is now compensation for the dependants of murder victims, but this is a pretty piddling effort on the part of governments, provincial and federal. Because we are here dealing with a capital punishment provision and amendments to the Criminal Code, I must merely say to this particular minister that with his jurisdiction in respect of the Criminal Code and law enforcement agencies I do not see how he can escape or evade his responsibilities by not getting into this field as well, and at least exerting some pressure on his colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), so that this matter can be clarified and, hopefully, taken over by the federal government. At the very least the ratio of federal grants or contributions to the various provincial funds should be drastically increased.

I merely point out to hon. members that I have not been an advocate of capital punishment in this country based solely on economic grounds; by no means. I merely say this to you, that we are talking here about substituting life imprisonment, 25-year prison terms or 15-year prison terms, for capital punishment. I merely ask members of this House who are here this afternoon whether they have thought of the cost to the taxpayers that such prison terms entail? Are we really not crossing something somewhere along the line, and are we not being misguided in our efforts when we suggest the expending of huge amounts of taxpayers' funds looking after those who commit the crimes, when we contribute darn little to the dependants of the victims of those crimes?

I merely suggest that, if we want to get down to a dollars and cents approach, which I admit is not necessarily the right one, as hon. members vote in respect of these particular amendments and this bill in its entirety they should do just one thing—compare what it costs the taxpayers of this country to house and look after those who commit these crimes with what the government contributes in relation to compensation to the dependants of the victims of those very same crimes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on motion No. 4 in the name of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made yesterday, Tuesday, June 29, 1976, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. At the same time the divisions on motions Nos. 9, 18 and 38 stand deferred.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Those of us who have attempted to propose amendments at the report stage of this bill have been very appreciative of the hard work, the long hours, and the great efforts of the gentlemen at the Table as well as of the parliamentary counsel and other draftsmen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence: I must admit that motion No. 35, standing in my name, which I first submitted to the parliamentary draftsmen for submission to this House as an amendment at report stage, somehow or other got lost in the shuffle. At a very late hour yesterday morning, before the 12 noon deadline, I realized it had not been reprinted in the Order Paper. I therefore got after the parliamentary counsel who very hurriedly got to work and redrafted the matter, and it appears now as motion No. 35 standing in my name. On sober second thought the parliamentary draftsmen contacted me. As a result I find that the amendment is a bit long. There are parts of it which are quite redundant and unnecessary and should not be included, in the draftsmen's point of view. As well, there should be three small lines at the very beginning in relation to the heading. In no way does this change the operative words. With your permission, Sir, and with the unanimous consent of the House, I would seek to amend my motion No. 35 so that it would read:

That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by (a) adding immediately after line 17 at page 8 the following new clause 21:

"21. The heading preceding section 669 and section 669 of the said Act are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

'Sentence of Death

669. The sentence to be pronounced against a person who is sentenced to death shall be that he shall be executed by drug or gas for euthanasia'."

As you will see, that deletes three paragraphs in respect of the matter and adds three inconsequential lines at the very beginning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence). In looking at the suggested change it appears it is not a change in the substance of the amendment, but is merely putting things into order, and making the amendment much easier to fit into the bill. Is it agreed that the correction be made?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not object to the hon. member's request to reword his motion. After all, he did file it originally in time. However, I wonder if he does not mean "after line 18" instead of "after line 17"? But I rise mainly to re-assert the caveat I entered earlier today, namely that I should like to raise a point of order about Motion No. 35 as a whole. As for changing its wording in the Order Paper, I certainly give consent.

● (1700)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This means it would be after line 17 which comprises the words "in a probation order".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It should be after line 18.

Mr. Lawrence: It should be added immediately after line 18 on page 8. The hon. member is perfectly correct. I cannot count and the draftsman cannot count. That is the problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so agreed that the changes will be made accordingly.

The House will now proceed to the consideration of Motion No. 7.

Mr. Sharp: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that some of the members who would want to participate in the debate on this item and any others that might be called today would like to leave this afternoon. I feel members of the House would be very happy to accommodate them. We hope this is an example of the co-operation we will have in the future. Therefore, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion of the President of the Privy Council that we should call it six o'clock with unanimous consent at this time. I do so call it six o'clock and wish everyone in this House a very long, restful, and enjoyable weekend on the occasion of our national holiday.

This House stands adjourned until next Monday at 2 p.m.

At 5.03 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 5, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

SUGGESTION CANADA ALLOW TAIWAN TO PARTICIPATE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that on May 21, 1969 the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in a letter to the International Olympic Committee in support of Montreal's bid for the 1976 Summer Olympic Games, accepted on behalf of all Canadians, the responsibility of hosting the 1976 Summer Olympic Games in that city in accordance with IOC rules and regulations, supported by a further letter on November 28, 1969 from the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in view of the fact that Taiwan, as the republic of China, was and continues to be a full-fledged member of the IOC in good standing under its rules and regulations, and since this government, by interfering with normal and regular international Olympic procedures in attempting to break the precedents that have existed unhampered since Adolf Hitler's interference in 1936, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser):

That this House instruct the minister of external affairs to abide by the official letters of support of May 21, 1969 and November 28, 1969 and leave the handling of the rules and regulations, including participation, in the hands of the International Olympic Committee where they rightfully belong.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE STUDY OF DAIRY POLICY AND IMPORTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Since a great many dairy cattle have been sent to slaughterhouses in the last few weeks and that dairy producers suffer considerable losses of income owing to the dairy policy now in force since April 1976, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) and the whole House, I hope:

That this House give permission to the Standing Committee on Agriculture to meet immediately to consider in depth the dairy policy as well as the import of dairy products.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

• (1410)

[*English*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

SUGGESTION CANADA ABIDE BY RULES OF COMMITTEE DESIGNATING PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion similar to that proposed by the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek), and based on a feeling which exists throughout this country. I would move:

That the government of Canada abide by the original agreement made with the International Olympic Committee with respect to the designation by the IOC of countries participating in the Olympics and, in the case at issue, that participants from Taiwan, participate as representatives of the Republic of China National Olympic Committee, thus eliminating the charge by Lord Killanin that the image of the Olympics has been tarnished by Canadian government interference in the designation of who represents what, thus injecting politics into the Olympics.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTRY

POSSIBLE RESIGNATION OF MINISTER OF TRANSPORT IN VIEW OF CONFLICTING VIEWS ON AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister.

In view of the comments made during the weekend by the Minister of Communications accusing the government, and I quote:

"of falling on its knees before a bunch of fanatics"

... for having signed an agreement with CALPA and CATCA and also owing to the surprise publicly expressed by the Prime Minister on his return from Puerto Rico about the clause of the agreement promising a free vote in Parliament on the basic issue of bilingualism in the air-ground communications in Quebec, which is a barely veiled denunciation of the conduct of the Minister of Transport, is it to maintain, as he said himself, the cohesion of power that the Prime Minister has asked or intends to ask for the resignation of both the Minister of Communications and the Minister of Transport?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wagner: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question.

To follow up on his answer, could the Prime Minister tell the House whether he will thus allow his ministers to denounce the decisions of the cabinet of which they are members? In addition, could he expose to the House his own idea of ministerial solidarity?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants me to give him a lecture on political theory one day, I am at his disposal.

POSSIBLE RESIGNATION OF MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS IN VIEW OF CONFLICTING VIEWS ON AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary. I would not have thought the Prime Minister would have taken so easy a sidetrack.

I therefore put my question to the Minister of Communications and ask her whether, in the light of the well known principles of ministerial solidarity the Prime Minister choses to ignore today, she persists in accusing the government of having knelt before a bunch of fanatics? If so, does she intend to resign, thus imitating the courageous gesture of the hon. member for Langelier?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, several of us feel that the agreement is bad, but still the best possible we could conclude under the circumstances.

[Mr. Speaker.]

I said in my statement that we could not denounce collectively what one of our colleagues, in the normal exercise of his duties, had felt he should accept and that, consequently, we are of the opinion, with regard to that agreement, whatever we feel as far as solidarity with our colleague is concerned, that the agreement is not satisfactory in every way. We have to live with an agreement that is not perfect. We remain united behind our colleague who supported the agreement, but I still feel that, faced with a bunch of fanatics, we were forced to accept an agreement that will be difficult to live with, but which in no way calls in question again the policy of bilingualism within the federal government.

* * *

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF MINISTER'S LETTER TO QUEBEC AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I think this is an area where calm is required and less inflammation.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport because he, too, has injected an element of confusion into this. In his letter to Les Gens de l'Air he mentions it is only a matter for the commission to "explain why they should disregard" the arguments of CATCA and CALPA. Could the minister explain what he means by taking this anodyne approach especially when in the signed agreement with CATCA and CALPA it is a matter of "justifying beyond a reasonable doubt" why any contrary view expressed by those two organizations should not prevail? To most readers, the words "explain" and "justify beyond reasonable doubt" do not convey the same meaning.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the words used in my letter stand by themselves in terms of explaining how I view the contents of the agreement and, I think, how they are viewed by other participants. If one looks at the practical situation which will face the commission one can have a view of what in fact will be before them which allows those words to be understood. As a practical matter, the time the commission will be asked to judge as to the procedures and their safety is when, at the end of the difficult simulation work, a set of procedures has been devised and Transport Canada is prepared to certify those procedures as safe and ready for implementation. At that point the issue arises as to the judgment of the commission. The agreement deals with the potential argument which may exist then, and this is obviously hypothetical, by the two organizations which would disagree with the view being taken by Transport Canada. I think if members would look either at the letter or the agreement they will see that what is to be expected is a clear and forthright statement which impresses a reader of its import as to why the commission was able to certify safety notwithstanding different arguments. That could be put in one or two different ways. I have now put

it in a third way, and I hope the hon. member will be able to understand it.

TIMETABLE FOR SIMULATOR STUDIES IN VIEW OF LACK OF INTEREST BY PARTIES CONCERNED

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): In connection with this simulator study, I was wondering whether the minister has a revised timetable and how he can expect it will materialize when one of the interested parties has expressed an unwillingness to co-operate with him.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I have always remained optimistic that in the end we shall have the co-operation of the various parties concerned and I would invite all hon. members to join in that hope, too. The simulation exercise timetable has, without doubt, been affected somewhat by the preoccupation of a variety of people who might otherwise have been engaged in doing the work. This work will now go forward. We are seeking, and we expect, the co-operation of a whole variety of experts and knowledgeable people who can make this work a success as soon as possible.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

MEASURES TO ENABLE POOR PROVINCES TO MAINTAIN STANDARDS OF HEALTH CARE AND POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance concerning his meeting tomorrow with the ministers of finance of the various provinces. Since the federal government is proposing to replace the existing cost-sharing formula with a new one which will involve cash grants and increased tax points, and since new tax points on their own do not help those provinces with a small tax base, can the hon. gentleman tell us what further measures the federal government intends to take to ensure that the poorer provinces are able to maintain high standards of health care and post-secondary education?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): It was in recognition of the variation between the value of tax points in different provinces that we acknowledged that a continued cash payment would have to be made to a number of the provinces, those which, as the hon. member has indicated, do not have a broad tax base. The proposal is on a formula to be agreed upon that both cash and tax points would be made available to the provinces and that there would be an attempt by a transitional formula to bring them to an equal per capita level in the cash payment.

● (1420)

REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF REVENUE ACCRUING TO PROVINCES UNDER PROPOSAL

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, in respect of any one of the alternative proposals the government has put forward for the provinces to consider, could the minister tell the House whether his department has prepared an estimate on the share of revenue which would have gone to the provinces during the past five years on the assumption that they had implemented one of the proposals that the government is now putting forward for consideration in the future.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, some elaborate figures have been prepared which will be made available comparing the range of options from a total cash payment all the way through to a total transfer of tax points. This will be arranged over a period of years. As I say there is an elaborate preparation of figures which will be made available to the provinces.

REASON FOR RELATING PROPOSALS FOR HEALTH AND EDUCATION TO GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, since in all the proposals which are being considered, as I understand it, the federal government is basing its share particularly on financing of post-secondary education and health care on a relationship to the change in the gross national product, I should like to ask the minister, since there does not appear to me to be any connection at all between changing real needs in either education or health care, why the federal government has decided to pin both to changes in the GNP.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is founded first upon a recognition that these are established programs, the performance under which has now matured and is predictable. Examination of the payments, for example over the last five years, would indicate that the transfer to the provinces would average out at something less than the actual increase in the gross national product. The government of course is concerned that its obligations to pay, whether under this program or others, should be predictable and within the over-all cash resources of the government and in that sense, while the payments could reasonably be expected to increase as costs increase throughout the country, they should not by this agreement alone be escalated at an even greater rate. This does not rule out of course the possibility at a subsequent date of the government entering into subsequent negotiations with the provinces for example to add additional provisions in respect of health care which of course would then have to be added on to the arrangements presently being made for the established programs at the present time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REASON FOR RETREAT FROM APPLICATION OF BILINGUALISM TO AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

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

In view of the fact that in the last few days the government had a particular opportunity to give evidence of its firm belief in the bilingualism policy it has been advocating, could the minister explain to the House the cause of

that retreat in the application of bilingualism in such an important area as transport which is of interest to ever more Canadians across the country?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it abundantly clear before, but I am glad to do so again, that we are in no way taking a step away from our plan of bilingualism in our total government services. We indeed remain committed to the view that there is a need to provide bilingual air traffic services in the province of Quebec. We have taken certain specific steps to do so in areas where that could be done. In areas where there is a more complicated situation we were prepared to produce the procedures, having faced the difficulties and complications, and introduce bilingual air traffic service there. It is well known that a good deal of opposition to that movement did exist in certain quarters. That opposition tended to focus on the question of safety.

At all times we stated our view that safety had to be taken into consideration and that indeed we would do so. All we have done now is to re-emphasize, in ways which put beyond any doubt even for the most skeptical, that that is what we will do. But I repeated before the week end, and I repeat again now, that it is our intention, given the development of procedures which we are confident we can develop, to implement air traffic services in both languages in the province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY AS TO PROTESTS AGAINST APPLICATION OF BILINGUALISM TO AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary.

Could the minister tell the House whether, in addition to the protests he received from Quebec pilots and air controllers as well as from the provincial government, he in fact received other reasonable and logical protests from various associations of Quebec against that position taken by the federal government?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had an opportunity to determine what communications I have received. Most of the comments I have seen to date have been ones I have observed in the press rather than ones I had directly in my own hand, but I will be looking at these later today.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF ALLEGEDLY CONFLICTING VIEWS ON AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It has to do with an interview which he gave when he was returning from Puerto Rico. I have to read from the newspaper article in order to base my question. The Prime Minister said:

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

Agreements reached by air pilots, air traffic controllers and the government concerning the safety of bilingual air communication mark a victory for bilingualism in Canada.

While flying back, he went on to say that the agreements are: "as total a victory on paper as was needed". His next observation was:

I think the exaggeration and even hysteria which met the government's assertion at the outset had disappeared, otherwise the kind of settlement that we reached would not have been possible.

I ask the Prime Minister whether he changed his mind in view of the fact that apparently he has not been able to convince some of his ministers who have been outspoken. Is he still of the opinion that that agreement was one that achieved a level of bilingualism that caused him to become ecstatic in his statement that it was a victory for Canada? I would ask him to explain the difference between the viewpoint he expressed while unimpeded by divisions in the cabinet and the viewpoint he expressed subsequently and also in the letter of communication to the former minister of the environment.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The right hon. gentleman explained the context in which the interview was sought by the press on board the plane. He will have to remember that these were opinions which were given, as it were, on the "fly".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Fly or sly?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is flying around so much that one wonders whether his flying experience alters his viewpoint. I am simply asking: Is the observation that he made on June 29th that all was well and that these agreements were a great victory for bilingualism, still his view or has he changed this view since he came down to solid earth?

Mr. Trudeau: The answer is very simple. All sides of the House have approved the policy of bilingualism. They support it and they will make sure that the country accepts it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not an answer, that is simply a Machiavellian evasion. Has the Prime Minister of June 29 changed his mind since returning to solid earth in Ottawa, or is he still of the same impression that this was a great victory for bilingualism?

● (1430)

Mr. Trudeau: The House will recall that before the strike was settled, the country was rather unsettled. The opposition in particular was calling for an end to this strike. When the strike was ended, I would say that that was a victory for Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker: "For bilingualism" is what the Prime Minister said.

Mr. Trudeau: The victory for bilingualism is assured because it has the support of all parties in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The right hon. gentleman laughed at that statement. I hope he is not denying the fact that his party as well as ours supports the principle of bilingualism everywhere it can be applied.

Mr. Fraser: Why don't you answer the question?

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member for Vancouver South has a supplementary. He is bellowing as loudly as he can. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will not catch your eye when it comes to the end of my answer.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley.

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

Some hon. Members: Three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The standing orders under which we operate in the question period clearly require that the Chair has to hear at least a preliminary explanation of a point of order before determining whether it must be taken now or at three o'clock. That is the practice the Chair has followed since the implementation of the standing orders.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The loud and raucous interruptions from the government side indicate that I have touched a nerve.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I raise this matter as one who has always been deferential to the Chair without any exception.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is a strange coincidence, this is the fourth or fifth time when I have asked more than one supplementary question and that that was the end. Generally—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would be pleased to hear the right hon. gentleman at three o'clock. In fact, he asked two supplementaries.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

REASON CANADA REFUSING ENTRY TO TEAM FROM TAIWAN

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. According to the International Olympic Committee rules, and I quote:

> Free entry must be accorded to teams from all National Olympic Committees recognized by the International Olympic Committee.

The city of Montreal's bid document to the International Olympic Committee of May, 1970, which was accepted by the IOC, stated: "All necessary entry permits will be available to delegations from all the National Olympic Committees" recognized by the International Olympic Committee. This bid was supported by the Prime Minister of Canada, by the prime minister of Quebec and by the then secretary of state for external affairs. In view of these facts I would like to ask the minister if he could explain to this House his government's sudden, unprecedented political interference with regard to the International Olympic Committee, specifically regarding the Taiwanese Olympic team and the government's refusal to allow that team or any other team, for that matter, belonging to the IOC free entry to Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the first part of the question, namely, an alleged undertaking by the government of Canada to the International Olympic Committee to admit all participants to the games. I believe the basis for that allegation is a letter addressed by my predecessor to the IOC on November 28, 1969. The relevant portion of that brief letter reads as follows:

> I would like to assure you that all parties representing the National Olympic Committees and national sports federations recognized by the IOC will be free to enter Canada pursuant to the normal regulations. I should be pleased to provide any further information respecting these regulations should you desire it.

It is obvious from that literal quotation that the undertaking by the then secretary of state for external affairs was not an unqualified undertaking. At no point in giving such an undertaking did Canada undertake—

Mr. Fraser: That is utter fraud; that is not what the IOC believed.

Mr. MacEachen: —to relinquish its sovereignty to an international organization, no matter how respected that international organization may be.

Further, may I add that we had foreseen for some considerable time the difficulties which would be implied for the IOC and for the government of Canada in dealing with this particular question. We had hoped that the IOC would have taken steps itself to reconcile the difficulties it finds—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: —in having as a member of the IOC the Republic of China when the People's Republic of China and all the sports organizations of the People's Republic of China claim that Taiwan is improperly occupying its seat on the IOC. Those difficulties were present. We drew them to the attention of Lord Killanin more than a year ago and have subsequently drawn them to the attention of the officials of the IOC. It was only when no action had been taken by the IOC that we made it clear in late May, through the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, that we would apply a formula for the admission of athletes to Canada which would respect Canada's China policy.

Let us bear in mind that it is possible for the Taiwanese athletes to come to Canada, to be admitted and to participate in the games in precisely the same way they participated in the Olympic Games in 1960 in Rome under conditions and regulations which were approved by the

IOC. All we are asking is that they apply the same consideration to Canada which they applied to Italy in 1960.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jelinek: I thank the minister for his speech. No matter which way he tries to twist it around, the fact is that the government accepted the Montreal bid and is harming the Olympic idea more than any other organization in the world.

Some hon. Members: Right on!

Mr. Jelinek: I would like to ask the minister if he does not find it hypocritical to allow Taiwan to compete under one name and not another. In other words, we do not have diplomatic relations with Taiwan; does it make any more sense to allow its athletes to participate as Taiwanese when we do not recognize Taiwan anyway?

Mr. MacEachen: We are attempting to formulate and we have proposed successfully, I believe, a formula which would permit the participation of Taiwanese athletes at the Olympic Games in Montreal. That formula would provide for that and at the same time would respect Canada's China policy. That is what we have put forward. I ask why it is not possible for the IOC to apply precisely the same understanding to Canada which it provided earlier in the case of Italy when Taiwan came to those games and participated as representatives of Taiwan and not as representatives of the Republic of China.

● (1440)

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Perhaps he could clarify the situation.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Oh, no! Are you kidding?

An hon. Member: There goes your franchise.

Mr. Jelinek: The Prime Minister is the one who accepted the bid on behalf of all Canadians in this letter. I should like to ask whether he was aware at that time if not by precedents alone, that all decisions relating to the Olympic Games, including participation, is left in the hands of the International Olympic Committee and if he was aware of this fact why did the government not make its position and intentions known to the IOC at that time instead of waiting until the eleventh hour and harming not only Montreal but the whole Olympic ideal? Why the sudden flip-flop?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may not have been listening. The Secretary of State for External Affairs indicated quite clearly that there was no sudden flip-flop. This problem has been in discussion with the IOC for more than a year. They apparently have not seen fit in one way or another to solve this problem as of yet but they have indicated to the Secretary of State for External Affairs the very obvious answer. It is the one they themselves gave to Italy in 1960. I would be surprised if the other side of the House did not think that an acceptable answer for Italy, one which is known to all parties and which was known to Canada, could not reasonably have been presumed by Canada to be the answer that they would give to Canada. There was no problem as far as we were concerned because it had already been solved 16 years ago.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR ASYLUM BY CHILEAN REFUGEES IN ARGENTINA—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the news report last night that 27 Chilean exiles who took refuge in the Canadian Embassy in Argentina—as a result of a threat on their lives by right wing terrorists—have asked for political asylum, can the minister advise the House what action, if any, his department is undertaking to grant them this asylum?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation referred to by the hon. member. At the present time Canadian officials are holding discussions with the authorities in Argentina with a view to resolving this particular difficulty. We hope we can produce some results but I am not in a position to go beyond that at the moment.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

ENTRY OF CHILEAN EXILES—SUGGESTION NO LEGAL BARRIER BE RAISED

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration? Will the provisions in Bill C-85, which is now the law, be used to prevent these Chilean exiles from immigrating to Canada even though they have not committed crimes as defined in Canadian law?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I shall have to take that question as notice and explore the legal implications before giving an answer.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RESCUE OF HOSTAGES BY ISRAEL—POSSIBILITY OF MESSAGE OF CONGRATULATION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government sent a message to the government of Israel congratulating that country on the daring rescue of hostages yesterday morning, thereby demonstrating that initiative and courage can successfully defeat terrorism? If so, would the minister announce what the message was?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon.

member, may I say that I have not yet sent a message to the foreign minister of Israel. I did receive a letter from him which was given to me late this morning, and I hope to reply to him as soon as possible. I should like to say in reply to the hon. member that the action taken by Israel in securing the release of the hostages was certainly a remarkable feat, well executed and responded to the widespread concern felt by Canadians that the lives of the hostages be spared. It was the first serious setback of international terrorism and as such will be widely applauded.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I should add in completing the answer for the hon. member that I understand the matter will be before the Security Council of the United Nations, and it will be possible to study further the implications of these events under international law.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGATION INVESTIGATION OF ILLEGAL ENTRY INTO QUEBEC NEWSPAPER OFFICE CONDUCTED BY MEMBERS OF FORCE WHO PARTICIPATED

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Solicitor General regarding the apparently illegal entry by the RCMP and other police into the premises of the Quebec newspaper L'Agence de presse libre du Québec a matter which concerns many members? Can the Solicitor General confirm reports that Messrs. Don Cobb and Francis (Frank) D'Entrement who have been investigating this apparently illegal break-in were at the relevant time when it occurred responsible, at least in part for its occurrence? If so, is this not a rather startling departure in investigative technique?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the matter is being investigated by the Quebec solicitor general and his officials, not by the RCMP.

Mr. Trudeau: It is no worse than your private detectives.

KNOWLEDGE OF HEADQUARTERS OF ILLEGAL ENTRY INTO QUEBEC NEWSPAPER OFFICE BY MEMBERS OF FORCE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Solicitor General look into the matter again to make certain he is fully briefed, and report whether similar incidents have occurred and whether in fact in this case headquarters knew in advance before this operation occurred?

Mr. Trudeau: How do private detectives proceed?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): They work better than yours.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have a report that headquarters was not advised in advance of that raid and I gave that information to the House before.

PUBLIC SERVICE

RECEIPT BY CLERK OF PRIVY COUNCIL OF HOUSING SUBSIDY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Could he advise the House whether he has been in contact with the Ontario housing corporation to discuss whether the Clerk of the Privy Council acted in good faith with regard to his receipt of an OHC subsidy?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. I am satisfied there was good faith in that particular case.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs? Will the minister inform the House if he has sought the advice of the obviously experienced Clerk of the Privy Council with regard to the department's inquiries into land speculation?

An hon. Member: He was in the air, too.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

REASON FOR PEREMPTORY RETURN TO JAPAN OF MR. HAMADA

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It arises out of the story in Friday's *Globe and Mail* that brings back some haunting memories of wartime years and Canadian attitudes. Would the minister examine the peremptory treatment accorded to a Mr. Masaya Hamada who arrived in Toronto from Japan with a visitor's visa, a return ticket to Japan and $1,200 in cash but who was returned immediately without a hearing and without legal advice and under threat of deportation?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hamada is a citizen of Japan. He came to Canada from the United States on June 29 and, at an immigration examination, indicated to the interviewing officer that he was coming to join his fiancée to marry her and remain here permanently. It turned out that his fiancée was already married and had not been divorced, therefore that suggestion was impossible to fulfil. Further evidence indicated that he was not in fact a bona fide visitor and under the regulations he was requested to return to Japan.

Mr. Fraser: Why did you not give him legal aid?

Mr. Johnston: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Considering that Mr. Hamada travelled some 10,000 miles to reach Toronto and was returned at his own expense when his expected visit was so abruptly ended, could the

office in Tokyo which issued the visa be instructed to warn potential visitors of the treatment that could be theirs on arrival in Canada, considering the extreme difficulties that arise in connection with language, and considering that Mr. Hamada had done nothing illegal and that his papers were in order?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I will check and double check this, but I doubt very much if Mr. Hamada was in fact issued a visa in Japan. Had he been issued a visa in Japan he would have been entitled to appeal under the Immigration Appeal Board Act. I would take that as prima facie evidence that he did not in fact have a visa issued in Japan.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

REASON MR. MARCOUX ALLOWED IN HALFWAY HOUSE WHEN AREA RESIDENTS TOLD NO SEX OFFENDERS ALLOWED

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General concerning a murder that took place in British Columbia on the weekend. I wonder if the Solicitor General can tell us why Mr. Marcoux, the man who has been charged with that murder, was allowed to stay in a halfway house when the people in that area had been guaranteed that there would be no people in that house with previous sexual offence records or rape records?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, that individual had completed his sentence and was under mandatory supervision. He was not out on parole and therefore we had no control over him. The halfway house in question was a private halfway house.

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Solicitor General told us that the man had completed his mandatory parole. I understand he does not complete it for a short while yet and that he was still under mandatory parole. Can the Solicitor General tell us whether that individual is under suspicion in two or three other murders that have taken place in the same area?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, there was some misunderstanding. I said that he had completed his sentence in prison and was on mandatory supervision. He was not out on parole. I have no information that he is suspected of other offences.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TREATMENT OF ATHLETES FROM TAIWAN ATTENDING OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is he in a position to tell the House if the athletes from the Republic of China coming to Canada to participate in the Olympics will be accorded exactly the same treatment as athletes coming from other countries in so far as their entry into Canada to participate in the games is concerned?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I missed the last few words of the hon. member's question.

● (1450)

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, I asked if the athletes who come to Canada from the Republic of China to participate in the Olympic Games will be accorded exactly the same rights with regard to entry into Canada to participate in the games as athletes from other countries who will be participating in the games.

Mr. MacEachen: Provided they come as representatives of Taiwan, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

* * *

FINANCE

NEW MONEY GROWTH TARGETS—DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. As the government has now been successful in restraining the growth in the money supply, that is M-1, to an annual increase of close to 10 per cent, about twice the increase to be found in the United States, and noting that the Governor of the Bank of Canada stated in Fredericton that lower targets will soon be appropriate, can the minister tell the House what these new money growth targets will be and when they will come into effect?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, these would be announced by the Bank of Canada in carrying out its responsibilities for monetary policy. From a conversation with the Governor, I know he has it in contemplation at the moment, but I do not have a precise indication from him as to when he proposes to announce the change.

INFLATIONARY EFFECT OF GROWTH IN PRIVATELY-HELD DEPOSITS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): While the government has finally held the growth of currency and demand deposits, M-1, to 10.4 per cent for the year ended May 1976, we note that other measures of money supply, such as currency and privately held deposits, M-2, are increasing at nearly double that rate, about 20 per cent. Can the minister tell the House whether he considers the continued rapid expansion of M-2 or M-3 to be inflationary, and whether he or the Governor propose to set growth targets for these measures of money as well?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Governor has often said that he considers M-1 as the best indicator of growth of the money supply.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BOARD'S GUIDELINES AND NEGOTIATED SALARY AWARDS—EFFECT ON PERSONNEL OF SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the guidelines established by the Anti-Inflation Board which generally limit increases in higher incomes to $2,400 per year, applying for example to senior administrative personnel of school boards, and in view of the fact that this limitation does not apply to comparable incomes where increases of up to $5,000 have been negotiated through a collective agreement, such as for secondary school principals, and, further, since this in some cases reverses the historical pattern and differential which has existed between these senior employees of school boards, does the minister agree that this anomalous situation should be rectified?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, provision has been made in the guidelines for an increase above and beyond the arithmetic guidelines in certain cases where a historical relationship has been established. This applies to all parties negotiating under collective bargaining agreements. The hon. member knows, for example, that in the case of a number of Ontario school boards, the Anti-Inflation Board has, on the basis of historical relationship, permitted increases in excess of the guidelines. Under the circumstances, I would accept the judgment of the board which is exercising its authority in that regard.

Mr. Halliday: Since this conflict in the regulations severely disrupts the smooth administrative functioning of large organizations, such as school boards, where levels of position of authority and responsibility carry with them corresponding differentials in remuneration, would the minister agree that it would be appropriate that an application for appeal be made, and could he assure us that the appeal hearing would be granted?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for also giving me notice of the supplementary. The Anti-Inflation Act provides for an appeal procedure now. It would be possible for an interested party to make an application for an order to the administrator and subsequently to the appeals tribunal. In that sense, there would be no impediment to an interested party making such an appeal.

* * *

FINANCE

EFFECT OF CAPITAL GAINS TAX ON FARMERS CONSOLIDATING THEIR HOLDINGS BY SELLING CERTAIN PARCELS OF LAND

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Finance. Does the minister consider it fair and equitable that farmers who wish to sell a distant parcel of land in order to consolidate their farms with closer parcels, must first pay a capital gains tax on the distant sale? Will the minister give consideration to changing that aspect of the capital gains tax?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his courtesy in discussing this with me. I, in turn, discussed it with my officials. There are some difficulties of comparison in this regard with respect to selling and repurchasing farm land as compared to selling and repurchasing other kinds of property. At the moment, I have not been able to find an effective means of dealing with this particular situation. However, by the hon. member's question, I have been alerted to the problem. I will attempt to seek a solution that will be equitable to all concerned.

* * *

NATIONAL GALLERY

ACQUISITION OF ROOM PAINTED WITH MURALS AT KARSDALE, NOVA SCOTIA—REQUEST THAT IT REMAIN IN NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State who represents the constituency involved. I have given verbal notice to the hon. lady. Because of the public interest aroused in a lately recognized public treasure, the room painted with murals, some over one and a half centuries ago, in Karsdale, Nova Scotia, recently acquired by the National Gallery, may I ask that the National Gallery carry out its intention to restore same and then give a permanent home to the same in the federally owned Habitation at Annapolis Royal where it may be seen by more than 190,000 visitors a year? In other words, I am asking that the National Gallery decentralize a bit.

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for giving me notice. I appreciate this room is in my constituency. However, a lot of representations have been made to the Secretary of State by private individuals, non-government officials as well as myself. It is the intention of the National Gallery to restore the paintings and bring this display to Ottawa where it will have the proper temperature and humidity in a room devoted to a maritime display. However, the concerns of the local people, as the hon. member will know, have only arisen within the past month, since the National Gallery started to work on the painting. These concerns have been brought to the attention of the National Gallery.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTRY

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT—PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Considering the resignation of the Minister of the Environment and the underrepresentation within cabinet of members from eastern Quebec where the problem of the environment is a major concern, can the Prime Minister clarify the status of this position and tell us whether he is seriously considering the appointment of a member from

eastern Canada, particularly from eastern Quebec, to hold this very important position in the Department of the Environment?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member knows that under an order in council there is an acting deputy minister and an acting deputy minister to the acting deputy minister. Thus, the position is not vacant now.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

NEGOTIATIONS WITH PROVINCE ON POLLUTION STANDARDS FOR LOWER FRASER RIVER—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State (Fisheries). It concerns the lower Fraser River. It was reported last night that negotiations are underway between the federal government and the provincial government concerning pollution standards for the lower Fraser River. If these negotiations are taking place, will the minister advise at what level they are taking place? Are they now active?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, in my temporary responsibility for environment, I have not had a chance to look at the file. I know the minister of the environment for British Columbia and I had an exchange of views some weeks ago, in fact in May, on the question of pollution of the lower Fraser River because of its impact on fisheries. However, I will take the hon. member's question as notice and reply to him later.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Canada Water Act, Section 16, the minister has authority to enter into an agreement with the provincial government to declare the lower Fraser as a water quality management area. Will the minister advise if the government is proposing that the lower Fraser become a water quality management area so that we can control pollution in co-operation with the provincial government?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, the question is too important for me to answer without first checking the facts very carefully.

● (1500)

* * *

FINANCE

REASON FOR REFUSAL OF FIFTY AND ONE HUNDRED DOLLAR BILLS BY PARLIAMENTARY CASHIERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance; it concerns the use of $50 and $100 bills in Canada, and I believe it goes to the root of our system of currency. Last July I raised this matter with the then minister of finance when I discovered that certain cashiers on Parliament Hill, along with others in other places of business, were refusing to accept $50 and $100 bills. The minister explained that the design then current was too easy to counterfeit and stated that a new design was to be introduced. In view of the fact that the new bills have now been in circulation for some time, would the hon. gentleman tell us why they are being refused by cashiers on Parliament Hill unless they are accompanied by the signatures and addresses of whoever presents them? In short, I ask the minister to explain how the government expects our system of currency to operate when the House of Commons itself refuses to accept currency which is marked "legal tender"?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I should like to take that question under advisement and consider it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you caught the observation which was made by the Prime Minister following my endeavour to elucidate what he meant when he said certain things which are reported in the Canadian press. One of the great difficulties of being the Speaker is that there appears to be an iron-clad rule that only two supplementary questions can be permitted. A minister can simply evade a question and not answer; he is not required to answer. But, certainly, one of the first rules, and this is so in the mother of parliaments, is that when a minister finds himself in difficulty, that is not the proper time to say: No more questions.

I do not know whether you caught the observation of the Prime Minister when someone rose to ask a question—I do not know whether he was referring to me or to the one who rose to ask a further supplementary question. The Prime Minister said, in effect, Mr. Speaker, I hope you do not recognize him.

I hope you will look into the record, for I feel sure that any observation such as that—and there is no question that it was made—indicates an attitude to parliament and to Your Honour which is contrary to parliamentary practice and responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: Order. My recollection of the phrase which was used was that there was another phrase added to it, in other words the hope was expressed that the Chair would not recognize the hon. member for Vancouver South until the Prime Minister had finished his answer. I believe that was the purport of it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have no need of explanation not in accordance with the facts which apparently the Prime Minister is now prepared to make, as is not an unusual thing for him to do.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, you could, of course, check the blues, but as far as I can quote myself at an hour's distance, the hon. member for Vancouver South was bellowing loudly at me and I suggested that you should not catch his eye, not that he should not catch yours.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following 133 questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,255 to 4,300, inclusive; 4,333 to 4,355, inclusive; 4,473 to 4,480, inclusive; 4,497 to 4,504, inclusive; 4,518 to 4,530, inclusive; 4,803 to 4,810, inclusive; 4,819 to 4,826, inclusive; 4,855 to 4,868, inclusive; 5,372, 5,455, 5,696, 5,730, 5,747 and 5,772.

[*Text*]

[*Editor's Note: The following answer applies to Questions Nos. 4,255 to 4,300 inclusive and 4,333 to 4,355 inclusive.*]

PENITENTIARIES—ATTEMPTED ESCAPES, SELF MUTILATION AND SUICIDES

Question No. 4,255—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Question No. 4,256—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Question No. 4,257—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Question No. 4,258—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Millhaven Institution?

Question No. 4,259—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at LeClerc?

Question No. 4,260—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Saskatchewan Penitentiary?

Question No. 4,261—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Cowansville?

Question No. 4,262—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Ste. Anne des Plaines?

Question No. 4,263—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Archambault?

Question No. 4,264—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Frontenac Institution?

Question No. 4,265—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Rockwood Institution?

Question No. 4,266—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Stony Mountain Institution?

Question No. 4,267—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Joyceville?

Question No. 4,268—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Montée St. Francis?

Question No. 4,269—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Beaver Creek Correctional Camp?

Question No. 4,270—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Pittsburg Institution?

Question No. 4,271—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Quebec Federal Training Centre?

Question No. 4,272—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Collins Bay Institution?

Question No. 4,273—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Warkworth Institution?

Question No. 4,274—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Bath Institution?

Question No. 4,275—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Saskatchewan Farm Annex?

Question No. 4,276—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Landry Crossing Correctional Camp?

Question No. 4,277—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Osborne Centre?

Question No. 4,278—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Ontario Pre-release Hostel?

Question No. 4,279—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,280—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,281—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,282—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Millhaven Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Order Paper Questions

Question No. 4,283—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at LeClerc and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,284—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Saskatchewan Penitentiary and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,285—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Cowansville and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,286—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Ste. Anne des Plaines and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,287—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Archambault and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,288—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Frontenac Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,289—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Rockwood Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,290—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Stony Mountain Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,291—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Joyceville Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,292—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Montée St. Francis and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,293—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Beaver Creek Correctional Camp and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,294—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Pittsburg Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,295—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Quebec Federal Training Centre and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,296—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Collins Bay Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,297—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Warkworth Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,298—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Bath Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

Question No. 4,299—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Saskatchewan Farm Annex and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,300—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Landry Crossing Correctional Camp and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,333—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Question No. 4,334—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Question No. 4,335—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Question No. 4,336—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Millhaven Institution?

Question No. 4,337—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at LeClerc?

Question No. 4,338—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Saskatchewan Penitentiary?

Question No. 4,339—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Cowansville?

Question No. 4,340—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Ste. Anne des Plaines?

Question No. 4,341—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Archambault?

Question No. 4,342—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Frontenac Institution?

Question No. 4,343—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Stony Mountain Institution?

Question No. 4,344—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Joyceville Institution?

Question No. 4,345—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Montée St. Francis?

Question No. 4,346—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Beaver Creek Correctional Camp?

Question No. 4,347—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Pittsburg Institution?

Question No. 4,348—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Quebec Federal Training Centre?

Question No. 4,349—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Collins Bay Institution?

Question No. 4,350—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Warkworth Institution?

Question No. 4,351—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Bath Institution?

Question No. 4,352—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Saskatchewan Farm Annex?

Question No. 4,353—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Landry Crossing Correctional Camp?

Question No. 4,354—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Osborne Centre?

Question No. 4,355—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Ontario Pre-release Hostel?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): By written communication dated May 3, 1976, the Solicitor General informed the hon. member that, because the required information was not currently available through the computerized inmate statistical information system, approximately 30,000 files (some active and some dormant) would have to be examined in various locations across Canada and reports compiled and coordinated at one central point in Ottawa. The Ministry of the Solicitor General does not have the additional staff available to engage in this research for an indeterminate number of months nor does it have the required funds for such a mammoth undertaking.

[*Editor's Note: The following answer applies to Questions Nos. 4,473 to 4,480 inclusive, 4,497 to 4,504 inclusive, and 4,518 to 4,530 inclusive.*]

PENITENTIARIES—ATTEMPTED ESCAPES, SELF MUTILATION AND SUICIDES

Question No. 4,473—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Dorchester Penitentiary?

Question No. 4,474—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Laval?

Question No. 4,475—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Ontario Prison for Women?

Question No. 4,476—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Dungarvon?

Question No. 4,477—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Springhill?

Question No. 4,478—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Westmoreland?

Question No. 4,479—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Ontario Regional Reception Centre?

Question No. 4,480—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Quebec Regional Reception Centre?

Question No. 4,497—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Dorchester Penitentiary and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,498—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Laval and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,499—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Ontario Prison for Women and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,500—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Dungarvon and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,501—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Springhill and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,502—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Westmoreland and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,503—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Ontario Regional Reception Centre and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,504—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Quebec Regional Reception Centre and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,518—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Dorchester Penitentiary?

Question No. 4,519—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Carlton Centre?

Question No. 4,520—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Portsmouth Centre?

Question No. 4,521—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Montgomery Centre?

Question No. 4,522—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at St. Hubert Centre?

Question No. 4,523—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Parrtown Centre?

Order Paper Questions

Question No. 4,524—Mr. MacKay:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Laval?

Question No. 4,525—Mr. MacKay:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Ontario Prison for Women?

Question No. 4,526—Mr. MacKay:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Dungarvon?

Question No. 4,527—Mr. MacKay:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Springhill?

Question No. 4,528—Mr. MacKay:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Westmoreland?

Question No. 4,529—Mr. MacKay:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Ontario Regional Reception Centre?

Question No. 4,530—Mr. MacKay:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Quebec Regional Reception Centre?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): By written communication dated May 3, 1976, the Solicitor General informed the hon. member that, because the required information was not currently available through the computerized inmate statistical information system, approximately 30,000 files (some active and some dormant) would have to be examined in various locations across Canada and reports compiled and coordinated at one central point in Ottawa. The Ministry of the Solicitor General does not have the additional staff available to engage in this research for an indeterminate number of months nor does it have the required funds for such a mammoth undertaking.

[Editor's Note: The following answer applies to Questions Nos. 4,803 to 4,810 inclusive, 4,819 to 4,826 inclusive, and 4,855 to 4,868 inclusive.]

PENITENTIARIES—ATTEMPTED ESCAPES, SELF MUTILATION AND SUICIDES

Question No. 4,803—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Ferndale and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,804—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Matsqui and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,805—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Mountain Institution and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,806—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Agassiz Correctional Camp and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

[Mr. MacKay.]

Question No. 4,807—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Williams Head and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,808—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Bowden and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,809—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at Drumheller and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,810—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of self-mutilations at British Columbia Penitentiary and how many resulted in the death of an inmate?

Question No. 4,819—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Ferndale?

Question No. 4,820—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Matsqui?

Question No. 4,821—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Mountain Institution?

Question No. 4,822—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Agassiz Correctional Camp?

Question No. 4,823—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Williams Head?

Question No. 4,824—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Bowden?

Question No. 4,825—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at Drumheller?

Question No. 4,826—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted escapes at British Columbia Penitentiary?

Question No. 4,855—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Ferndale?

Question No. 4,856—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Matsqui?

Question No. 4,857—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Mountain Institution?

Question No. 4,858—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Agassiz Correctional Camp?

Question No. 4,859—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Williams Head?

Question No. 4,860—Mr. Reynolds:

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Bowden?

Question No. 4,861—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Drumheller?

Question No. 4,862—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at British Columbia Penitentiary?

Question No. 4,863—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Pandora Centre?

Question No. 4,864—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Grierson Centre?

Question No. 4,865—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Oskana Centre?

Question No. 4,866—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Altadore Centre?

Question No. 4,867—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Scarboro Centre?

Question No. 4,868—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of attempted suicides at Burrard Centre?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): By written communication dated May 3, 1976, the Solicitor General informed the hon. member that, because the required information was not currently available through the computerized inmate statistical information system, approximately 30,000 files (some active and some dormant) would have to be examined in various locations across Canada and reports compiled and coordinated at one central point in Ottawa. The Ministry of the Solicitor General does not have the additional staff available to engage in this research for an indeterminate number of months nor does it have the required funds for such a mammoth undertaking.

CONTRACTS WITH CANADIAN VICKERS LTD.

Question No. 5,372—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. Did the Department of National Defence have any contracts or business dealings with Canadian Vickers Limited of 5000 Notre Dame Boulevard East, Montreal, Quebec during the period from 1963 to 1975 inclusive and, if so, in each case, what was the amount of money involved and were tenders called?

2. If tenders were (a) called, did Canadian Vickers submit the lowest tender (b) not called, what was the reason?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Records prior to the Fiscal Year 1970-71 are not available. In order to limit research resources required to provide the information requested only contract over $10,000 are included. 1. Following is a list of contracts over $10,000 awarded to Canadian Vickers Limited of 5000 Notre Dame Boulevard East, Montreal, Quebec, by the Department of Supply and Services (Marine and Industrial Machinery Products Centre) on behalf of the Department of National Defence during the period Fiscal Year 1970-71 to 1975-76. *Denotes tenders were not called.

Order Paper Questions

2. (a) In all cases where tenders were called Canadian Vickers submitted the lowest or only tender or only responsible (**) tender. (b) In those cases where tenders were not called the reasons are: *1, 2, 3, 5 and 7. Only firm with personnel available in quantity and classification and facilities capable of providing the required technical services in respect of the Canadian Forces Shipbuilding, Conversion and Maintenance Programs. *4. Only firm with a Planer capable of doing the job. *6. Canadian Vickers had proprietary rights to the items being purchased. *8. On completion of the refit of the *Margaree* at Canadian Vickers in February 1976, the vessel, while being towed to Halifax (vessel unable to operate in ice), sustained damage and was returned to the shipyard to affect repairs. *9. The *Riverton*, one of the tugs towing the *Margaree*, needed emergency propulsion repairs. It was considered prudent to have the work done by Canadian Vickers, so the tug crew could use the *Margaree* as a base for messing and sleeping and to augment security and fire protection crew.

Contracts Over $10,000. Awarded to Canadian Vickers Limited by the Department of Supply and Services on Behalf of the Department of National Defence

Contract Date	Brief Description	Contract Value
	1970-71	
08-05-70	Refit *Margaree*	$ 455,814.
28-08-70	Naval Central Design Office	539,395. *1.
	1971-72	
17-08-71	Naval Central Design Office	269,509. *2.
26-07-71	Refit and Docking *Fraser*	1,060,081.
23-08-71	Docking *Preserver*	39,457.
23-09-71	Working Drawings DDH-280	1,090,000. *3.
15-03-72	Planing Gun Mount Ring DDE-257	14,565. *4.
	1972-73	
15-06-72	Refit and Docking *Nipigon*	1,118,715.
02-01-73	Refit and Docking *Assiniboine*	1,945,952.
14-07-72	Naval Ship Design Agency	3,380,250. **
	1973-74	
06-07-73	Refit and Docking *Skeena*	2,027,554.
15-11-73	Refit and Docking *Protector*	1,828,219.
26-09-73	Depth Sonar Handling Gear *Skeena*	17,184.
	1974-75	
15-01-75	Refit and Docking four Destroyers	14,000,000.
26-09-74	Hydraulic Cylinder Assembly	22,548.
20-01-75	Parts for Steering Gears	14,614.
21-01-75	Spare Parts	11,178.
12-09-74	Diving Chamber	511,850.
15-04-74	Naval Ship Design Agency	1,655,000. *5.
21-06-74	Hose Assembly, Hose Assembly Flexible, Pivot Arm Bushing for AN/SQA 501 Sonobuoy	14,738. *6.
	1975-76	
08-05-75	Naval Ship Design Agency	5,850,000. *7.
10-03-76	Emergency Repairs *Margaree*	380,549. *8.
09-03-76	Emergency Repairs *Riverton*	16,269. *9.

Order Paper Questions

CMHC—ANNUAL REPORT

Question No. 5,445—**Mr. Jelinek:**

1. How many copies of the Annual Report of CMHC were printed in (a) 1972 (b) 1973 (c) 1974 (d) 1975?

2. For each year, what was the cost of (a) printing (b) mailing and distribution?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Acting Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows: 1. The following is the number of copies of the Annual Report of CMHC printed in each of the years 1972 to 1975:

Year	Number of copies
1972	10,200
1973	12,301
1974	12,125
1975	15,707

2. Provision is made each year in the Administrative Budget of CMHC for the costs of printing and distributing its Annual Report. The Administrative Budget is the responsibility of the President and the Board of Directors and it is not the policy to disclose details of internal administration.

PHYSICAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Question No. 5,696—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. How much of the Physical Resources Development Programme monies has been spent to date?

2. In what areas have these sums been allocated and to whom were they given?

3. If it is intended to expend further funds under the Programme, will consideration be given to the merit of providing assistance to a facility in British Columbia, specifically the Centennial Stadium track replacement in Victoria?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Nil.

2. Nil.

3. The submission for financial assistance for the Centennial Stadium track at the University of Victoria was reviewed under the Physical Resources Development Program. This proposal was not recommended for approval and the University was so advised.

MR. GUY COUSINEAU

Question No. 5,730—**Mr. Scott:**

1. What will be the salary of Mr. Guy Cousineau in his new position as Special Advisor to the President of the Treasury Board for matters related to the creation of Loto Canada?

[Mr. Goyer.]

2. What was Mr. Cousineau's salary in his former position as Chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): 1. As Special Advisor to the President of the Treasury Board, Mr. Cousineau is paid in the Deputy Minister I salary range, the minimum of which is $41,000 and the maximum $54,000.

2. As Chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, Mr. Cousineau was paid in the same Deputy Minister I salary range.

DURHAM MEMORIAL HOSPITAL—MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Question No. 5,747—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Has any request been received from the Government of Ontario for permission to amend the Memorandum of Agreement dated March 3, 1958, between the federal and Ontario governments as the agreement relates to Durham Memorial Hospital?

2. Does the government consider the agreement still valid and binding on both parties?

3. Would the closure of Durham Memorial Hospital be affected in any way by the Memorandum of Agreement?

4. Has the government made any representations whatsoever respecting the future of hospitals in Ontario threatened with closing and, if so, what is the nature of these representations?

5. What is the government's contribution to the operation of hospitals in Ontario (a) in dollars (b) as a percentage of the total cost?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. No.

2. Yes.

3. The closure of Durham Memorial Hospital will not in itself affect the Memorandum of Agreement. However, should provincial payments to the hospital cease, this would affect the amount of the federal contribution payable to Ontario under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

4. No.

5. The Federal Government's contribution to the operation of hospitals in Ontario for the calendar year 1973 was (a) $521,272,098. (b) 49.7 per cent of the total shareable cost in Ontario.

PERSONAL FEDERAL INCOME TAX BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY

Question No. 5,772—**Mr. Schumacher:**

By province and territory, how much personal federal income tax was paid in the year (a) 1971 (b) 1972 (c) 1973 (d) 1974 (e) 1975 (f) 1976 to date?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): (a) 1971—See *Taxation Statistics,* 1973 edition—Table 5; (b) 1972—See *Taxation Statistics,* 1974 edition—Table 5; (c) 1973—See *Taxation Statistics,* 1975 edition—Table 5; (d) 1974—See *Preliminary Taxation Statistics,* 1976 edition—

Table D. Data pertaining to parts (e) and (f) are not available.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,252 could be made an order for return, this return could be tabled immediately.

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

[*Text*]

EXPANSION OF RAIL PASSENGER NETWORK

Question No. 5,252—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Did the Department of Transport indicate in 1974 that an expansion or revision to Canada's rail passenger network would be made and, if so, what steps have been taken in this regard?

2. Have steps been taken to urge railway companies to improve and revive the vital role of trains in a balanced integrated transportation network and, if so, what are they?

3. Does the government and the provincial governments, either directly or indirectly, contribute to building and maintaining railway rights-of-way, terminals, railway buildings and structures, rolling stock and other services and, if so, in each case (a) in what amounts (b) what are the details for the years 1965 to 1975?

4. Does the government and the provincial governments, either directly or indirectly, pay for building and maintaining airports, meteorological and navigational services, roads, bridges, dock construction, snow clearing, harbour dredging, etc. in order to provide services for air carriers, bus companies and shipping firms and, if so, in each case, in what amounts?

5. Has any study been made to show the tremendous advantage of train and railway transportation over other modes of transportation in land and land use, energy and energy conservation, pollution, capacity, comfort, safety, etc.?

6. Has any study and consideration been given of adopting, in Canada, the inter-modal concept of transportation that has been accepted in Europe and the United States whereby high speed inter-city trains are given an important role in a balanced transportation system?

7. Does the Department of Transport adopt in its purported transportation policy a view that rationalizes an obvious anti-rail bias and, if so, for what reason?

8. What procedures and methods has the Department of Transport employed to encourage the use of mass transportation or mass transit?

9. Has consideration and study been given to subsidization by the government to promote more mass transportation systems in order to give economical and logical answers to energy conservation, the reduction of pollution, free choked city streets, the reduction of parking problems and the protection of the general health and economy of citizens?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Wednesday, June 30, consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Reynolds: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was just looking at the way in which the motions have been set out. Motion No.7, with which we are dealing today, has already been proposed by one member and the allocation of speaking time is quite clear under Standing Order 75(9). My point is this: where Your Honour has grouped two motions, or three or four motions together, could we get a ruling from you as to what the allocated time would be? For example, the next motions to come before us are, I believe, Nos. 10 and 11 in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) and myself. Will we be allowed 40 minutes each to speak on those motions, since they are lumped together? The Standing Order says hon. members will be allowed 20 minutes on an amendment. Will they be allowed 40 minutes because two amendments are being taken together?

Mr. Speaker: The purpose of grouping these motions for discussion is that debate will not be duplicated. The intent of the rule, unless someone can persuade me to the contrary, would have no effect unless the Chair were able to combine similar motions for discussion and thereby limit speeches to one speech per grouping.

Mr. Reynolds: The point I am trying to clear up is this: on the next motions to come before the House, who gets the 40 minutes, the hon. member for Lotbinière, or myself?

Mr. Speaker: Order. We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The question is on motion No. 7, in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds):

That Bill C-84 be amended by deleting clause 2.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, sections 46 and 47 of the Criminal Code presently read as follows:

"46. (1) Every one commits treason who, in Canada,

(a) kills or attempts to kill Her Majesty, or does her any bodily harm tending to death or destruction, maims or wounds her, or imprisons or restrains her;

(b) levies war against Canada or does any act preparatory thereto;

(c) assists an enemy at war with Canada, or any armed forces against whom Canadian Forces are engaged in hostilities whether or not a state of war exists between Canada and the country whose forces they are;

(d) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province;

(e) without lawful authority, communicates or makes available to an agent of a state other than Canada, military or scientific information or any sketch, plan, model, article, note or document of a military or scientific character that he knows or ought to know may be used by that state for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or defence of Canada;

(f) conspires with any person to do anything mentioned in paragraphs (a) to (d);

(g) forms an intention to do anything mentioned in paragraphs (a) to (d) and manifests that intention by an overt act; or

(h) conspires with any person to do anything mentioned in paragraph (e) or forms an intention to do anything mentioned in paragraph (e) and manifests that intention by an overt act.

My right hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) brought this aspect to the attention of the House a number of times during the question period before debate on this bill began. Certain incidents which have taken place over the past weekend, in particular the hostage-taking situation which caused the Israelis to go right into Uganda and free a planeload of hostages, strengthen the case that an important item of discussion in this House today should be the deletion of clause 2 of the measure before us. It is my opinion that if we delete this clause from the bill we would, in effect, kill the bill. The government has made it plain that it regards the bill as an abolition bill. If we delete clause 2 we would keep on the record capital punishment for persons who commit high treason.

● (1510)

I could spend many hours talking about the reasons I think we should retain capital punishment. No reason could be plainer than the events of last weekend to reinforce my statement that we in this country should retain capital punishment for high treason. Although I hope this will not be the case, with the Olympics coming up shortly in this country some hostage-taking could occur, as it did in the last Olympics. Hostages were also taken in the Uganda incident last weekend. What protection would we have in this country if hostages were taken at the Montreal Olympics?

I would like to put this very serious question to those members on the other side who are abolitionists and who voted for this bill: If 25 or 30 terrorists were to appear on the scene in Canada, would we want to put them in our jails for 25 years? I would hope not. This is why I think there should be a law on the statute books to put them to death. That is what should happen to anybody who tries to disrupt life in this country in any way.

To underline my argument against life imprisonment for 25 years, there is a man in the British Columbia penitentiary right now who has been well quoted in an article that appeared in the Vancouver *Province* of June 12 last, Mr. Larry Corbett. He talked about what it is like to be in jail for 25 years. This is what he said:

You know, normally speaking he'd never do that but now he's only going to get one chance. Like when you drop this 25 on a guy and he gets into a position where he can escape, he's not going to get another chance for years. They're going to swallow him up in one of these "penthouses" . . .

Should a prisoner be successful in escaping, he becomes desperate to stay on the loose and this puts the public generally in greater danger than before, Corbett says. If he has a heavy murder term to return to, there isn't much more than can be done to him.

Inside the prisons, Corbett says, there will be a considerable build-up of tensions resulting in more jail killings and suicides.

[Mr. Reynolds.]

"It takes a hell of a lot of self-discipline to walk away from a simple little thing now. But what about when you turn around and there's absolutely no hope of me getting out for 25 years. What good am I even to myself?

"Any initiative I might have is totally lost. So now rather than restraining myself I'll be more aggressive. This guy over here isn't going to restrain himself and he's going to stick it to me. So now the paranoia sets in and you figure well, okay, I've got to get him first."

Other prisoners were interviewed and they all said the same thing. With our penitentiaries filled with people who have been sentenced to 25 years in jail, they will be vicious places to be in. The guards will have a terrible time. I can think of nothing worse than having terrorists convicted of high treason sent to jail for 25 years, with no hope of parole. These are people who will have no allegiance at all to Canada, people who have tried to destroy it. They will be in jail with others who, although they are not sweet roses, are not in prison for treason. This is why I think members on all sides of the House should seriously consider changing their minds and deleting this clause from the bill.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. member for Prince Albert raised this issue in the House a number of weeks ago. An article appeared in the Toronto *Star* last Wednesday which I read as I was heading back to my riding. It is by Robert Nielsen and is headlined "Terrorism may yet revive the death penalty issue". I should like to quote a couple of paragraphs from this article:

John Diefenbaker is my kind of abolitionist because he would make an exception for terrorists. Here we are dealing not with unprovable deterrence but with an airtight case for the protection of society.

When captured terrorists are allowed to live, innocent people will surely die. Children in schools and buses, hapless tourists in aircraft and airports, will be pitilessly mowed down or blown up.

This has happened again and again already. Terrorists seize an airliner full of passengers or a school full of children—killing a few incidentally or to prove their sincerity—and then threaten to murder their hostages unless a gang of brothers-in-arms, previously imprisoned for a similar crime, are set free.

I should like to stress that point, Mr. Speaker. If this country holds in jail for 25 years terrorists who kill people, how long will it be before some other terrorists hijack an aircraft or take some hostages and demand that this country free some of their citizens who are held in our jails?

An hon. Member: They will probably run the operation from inside jail.

Mr. Reynolds: As one hon. member says, they will run the operation from inside jail—and that is true. We know that the drug syndicates run their operations from inside jail. That is all the more reason the House should delete this clause, to let the terrorists of the world know that they cannot come to this country and try and pull any crazy stunts during the Olympics. If I may just conclude the article by Robert Nielsen, he wrote:

If the government concerned does not yield, they carry out their threat. If it does yield, both sets of terrorists are released to kill again. The future murders are not conjectural; killing is the terrorists profession.

Don't say it can't happen here; it already has. Mrs. Pierre Laporte is a widow to prove it.

Only a fool would predict that Canada has seen the last of terrorism within its borders. And if terrorism does come back, the debate on capital punishment will revive, hotter than ever.

I shall leave that aspect for now, Mr. Speaker, but I hope that hon. members who are listening to this important debate, or are reading it in *Hansard*, will seriously consider deleting this clause from the bill. This would virtually kill the bill since the government has stated quite openly that this is an abolition bill. I understand there may be some agreement among the House leaders to have some of the votes on these motions later this week, and perhaps by Thursday of this week we can vote on the motions discussed to that stage. If we could delete this clause we would defeat the bill and get it out of the House of Commons.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in support of the defeat of this particular clause in the bill, and there are a variety of reasons for my doing so. I mentioned the question of treason when I first spoke on second reading debate. In the meantime, my reasons for desiring to see this clause eliminated from the bill have been widened by some rather irresponsible and inflammatory statements by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) during his contribution to the debate. Speaking on June 15 last, the Prime Minister used expressions of high semantic value concerning the noose and the horrors of hanging a person. This, of course, is a tactic that is employed by the press; and I deplore in the strongest language I can think of the tactics used on television. Whenever they talk about this subject, their symbol for debate is a noose around the maple leaf. They do this in order to drive people away from this means of carrying out the death sentence upon those who are guilty of murder of one kind or another. We are not talking about this.

● (1520)

My views have no connection with hanging but, rather, with the death penalty. I even avoid use of the term "capital punishment" because that has a connotation as a result of the Latin derivation having to do with the head. I am not talking about that; I am talking about the imposition of death on a person who has taken the life of someone else. In this particular instance we are talking about treason and treachery as referred to in clause 2. The Prime Minister can make certain suggestions, if he wants, in order to get people's backs up and sort of convince some of those wishy-washy members on his side of the House that they should vote in support of this bill. Thank goodness they are not all wishy-washy.

The Prime Minister can suggest that the lives of those 11 people will be on the conscience of those who defeat the bill. This is not on my conscience now. What should be on the conscience of every Canadian is the life of those who have died and those who will die if this bill is not defeated.

I hesitate to bring forward this subject, but the Prime Minister did so when talking about treason: he delivered an inflammatory address in this connection. As the hon. member who preceded me said, Her Majesty will be here within two or three weeks, and the government is suggesting we remove from the statutes the death penalty for anyone who makes an attempt on the life of Her Majesty. What would be the case in respect of a president? Is the Prime Minister going to reinstate the death penalty when a president is involved? The Prime Minister is certainly not thinking in terms of Canada's connection with, and value for, the Crown. It is not only the Crown which is involved in the act of treason. We all know that treason is a matter affecting the institutions of our government, and anyone who mounts a revolt or tries to overthrow or take over institutions, federal or provincial, by force is guilty of treason. If that is not a crime deserving of the ultimate penalty, then I fail to know what more serious crime there is.

This is supposed to be an abolitionist bill. I have the feeling that the government and those who drafted the bill have failed to realize that the death penalty is still very much written into our laws. The schedule of the bill provides for the removal of certain clauses of the Criminal Code and of the Fugitive Offenders Act, but there are other areas where treason and treasonable acts remain on the statute books. I am not questioning this, because this is where they ought to remain as crimes for which the death penalty should be accorded after a person is convicted by a judge and jury. I refer to the National Defence Act, chapter N-4, of the Revised Statutes of Canada. This chapter does not talk only about persons in uniform, but about every person who is held guilty of committing any one of a number of offences. In general terms, it refers to every person who does, or omits to do anything, or aids such a person who commits an offence, or abets any person in the commission of an offence, or counsels or procures any person to commit an offence. Thus, any person would be guilty of an offence.

What sort of offences are involved? For example, on the matter of security—and this is section 65 of the National Defence Act—the death penalty is provided for a number of offences. It provides that every person shall suffer death who discloses the preparations for operations of any of Her Majesty's forces. That is one treasonable act which would undermine our country. It refers to every person who discloses, in any manner whatever, any information relating to the process, procedure, publication or document of any of Her Majesty's forces or of any forces co-operating therewith, or does or omits to do anything with intent to prejudice the security of any of Her Majesty's forces or any forces co-operating therewith. This does not refer only to persons in uniform.

Bill C-84 is a complete fraud that is being put upon the people as the abolition of capital punishment in this country. It is nothing of the sort. It is a limited abolition bill, and it is high time the real intent of the bill was made clear. Section 68 of the National Defence Act provides that every person who is a spy for an enemy is guilty of an offence, and upon conviction is liable to suffer death or a lesser punishment. Section 69 provides that every person who joins in a mutiny that is accompanied by violence is guilty of an offence and liable to death or a lesser punishment; and section 70 provides that every person who joins in a mutiny that is not accompanied by violence is guilty of an offence and is liable to imprisonment for life or a lesser punishment. It then refers to the ringleaders and suggests that, upon conviction, they are liable to suffer death or a lesser punishment.

This government is deluding the Canadian people, as it has made the practice of doing for the last four or five years. It is deluding those who are sincere abolitionists

that there is to be an end to the death penalty in Canada. This is just not true. Here we have the government trying to make lighter the sentence for the crime of treason or a treasonable act in Canada, be it against Her Majesty or against our institutions. I mentioned this in my earlier intervention in this debate which happened to be on budget day, May 25. Nobody bothered to pay any attention because the budget was the all-important thing on that particular day; but it is there in the record for May 25, if anybody wants to read it.

I fail to see how this government can put forward such a notion, depriving Canadians of all their desire to uphold, with every power in their possession, the institutions they hold dear, even to the length of putting their lives on the line to defend them. There are many of us in this House—thank God—who have done that. There are some in this House, although not too many now, who have done this even twice. I am prepared to do it a third time. This measure is absolutely unacceptable to the Canadian people. It is certainly unacceptable to me. I think I speak for a great many people in my riding and a good many people across the whole of this country who just cannot understand the reasoning of this government in abolishing treason as an offence for which the death penalty ought to be given by a jury.

● (1530)

The acceptance of clause 2—and I hope we will have a vote on it shortly—would have a number of consequential effects which I have listed and which I think I will save for debate in respect of certain other clauses. If clause 2 should be defeated, one of the consequences would be that clause 7 of this bill would become either superfluous or debatable, and the original section of the Criminal Code being amended by clause 7, namely, section 534, would automatically be reinstateable. I have 16 examples which follow pretty much the same pattern.

If this particular clause relating to treason or treasonable acts, whether against Her Majesty—and God help us, may that not occur—or against institutions of this country, federal or provincial, by force of arms, should be defeated, a number of very interesting consequences would occur which I propose in the course of time to mention.

I think we should look at the schedule of the bill. We have to look at it in relation, unfortunately, to clause 2, because throughout this whole part of the Criminal Code there is a suggestion in the amendments that in respect of the words "high treason or" only life imprisonment would be involved. Life imprisonment, I think, is one of the most cruel and most inhumane sentences that could be imposed by any judge. The jury may find a person guilty of an act for which life imprisonment is the penalty, but I find it difficult to understand how any thinking soul could see a person condemned to life imprisonment. What has that man to lose? I will introduce some of the horrors on the other side of those introduced by the Prime Minister. I suggest that some abolitionists volunteer to act as guardians of some of these people who have been sentenced to life imprisonment.

An hon. Member: Why don't you volunteer?

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Why should I volunteer? I am in favour of retention.

Mr. Caccia: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question?

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I am in the middle of my speech and I would prefer to wait until I have concluded it. I still think there might be a few abolitionists over there who are courageous souls who stood up against the desires of their constituents and voted for abolition who might volunteer because we will have a great deal of difficulty getting people to act as prison guards or even policemen. This will be a very serious problem in our country. I do not think the abolitionists over there have even thought of this.

A man condemned for life, whether for treason or any other act, even if his sentence should be shortened, is a man who has nothing to lose. He can kill. If he wishes to get out and kill, he will do so. That is the man's life who will be on my conscience, not the life of the man who, if we defeat this bill, will hang for his crime. Those who really concern me are the survivors of the victims of these crimes and the victims who are yet to come if this bill should pass.

I sincerely hope this bill will be defeated. I am working with everything I possess to ensure its defeat. One tiny aspect of the defeat of this bill would be the removal of clause 2 which touches on treason. The Canadian people cannot accept that treason should be set up as a crime for which life imprisonment alone is the sentence which may be given by the courts, We know, from past experience, how difficult it is to keep people in prison for two years. If people sentenced to life imprisonment want to get out, they will kill in order to get out.

There seems to be a thing about escapes in this country. I do not know quite how it happens. However, there have been a number of escapes over the last three or four years. I have lost count. Those people will be on the loose in Canada simply because we have become soft in respect of the criminal and have forgotten about the victim. Surely we are men of reason. Surely we want to protect our society. The millions of law-abiding citizens are my concern. They are on my conscience. It is not the few tens who have decided to take the law into their own hands who are on my conscience.

Many of those on the other side who are abolitionists have said that there is no deterrent value in the death penalty. I disagree. I have been told by a well known lawyer, who happens to be a member on this side and who has defended criminals, that some of them might have become murderers but for the fact that they were deterred when they became involved in a felony such as a bank robbery. They admitted to this lawyer that they refused to take a gun along with them.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I should like at least to finish this sentence, and then I will sit down.

An hon. Member: There are others who should finish their sentences.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): There are a good many. A particular criminal told this lawyer that he refused to take a gun with him for fear that he would use it and kill someone and go to prison or face the death penalty. That is a deterrent. Another deterrent value is that the criminal who has been executed does not commit the crime a second time.

● (1540)

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

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Yes, if it is relevant.

Mr. Caccia: Earlier in his speech the hon. member suggested that abolitionists should volunteer to supervise the inmates. I should like to ask the hon. member whether, along the same line of reasoning, retentionists including the hon. member, would volunteer as executioners.

An hon. Member: That is quite irrelevant.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I think here, again, we are encountering that abhorrent attitude adopted by abolitionists who insist on the noose. I am not talking about the noose, and hon. members know it. I am talking about the death penalty. These are many ways of disposing of people—and the noose is only one of them. There is gas, electricity, or a man could be given a handle with which to do it himself.

Mr. Caccia: The method of execution was not my question. My question has to do with whether the hon. member would agree to be the executioner, regardless of the method.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I can think of methods whereby a man could execute himself.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest to the hon. member that we are getting into debate.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I think that of all aspects of Bill C-84, the one that should give abolitionists the greatest concern is clause 4 as it now stands. While the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and members of the cabinet say this is a free vote on a piece of legislation, it is a government measure on which some hon. members have been allowed to vote against their own party, but even when they have been allowed to vote against their party, they have been placed in a situation of duress—

Some hon. Members: Not true.

Mr. MacFarlane: It is only true of your side.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Garbage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) has the floor, and I suggest we all listen.

Mr. Coates: I suggest to hon. members that if they do not agree with what I have to say, there is a very easy way of solving that problem, and that is to stand and make their own speeches. I have endeavoured to do my part, and I hope they will do theirs so that the people of this nation will know that a debate is going on and that no one is opposed to the other person's point of view so long as that person is willing to indicate what is that point of view. I watched particularly the vote on second reading and saw the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) take very careful note of all those who voted against the legislation before the House. I am sure that their progress in the days ahead will be minimal so far as this government is concerned.

I have listened to the hon. member for Hamilton-Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) quite often making contributions from his seat. I can understand that, because he is substantial in that area, and no doubt he has a great deal of difficulty in lifting it. But I think he can get up and explain to his constituents how he changed from the position that he once held.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to have to say this to every speaker in the opposition, but if he would look at the proper page in *Hansard* he would see that I have already answered the question very well. However, I think it is wrong for him to assume that I changed by mind in any way or form. As far back as the time when the hon. member was still a member from that area he would remember that I was an abolitionist, which was easily 15 years ago.

Mr. Lawrence: Well, that certainly shows inflexibility of mind.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest to the hon. member that we are getting into argument.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, I enjoy very much hearing from the hon. member for Hamilton-Mountain either in the House or outside, and I hope he will make longer speeches before this debate is over and explain to his constituents again—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest the hon. member should address the chair.

Mr. Coates: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I hope the hon. member will explain to his constituents how he can adopt a point of view that is so contrary to the point of view they wish him to have when expressing himself on this matter.

I should like to get back to the amendment before the House to delete clause 2. I started out by saying that of all the matters in the bill, this is the one that most concerns members of the House—some of them who are not basically retentionists, who are abolitionists but who feel, at the same time, that any individual who commits high treason against one's country deserves to pay the supreme sacrifice of his life for having committed treason; and I include in that group any individual or group of individuals who would perpetrate insurrection and revolution.

Indeed, if we go back a few years and think of what happened in the province of Quebec, I think most of us would agree that the Canadian people would have been outraged if the criminals had been captured and brought

before the courts, rather than being allowed to escape from this country, and if the penalty of death had been pronounced by the courts, as it should have been. But the government commuted the sentences after they had, in fact, killed one outstanding Canadian and had come very close to killing a foreign diplomat in our country.

We witness more and more the development of terrorism in the world and while, fortunately for us and our people, most of the terrorism that has occurred has been outside our country and as a result we are onlookers of events of great traumatic significance to a great many people and nations, I find it difficult for us to try to wipe it from our minds. The sort of situation that occurred in Uganda, which could have resulted in the death of a great many people and which was brought about by people committed to open rebellion against society, could have happened in this country; and if it had, it could have resulted in these people being placed in our penal institutions.

The people who look after the operation of our penal institutions have a difficult enough time without being asked to guard international terrorists and people willing to commit high treason against their country and to stop them from killing either penitentiary employees or fellow inmates. We have not been able to maintain security in our penal institutions up to this point, and the number of kidnappings that have taken place in these institutions in recent months indicates how difficult it is for those who have accepted the responsibility of operating these institutions to carry out their duties. How much more difficult would their task be if we placed within these institutions even more dangerous people who are committed to destroying society as it now exists. We cannot expect those who operate our penal institutions properly to protect society against these people on top of the difficult task they already have.

● (1550)

Regardless of whether in the end we vote for abolition or retention, if there is one part which should come out of this bill, that is the part. For years, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) campaigned as a commitment to himself and to the public at large, for the abolition of capital punishment. It was very courageous of him to come into this House and vote against this bill.

This bill goes further than the United Kingdom has gone. A great many countries have eliminated capital punishment for high treason and for many other crimes, but the right hon. member came into this House and stated that he could not support a bill which would achieve the end against which he had worked throughout his lifetime. He came into this House and said he would not support this bill because the government should be convinced that that particular part of the bill should be eliminated, so that with the coming of the Olympics, with many international events taking place in this country, and with the volatile Middle East situation, the people of this nation should be protected from international terrorism or any form of insurrection taking place. Those who commit those dastardly deeds should pay with their lives.

Then we come to the last but, as far as I am concerned, the most important consideration, and that has to do with our monarch. We are saying to the people of the Commonwealth that while we are a Commonwealth country, we are not willing to give to the Queen of Canada the same degree of protection the United Kingdom is willing to give her. We are saying to anyone who might consider assassinating her that he will not have to forfeit his life for so doing. We are, in effect, saying to the Queen that there is a lesser degree of protection available to her in Canada than in any other Commonwealth country. As I understand it, of the six countries which have abolished capital punishment for high treason, none is a member of the Commonwealth. That is far too extreme a degree of abolition for the government to ask of the people of Canada, especially when the great majority of Canadians do not wish the government to abolish the death penalty, particularly as it applies to the murder of police officers or penitentiary employees.

There are many in this country who would be willing to extend, rather than limit, the number of crimes which should be punishable by death. There are many who believe that the death penalty should not only be carried out for the protection of police officers and penitentiary guards, but that it should extend to all first-degree murders when mercy is not recommended by the jury. The government is going beyond what the people ask and is extending abolition to the point where anyone who kills the Queen will only be imprisoned for 15 years before consideration is given to that person's securing parole—not necessarily receiving it, but consideration being given—and life imprisonment will be for a period of 25 years. A person 20 years of age can kill the Queen of Canada and be walking the streets again at the age of 45. One gets a terrible feeling that there is something wrong with the legislation before us and that we should do something to eliminate it.

I support the amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) because it is realistic. It is the very least that those who believe in retention should expect from this government. I say to the abolitionists in this House that if this government is determined to place legislation on the statute books of this country which eliminates the protection which is now available to the monarch and to the Canadian public against terrorists, it should be defeated. The abolitionists in this House should be concerned because the government does not feel that the monarch or the public should be protected against terrorists, international gangsters, the mafia and people of that ilk. Those people know, when they consider committing crimes against individuals, that the worst penalty then can expect is 25 years in prison.

There must be something wrong with a government which believes that, regardless of what the people think, it knows better. That is an indication of a sickness in democracy which we can cure only by defeating the legislation of a government which takes this approach to politics. The best way to restore some respect for parliament and for the democratic institutions which all of us are supposed to love is to see that legislation which is contrary to the beliefs of the great majority of Canadians is defeated.

Surely, abolition carries with it some responsibility—and there is no responsibility on the part of a government which says to the Queen of Canada that we cannot afford to her the same protection which the parliament of the

United Kingdom is willing to provide. That parliament has existed longer than any other democratic institution in the world.

It is not responsible or realistic for a Commonwealth country to say to its fellow members of the Commonwealth that it cannot give to the Queen the same degree of protection she will receive when she visits other Commonwealth countries. We cannot provide her with that protection because the government has decided that any individual who attempts to assassinate, or who assassinates her, will only go into one of our institutions, and while there he will probably carry out the same type of crime against other persons, whether they be officers in the institution or inmates.

● (1600)

When an individual commits any kind of crime against the state, he should be prepared to sacrifice his life—nothing more, and nothing less.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: He should realize that will be the only penalty and there will be no other. No mercy will be shown any person who endeavours to murder the Queen or sell documents that would be of value to enemy nations. In these days I do not know if this government would designate some of the democratic countries as enemies and the communist countries as our friends. But I cannot envisage a situation where this government should be concerned about the lives of individuals who were endeavouring to destroy this country, our monarch, our prime minister or any specific individual who represents us in a very special way.

I say to you, sir, that I will support the amendment. I hope the abolitionists in this House will support it, as an indication that we have special feeling for the Queen and our country and that we will give the ultimate protection to our Queen and extract the supreme sacrifice from anyone who does damage to our nation or endeavours to assassinate the Queen.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, it is time this government shed the "Alice in Wonderland" mentality regarding the objects and objectives of some people in society at whom this legislation is directed. It seems to me a contradiction in terms to talk about peace and security legislation and at the same time to eliminate the consequences for treasonous activity. Therefore, I plan to support this amendment which would make treason punishable by death.

The government is charged with providing good order and security for our country and its people, as well as for those people, especially heads of state, who visit our country. This good order is based on the concept of civilization. But treason denies the right of any government even to try to maintain order. This bill becomes a vote of confidence for anarchy.

In the last generation there was a notion, that has become popular in society, based upon the worship of the non-hero. There was a time when the hero was an individual who acted courageously on behalf of his country and was commended by the citizens of the country and the government. As a matter of fact, one of our distinguished medals, the Victoria Cross, is a commendation for an act of valour on behalf of the country. But that kind of philosophy is under attack. Today we are faced with a popularization of the views of men like Marcuse who have made the non-hero popular. A man who either deserts his country or acts against his country is becoming the hero because that is seen as an act of courage. The man who goes over the hill is the hero.

Mr. MacFarlane: George Washington.

Mr. Friesen: More like Benedict Arnold. Today, these people would put up a shrine to Benedict Arnold, instead of George Washington.

There is a very popular philosophy around today which says that everything the establishment does is wrong, and therefore, since the establishment is wrong, it is all right to attack it, to tear it down and to destroy it. That becomes a perverted sense of morality: it is more just, more righteous; more sensible to attack and destroy the establishment than it is to work with the establishment and to honour it. We have had a very notable example of this kind of philosophy in the last few days, with the taking of over 200 hostages in an airplane and flying them to Uganda. In the minds of a lot of people in the world, those seven or so terrorists were heroes. Thousands of people think those men were the heroes in all that activity because they were attacking the establishment. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the commandoes who carried out the raid yesterday are the heroes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Friesen: They set the record straight.

Mr. MacFarlane: An act of war: that is how you would deal with treason, not the noose?

Mr. Friesen: There is a parallel philosophy which was developed in Russia and exported to China and southeast Asia which says the only way you can deal with a capitalist country is to destroy it, because capitalism is corrupt and on its last legs but it will try to fight for acceptance to its last breath, and that capitalism must be destroyed by a revolutionary act and overthrow of the government. That philosophy is still very popular in many countries. It is fine if those countries want to maintain that kind of government for themselves. Let them have it. But allied with that philosophy is the need to export the revolution. It is not good enough to have that kind of government within Russia, China, Viet Nam, Cuba or Cambodia: in order for that philosophy to thrive, the people who believe in it must carry it to other countries. There are a good many people in our country who think that our democratic institutions ought to be destroyed and are doing what they can to attack them.

Several months ago in this House, when we were dealing with the bill regarding citizenship, I spoke of the special parliamentary committee which had travelled the country to study immigration. We were confronted by these people in all the major cities and some of them were supported, would you believe, by the Department of the Secretary of State. These Maoists confronted us in every city across Canada. We were called fascist pigs because we were part

of the establishment. Members of the government and members to my left were on the committee and were included as fascist pigs. We represented the establishment, and they kept calling for the downfall and destruction of the parliamentary system and the democratic way of life in Canada. These people really believe what they are saying, Mr. Speaker—and in the bill as it is before us today we are saying that we want to protect these people and destroy ourselves in so doing.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): We have to be out of our minds.

Mr. Friesen: It is rather like drinking hemlock, Mr. Speaker. Who would take a viper to his bosom?

Mr. MacFarlane: Socrates.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is one in our enlightened self-interest. If we cherish those institutions within our country which preserve democracy, which in fact provide freedom for dissenters to say what they say and what they could not do in the countries they espouse, which give us the kind of freedom that we enjoy, we cannot pass the legislation as it stands before us today. It is in our enlightened self-interest to pass the amendment before us, namely, that treasonable activity is punishable by death. Therefore, I plan to support this amendment and I shall vote in its favour.

● (1610)

I challenge the people who support the bill in general, who have not given sufficient thought to the implications of the bill in the case of treasonable activity, to rethink their position on this matter and to give some consideration to voting in favour of this amendment.

I began by saying that we have presented in this legislation an "Alice in Wonderland" mentality. I want to underscore that fact. The whole purport, underlying philosophy and groundwork of this bill rests upon the belief that man is indescribably perfectable, that in his most destructive state he has become that because society has treated him wrongly: either he has been deprived in his youth economically, or he has had a wrong upbringing. Somehow, all along the way we want to absolve man of the responsibility for his behaviour.

Mr. Skinner has done a lot to popularize the notion that we are no longer responsible; that we have been so conditioned by the forces of our society that we cannot make an independent decision any more. I reject that philosophy. I maintain that there are men and women in this and other countries who are deliberately villainous. They are determined and have chosen a path to do wrong. It is within the heart of every one of us to do that. None of us is immune from criminal activity; none of us is immune from inhuman behaviour. We are all victims of a depraved nature. Therefore, I cannot hold truck for that philosophy which says all we need to do is change the circumstances for criminals, give them a better environment and a little tender loving care and they will automatically become different people; give them plush carpets, nice lounges, better day-rooms and recreational areas, and they will be fine people. There are people who are determined to do wrong; people who have come to that place where they will

entertain violent notions and violent activity against the Crown, the Queen, and are determined to do wrong.

I say, again, that it is in our enlightened self-interest to entertain this amendment which will preserve freedom in our country to live in peace and tranquility. I urge hon. members to again think about their position on abolition of the death penalty and to give consideration to this amendment which will preserve the death penalty for those who are guilty of treasonable activity.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, in clause 2 of Bill C-84 the Solicitor General of Canada is proposing abolition of capital punishment for any act of treason against Her Majesty, against Canada or against a province. He is also proposing abolition of capital punishment for overthrowing or threatening to overthrow the regime or for collusion with the enemy when as a country we are in a state of war. In short, Mr. Speaker, this means that the philosophy underlying the propositions of the Solicitor General of Canada, the Solicitor of the day—we hope he will not so remain for a long time—this means that any act likely to endanger the country or part of it would not be punishable by death but rather by what the minister calls life imprisonment.

As for life imprisonment, Mr. Speaker, and this is the first point I want to make, I do not believe in it since I do not have faith in the goodwill of the Solicitor General when it comes to implementing the law. Mr. Speaker, how many instances could we cite to prove that parole was granted even though we had been assured there would not be such release on parole?

We must not lose sight, in this debate, of the context in which the Solicitor General has placed us. He started with the notion that any irreversible penalty such as the death penalty is bad in that sense that it would denote that our society is prone to violence. He is himself a great pacifist who believes in the good will of all humans, that is why he tells us: "We shall apply such punishment which is not final, such as jail terms." And to make sure that imprisonment is not abusive towards the criminal the minister applies this principle which is radically opposed to the punishment provided by the Criminal Code, namely release on parole. Thus clause 2 of the bill which is before us and which amends the Criminal Code as far as murders and other major offences are concerned, mentions treason to which I referred earlier.

● (1620)

The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) suggests then the abolition of capital punishment in cases of treason. He thinks it is a serious crime to attack Her Majesty the Queen, the government of Canada, a province or the system. It is a serious crime to conspire with the enemy in wartime but it is not serious to the extent that the criminal convicted of treason should be sentenced to death as provide by the Criminal Code.

However, Mr. Speaker, if tomorrow our country were at war with any of the countries in the world, that same government would ask Canadians and the young people to fight in the armed forces to kill people they do not know, risking their lives to ensure the security and the defence of

Canada. That same minister would travel from coast to coast to ask the mothers of young Canadians to sacrifice their sons, as we can see it in the Memorial Chapel here in Parliament and where this government is proud to turn the pages to show the names of those great Canadians who fought for Canada in foreign countries where they lost their lives. Why? For the security of Canada, for the well being of Canada, to protect our ideology, our identity and our security. Thousands of Canadians risked their lives on those battlefields.

Mr. Speaker, all this is done for the security of the public. What is treason according to the Criminal Code? Treason is a threat made by one individual or group of individuals attempting to overthrow a government by force, through criminal means, threatening not only the stability of the state, but also the health and lives of citizens. This is an act of treason in general. An act of treason is also conspiration with the enemy in wartime, an act of treason is what we saw, for instance during the October crisis in Quebec, it is an act that endangers the lives of citizens and the political system as in Canada we are supposed to live in a democracy and that the most logical way to overthrow a government is democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this is the logic of the Solicitor General. We shall remember the epic fight of our ancestors against conscription, when they were told that they had to enroll to protect the country. And now, today, the Solicitor General claims that if any foreigner or any Canadian does the same thing, the death penalty will not apply.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder which side the Solicitor General is on and which aim he is trying to reach. I am trying to understand how he thinks and, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. I cannot understand why the minister supports clause 2 when Criminal Code sections 46 and 47 clearly state that everyone commits treason who, in Canada, attempts to kill Her Majesty, levies war against Canada or does any act preparatory thereto.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone did and act preparatory to levy war against Canada, the death penalty would not be applied. It means that anybody can come to Canada to levy war, and if he can be caught before destroying us, the death penalty will not be applied in his case even if he might have killed 25, 30, 50, 100 or 200 Canadians during his military operations. The minister proposes that the death penalty should not be applied for clause 2; he proposes, if somebody assists an enemy at war with Canada or any armed forces against whom Canadian forces are engaged in hostilities, that the death penalty should not be applied. The minister proposes that we be docile, that we be kind, that we respect all that and that we lay the red carpet for anybody who might use force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province.

The minister proposes that in that particular case the death penalty will not apply in spite of conclusive and cogent evidence. Mr. Speaker, I was in the House with several of my colleagues at the time of what has been called the October crisis. I still remember this Prime Minister snivelling on television and asking everyone to show restraint in that very grave moment; I remember the tearful former Quebec Minister of Justice announcing the death of his colleague minister; I remember the trucks of the Canadian Armed Forces rolling down our streets, getting everyone edgy, controlling and watching all public buildings, members of parliament and ministers; everybody was on general alert, it was a very grave moment, Canada's security was at stake, particularly that of Quebec, that insubordinate province. Canada's security was so in danger that this government introduced a war emergency measures to stop that little outburst of revolt limited to one place in Quebec.

The army was even sent in small communities to watch alleged accused who could have been in collusion with people of the FLQ. We were in a state of general alert, and I remember that our party was holding a convention at Thetford-Mines at that time, a provincial convention for the federal party, and during the last night with beat of drum we were told about the death of minister Pierre Laporte. People were getting nervous and it was very grave. The army was on the look-out and everyone was calling for action.

What happened since then? The October crisis still remains to be explained. A lot of things are still unexplained in that file both to the public and members. A lot of things not only remain to be explained but once again I wonder how it was possible to bring in the army if today the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) suggests that this type of action is not serious. If that kind of situation is not serious, let us immediately abolish—and it is urgent—that emergency measures act. Let us put order not only in the Criminal Code but, to be consistent, in any other legislation.

Some will say, such events could still reoccur. Let us be logical. We are now having in Quebec the Olympic Games which are going to cost a lot of tax money paid by Canadian taxpayers. What is the cost of the military operations to ensure the security of athletes, visitors and prominent people? What will be the amounts paid and the role played by the federal government? Will it be to the extent of forbidding any traffic? This is quite a situation! I have been told that the federal contribution to ensure security will be about $100 million. But let us suppose a moment that such an act of treason does occur, in accordance with sections 46 and 47 of the Criminal Code, which the Solicitor General would like to abolish. On one hand, the federal government is investing $100 million for the security of athletes, very important people and visitors as well as for the general security at the Olympic Games to protect the reputation of the country. It is nice to see soldiers parading!

Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that an attempt is made against Her Majesty who will open the games, or against the officials of other countries or one of our public men. What will happen? A general alert, and after giving a good show to demonstrate that Canadians are safe, the criminals will be caught. Then they will be told: "We are sorry, we have to release you because Canada is an understanding country. You are released." The minister will put these people in prison. He will call a press conference. I can see him with his glasses, smiling and telling us that he has made some order in this area. What we shall learn is that a few years later, these same criminals or alleged criminals will be free once again.

With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to questions in the order paper which were asked recently in June about the number of convicts who are now free in Canada and who have not been recaptured yet, and this for each penitentiary in Canada. You can find this in *Hansard*. Mr. Speaker, how can we believe that the minister will ensure safety in Canada if he is content with putting convicts comfortably in prison and giving them a parole or temporary freedom, since the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) believes in rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, I am among those who believe that our society must be protected. I am among those who believe that our society, an organized society, must have the means to protect itself against external or internal enemies. Consequently, to protect ourselves, if someone wants to cause trouble of some kind in Canada, act in collusion with the enemy, make threats of revolt or of takeover of a provincial system or of the Canadian government, we must show the whole world that we have laws, we respect our citizens and we want to protect them.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). This is why I shall oppose the minister who is asking us to pass clause 2 according to which any act of treason against the Crown in general would not be subject to capital punishment. In my opinion, not only is the philosophy which the Solicitor General wants us to adopt dangerous, but it also constitutes an invitation to throw over our government system, no longer democratically, but by force. Mr. Speaker, God knows that more and more Canadians think that this is the only solution.

● (1630)

[*English*]

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, we have before us a motion to delete clause 2 of this bill which is an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences. We are considering one particular aspect of violent crime, and that is treason. I rise at this time simply to voice my support for this amendment.

I do not propose to go into the arguments that have already been placed on the record. Suffice it to say that I agree with what has been said and the reasons given in support of this motion. It is difficult to comprehend the government's determination at this time to pass this legislation, Bill C-84. At a time when the government has announced that it is launching an attack on violent crime, we have before us a bill, the provisions of which, I suggest, constitute an invitation to commit violent crime in this country.

If everything in this country was what we wished it to be, if there was a greater awareness on the part of people of their responsibility to their fellow man, a greater appreciation of the sanctity of life and a recognition of the rights of others, then I think we could understand why the government has taken the position it has. But when we see a growing disregard for human life, with little respect for the rights of others, for the government to bring in a measure of this kind is completely beyond reason.

I have just returned from my constituency, Mr. Speaker, and if the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) would like to get the feel of the country, I suggest he goes to Fraser Valley East where just the other day a little girl's body was found tied to a tree. This was one of a number of serious crimes committed just recently, and as I mingled with the people and talked to them this was foremost in their thinking.

Reference has also been made to the events of this past week in connection with hostage-taking. Terrorism is flourishing today, and even in this country the very foundations of our civilized society are being threatened. Yet we are being urged to pass legislation which I believe is simply an invitation to certain people to commit crimes in this country.

People are being forced to the conclusion that they cannot expect justice from this government. I am not questioning the sincerity of the Solicitor General, but I just do not know what kind of dream world he is living in. Although it appears to be futile to try to achieve any change in this legislation, I feel I have to stand today and challenge the Solicitor General to take another look at reality in this country. People are looking for some evidence that crime does not pay. Under the present administration of justice in this country, it looks as though crime does pay. Although I am not questioning, as I say, the sincerity of the Solicitor General, I am questioning his judgment in a very fundamental fashion.

The motion before us seeks to reduce the punishment for treason. As has already been pointed out, Her Majesty the Queen of Canada is once more coming to this country, yet we are removing this safeguard for her protection. Surely to goodness, if we are to be faced with a provision like this, it could have been brought in a little later in the session instead of just prior to Her Majesty's visit to Canada. I just cannot see any logic behind this legislation. I cannot understand why we are being called upon to support legislation removing this safeguard.

That is all I am going to say, Mr. Speaker; I said I did not intend to make a long speech. I just want to ask whether there is some logic for our being presented with legislation which removes the penalty of capital punishment for the most serious crimes that can be committed and which some people are committing. I support the motion before the House.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief. At the outset let me say that I will lend my full support to this motion, which basically reinstates the penalty of capital punishment for the crime of treason. Treason is a most heinous crime. It is a crime much worse than murder because it is an out-and-out attempt not only to kill the head of state but to destroy the governmental system under which we live. It is, also, an act of supplying evidence or information to an enemy, allowing that enemy to destroy our country. It is a crime that strikes at the very heart of our country.

● (1640)

I understand the concern of the abolitionists when it comes to the crime of murder, but I cannot understand how an abolitionist could not support capital punishment in respect of a crime of the nature which would destroy our country. Murder is carried out by an individual who has no

respect for the life of another individual. Treason is carried out by a person who has no respect for his country. Does such an individual deserve to live? Should he not suffer death or capital punishment for such a crime? I, personally, believe he should and I believe the majority of Canadians feel the same way.

An hon. Member: And one weekend at home will tell you that.

Mr. Neil: If you talk with those Canadians who spent some time in the armed forces during the last war and were prepared to give their lives for their country, you will know there is no question about where they stand. Yet this government says it really cannot execute those people who commit treason, because to execute is a cruel and inhumane type of punishment. The government suggests we should send them to jail for a short period of time and rehabilate them. You cannot rehabilitate the type of person who would kill Her Majesty, destroy this country or supply secret information to another country. Such people are beyond rehabilitation.

Mr. Benjamin: How do you know that?

An hon. Member: Because they don't want to be.

Mr. Benjamin: And how do you know that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) has the floor.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) has some comments to make, I am sure the floor will be available to him as soon as I have completed my remarks. I would be interested to listen to any remarks he might have to make.

Mr. Reynolds: We would like to have them on record.

Mr. Neil: Yes, I should like to see them on record. The people of Canada are concerned about law and order. They want a country in which they can live in peace and security. They want a country in which there is discipline. They want a country of which they can be proud, and they want a country in which they know we will have stable government, rather than a country that gives a licence to radical individuals to kill the head of state or overthrow the government, for which they receive a light slap on the wrist.

Let me say, in conclusion, that I shall be very disappointed if all hon. members in this House do not unanimously support this motion.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: What does "Regina" mean, Les?

Mr. Benjamin: My city is named after Victoria—"Regina." Kings and queens come and go, and kings and queens and—

An hon. Member: And so do MPs.

Mr. Benjamin: —members of parliament and people in public office know that they run a risk. They live with a hazard, whether it be from a drunk in a beer parlour or a mental case who is out to kill. These people live with that hazard every day of their lives when they are in this occupation, whether you are a king, a queen, the prime minister, the solicitor general, a member of parliament, or the mayor of a city. When you accept public responsibility you are faced with the hazard and risk of the sick mind. It may be in the person of your next-door neighbour or your brother.

The hon. member who has moved this amendment asks each of us to become paranoid, like the amendment. He asks each of us to look under his bed each night. He asks each of us to suspect anyone and everyone who comes in contact with Her Majesty or anyone else in public office. I look at this amendment as a resolution to place the crime of treason in such a category that it will apply to every person, making everyone suspect.

I would ask the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) how he, as a Conservative, in his ideology, would have fared in a country that considered treason the espousal of right-wing philosophy. We have just celebrated with and complimented the United States on its two-hundredth anniversary of a revolution. Many people died fighting on both sides of that question. The king of England at the time said that was treason. I should like to ask the mover of this amendment, and the hon. member for Moose Jaw, whether they still consider the United States of America and every citizen in that country as traitors. I am sure there were a number of people in the United States in 1776, and four or five years before that, who would have been happy with the opportunity to assassinate George III. Indeed, some of them tried to seize the opportunity. George III had a fair number of what were called Tories and Whigs in jail in those days, some of whom we have never heard from since. They were there for the crime of treason because they wanted to speak out and were condemned for having to resort to violence.

An hon. Member: Are you defending treason?

Mr. Benjamin: I am not defending treason, I am trying to suggest to hon. members who support this kind of amendment that they are asking all of society to join them in their paranoia. Society, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), and members of this House will do everything they can to protect both the person and the institution of Her Majesty and her loyal subjects.

An hon. Member: Including putting up your life?

Mr. Benjamin: The hon. member asks me something about my life. Life lasts for so long, but for the life of me I fail to understand how responsible members of parliament representing Canadians in every part of our country could ask us to resort to this mindless hysteria that reaches back into the Middle Ages. I do not understand what motivates them.

● (1650)

The hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Patterson) said he does not question the motives of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). Wasn't that big of him? He repeated that three or four times. I am not a friend of the Liberal party. Even my friends to the right will acknowledge that.

I have been a bitter enemy of that philosophy and that degenerate political party for as long as I can remember.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I would suggest that the hon. member return to the subject.

Mr. Benjamin: When hon. members are opposed to an amendment regarding treason and capital punishment, and then someone says that he does not question the motives of the Solicitor General and I take that as a direct reflection on all other members of this House. That, it seems to me, is beneath the intelligence and the integrity of the mover of the amendment and those who have spoken in favour of it. I remember, when I was a kid, that people were said to be guilty of treason.

Mr. Reynolds: If he can remember when he was a kid, he has a pretty good memory.

Mr. Benjamin: The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), who was only in diapers then, should ask the people who know. The hon. member for Moose Jaw and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) know better. It was said in those days that people who were found guilty of treason should be shot. There were pamphlets and newspaper advertisements to this effect. Some hon. friends to my right might agree with those headlines and scurrilous pamphlets to the effect that the death penalty should apply to treason in the case of fellows like M. J. Coldwell and W. S. Woodsworth who were called treasonous. There was a member of Parliament who was found guilty of treason. He was convicted, sentenced and later departed. If he is still alive, he would be living his declining days in Poland. I refer to one Fred Rose. He was not executed.

An hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Benjamin: If the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to read *Hansard* for the years 1945, 1946 and 1947, he would find the reason. There were even some members of his own party who did not advocate that kind of penalty.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I am advocating it now.

Mr. Benjamin: That is one instance. The hon. member might like to cloud the issue. There were people in the progressive party and in the co-operative movement, as well as the farmers and the livestock growers who took the CPR to court, who were called treasonous. Where do my hon. friends wish to draw the line concerning what is and what is not treason? The first socialist member who was elected in 1896 was accused of being guilty of treason. It was said that rather than being seated in the legislature, he should be hanged.

Mr. Speaker, for some reason or other some of my hon. friends seem to conclude that if one fails to support an amendment which calls for the death penalty for treason, somehow everybody else is, by definition, treasonous. The hon. member for Moose Jaw was as subtle as a baseball bat with a nail in it. The hon. member for Fraser Valley East was just about as subtle. These are the kinds of laws that people such as Idi Amin, Joe Stalin, Adolph Hitler and Mussolini like. They like those kinds of laws about treason. They not only like them, but they implement them.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): They did not even bother charging the people; they just shot them.

Mr. Benjamin: You bet they did. Adolph Hitler, Mussolini and Joe Stalin did not bother with the formality of trying someone for treason: the right to dissent went down the drain. Let us assume the worst. Let us assume that some megalomaniac, some nut, assassinated the Queen, the king, the prime minister, the leader of the opposition, or the Solicitor General. That is a hazard which confronts everyone in public life. There have been many incidents. There was a case of an irate taxpayer trying to kill the local mayor. I guess that would be called some kind of treason.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): No.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, neither the Queen nor the Crown have asked for this. The royal prerogative has not asked the death penalty if there should be a crime involving the killing of a royal person. This has not been asked for, yet the royal succession and parliamentary democracy continue. This type of thing can happen to any of us. I will make one exception. I would except that in time of war, if our country were attacked and had declared war, if one of the articles of war included execution for treason during a state of war I would, however reluctantly, accept that our society as a whole had been attacked, including the Liberals, the Tories, the Socialists and everyone else; in fact even those of us whom the public thinks of as no-good Micks. If it involved all of us, then there might be some legitimate argument for the crime of treason being a specific offence, rather than a peacetime thing as a general rule.

I should like the members who support this kind of amendment to provide some additional reason for it. The hon. member for Moose Jaw says that the Canadian people question the old adage that crime does not pay.

Mr. Neil: I did not say that.

Mr. Benjamin: Then the hon. member for Fraser Valley East said it. You are all the same breed of cat. If there is any one thing in which people historically believe, it is that crime has paid, and has paid very well, thank you. Hon. members wonder why the slob who grew up in a slum knocks off a couple of service stations, serves a couple of jail terms and finally ends up shooting a policeman or prison guard. Naturally, the hue and cry is that he be hanged. I do not hear anyone say that the mine owners or the contractors—who are just as guilty, in my book—should be hanged. You want people to have respect for the law. Our law is for the rich.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Benjamin: Hon. friends to my right would find it interesting, if they took the trouble, to learn who has been hanged in this country and who has not been hanged. Invariably, those who had the resources—particularly financial, social, business, and so forth—could resort to appeals and could go through all the procedures of our

legal process. Do not tell me that the poor, convicted murderer gets the same deal as the rich convicted murderer. He does not get the same deal. If hon. friends to my right, and those who agree with them, could show me how our law could be changed so that the poor, convicted murderer, whether it be for treason or for any other reason, could be treated in the same way as the rich, convicted murderer whose appeal is automatically launched by an appointee of the court, I would be satisfied. The poor man has no choice, but the rich man can get the top brains, the top lawyers and the best research.

● (1700)

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Benjamin: If my fine friend wants to live on cloud nine, he is welcome to it. If he did a little research into who has been convicted of murder and who has, or who has not, been hanged he will find that the law is for the rich—particularly the implementation of the criminal law.

As a member of parliament I do not want to be party to what I consider to be bad enforcement of the law by the Solicitor General and by the government—the unequal enforcement of the law. There is no equality of opportunity before our law, both in fact and in practice. I wonder if hon. friends to my right would also explain to me, when they are discussing an amendment which has to do with treason, their definition of "treason." Is their definition narrowed down to the assassination of the monarch? If so, I wish they would say so. I still would not support the amendment. In fact, the monarch, especially the one we have now, would be the last one to ask for or to expect that kind of law. Since the British have not done it for years, I find it passing strange that all of a sudden, from under a bunch of rocks or out of the woodwork, comes an amendment to the law that has not even been suggested in the British House of Commons.

Mr. Stevens: It is their law now. Why are you voting with the government?

Mr. Benjamin: In that case, I am learning about all these people who will use any type of subterfuge, excuse or reason, however weak.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: I will continue for one minute only, Mr. Speaker. They will justify or use any subterfuge, reason or excuse to go back to what they really want, which is the death penalty. If they cannot have it holus-bolus, they will look for some other way in which they can satisfy their own feelings and the feelings of a large portion of the public.

An hon. Member: Yes, 80 per cent of the public.

Mr. Benjamin: Perhaps the hon. member has that kind of constituency. My mail runs the other way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Benjamin: I want to tell my hon. friend that my mail did not run 80 per cent as against 20 per cent; it ran 55 per cent as against 45 per cent. If he would like to come up, go through all my files and read all my letters from my constituents—in fact, I put it all down in a newsletter—he is welcome. I am not relying on numbers, and I am not relying on the 80 per cent. If there were 80 per cent in my constituency in favour of abolition, I would feel that way before they ever said it, and I do not rely on numbers. But I would like to remind my hon. friend that if he or any of his colleagues want to talk to me about numbers, they do not really mean anything when you get right down to the crunch.

An hon. Member: They help in elections.

Mr. Benjamin: If he wants to be some kind of a blob, if he wants to run with the wind, I would like to hear if the so-called overwhelming majority of his constituents felt the same way four years running. If he wants to be like a stallion sniffing the wind when he enters the gate to the pasture, that is the way he would run. If he wants to be some kind of a blob of a member of parliament, so that whatever his constituents think or whatever his newspapers say, or whatever a dozen or ten dozen letters tell him the majority of his constituents think, then frankly we do not need such members of parliament. People can always put their social security number into a computer. They would not need a member of parliament.

If the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) wants to talk about what is good for the next election, or good in terms of politics—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I did not say that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre has the floor.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your intervention, but I am sure the hon. member and I were trying to be helpful to one another.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member is making a speech. I suggest he get back to the facts.

Mr. Benjamin: Thank you. I seldom rise to speak in the House, and I do not speak very much.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Benjamin: I am a kind of a half-decent fellow, but I was invited to put my views on the record and that is exactly what I am doing. I would like a definition of "treason" from hon. members who support the amendment. What constitutes treason? I am sure the late supporters and sympathizers of Louis Riel are having second thoughts about treason. In fact, it would not be difficult to get a unanimous vote of the House to pardon Louis Riel. It is a little late, but better late than never!

I put on the record what I feel about these matters. I could be wrong, but unless the argument is put forward by hon. friends to my right in a more lucid, logical and reasoned way, I am afraid I will have to be stubborn—and I am not usually stubborn. I will have to stick to my

conviction, to the principle, to the matter of conscience on what I think is civilized behaviour and intelligence.

● (1710)

The one exception I would make is in the case of a declaration of war when the nation as a whole is united to defend itself. That is the only exception I would make; and even in that situation, not only in Canada but in countless countries, most of the people who were found guilty of treason were not executed. If my hon. friend would care to check the Archives and the Department of National Defence, in the Boer War, the First World War, the Second World War, and even the Korean War there were some cases of treason—and I would like somebody to tell me about anybody, particularly in the last 30, 40 or 50 years, who was executed when found guilty. Even when they admitted guilt, they were not executed. Even the red-necked dinosaurs of those days did not advocate it, and if they did they got short shrift.

I hope the lengthy statements which have been made by hon. members in support of these amendments will not be repeated. I want to say to the hon. member for Fraser Valley East that the kind of statements he makes do nothing more than incite and encourage those nuts who can be encouraged to consider committing treason or murder.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. I hope the bill goes through as is. There may be some minor amendments, but surely there must be something more than we have seen so far. I hope we get something more. If we do not, I invite hon. friends to my right, some across the way and those to my left, to decide that their arguments have all been made. Then we can vote on all the amendments and third reading of the bill in the next couple of days.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn)—Conflict of Interest—Allegation Mr. Bissonnette is linked with commercial activities of chairman of Anti-Dumping Tribunal; the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Post Office—Application to Olympic stamps of provision to withdraw 12 months after issue; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Transport—Threatened strike of aircraft safety inspectors—Government action to ensure adherence to safety regulations.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, we just finished listening to philosophy, ridicule and a bunch of nonsense from the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: In all my 18 years in the House of Commons, I have never listened to so much nonsense as I just have. The hon. member rarely makes a speech when he does not go overtime. He rarely makes a good speech unless he is heckled, and I do not blame the hecklers in this particular case. He made a very poor speech and was only heckled a little. He should have been heckled a lot more.

The amendment before the House suggests the deletion of clause 2 of the bill which refers to the penalty for those who commit treason. The hon. member did not know what treason was. As far as the bill is concerned, treason is committed by anyone who kills or attempts to kill Her Majesty or does her any bodily harm tending to death or destruction, who levies war against Canada or does any act preparatory thereto, or who assists an enemy at war with Canada. Those are the three broad definitions of treason. The clause goes on to say that everyone commits treason who, in Canada, uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada. One could go on and read the whole clause, but I suggest that I have read enough to provoke thought, and I hope enough for the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre to read the remaining portions of clause 2(2).

Let us consider for a moment the part of the clause which states, "uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada". This bill is part of the peace and security legislation program of the government. In October of 1972, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)—the great abolitionist, he would like us to believe—this cabinet minister and this government brought in the War Measures Act saying that there was an armed insurrection against Canada and against the government and that there was an attempt to overthrow the government.

We had to fly the army into Montreal. Cabinet ministers, the Prime Minister, the then leader of the opposition and all other official people in Ottawa had to be protected by army officers. Those officers were armed with particularly fast guns with hair-triggers. Was this government trying to tell us that it was against treason and that it did not believe in capital punishment when there was only the slightest tremor? This House has heard no evidence to suggest it was anything more that the slightest tremor. The

Rose brothers and a couple of others looked all over the United States for a couple of guns, and kidnapped two important people in Montreal. There was a so-called armed insurrection against the government—that is what we were told in this House, and we have heard nothing since.

An abolitionist cabinet immediately conned the rest of the House of Commons into believing that we were faced with an armed insurrection and that officers had to be armed and flown in from all over Canada to protect officials wherever they might be in Ottawa or Montreal. Was that not an expression of a deliberate preparedness to use capital punishment as a deterrent to the continuance of that so-called insurrection against Canada and the government? To me it was. Surely the government of the day must have thought that people were prepared to commit treason as defined in this clause. That is what we were told people in the FLQ were prepared to do. The FLQ was banned, and that is still the case. That is the only time in Canada's peacetime that an organization has been banned.

Many people over the past 30 or so years have often talked about banning the Communist party, but that has never come about. The Communist party exists, holds meetings and fields candidates in general elections, but because of this supposed threat the FLQ was banned. I point this out to suggest that this government in the past was prepared to use the death penalty when it felt that treason was being committed. I am not suggesting that in cases such as that nearly everyone caught—the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) shakes his head in a negative manner: If I am misinterpreting—

Mr. Allmand: You are.

Mr. Horner: The minister suggests that I am. He is permitted to get up after I have finished and straighten me out. I will listen to him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: However, his government has yet to put the facts on the table and to prove that there was an armed insurrection. Were those army officers, who were armed with guns, prepared to use them? Yes, they were. The record of this House is that they were issued with special guns and were specially trained soldiers. The guns were equipped with hair-triggers. I know what a hair-trigger is and that those guns were so equipped, because at that time an officer shot himself getting out of a truck outside my apartment. I know very well how they were armed and the type of hair-trigger on those guns. The government was prepared to use the death penalty for what it thought was treason, without giving people a fair trial. Over 400 people were arrested, all of whom were released and very few, if any, were charged. Why am I raising this matter, Mr. Speaker? It is merely to point out that this government acknowledges that when they feel threatened themselves, they will resort to the worst kind of use of capital punishment.

● (1720)

The hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Patterson) spoke about the recent terrorist incident in Uganda and the build-up of terrorism throughout the world. We can be fairly proud of our country as we have been relatively free of acts of international terrorism since 1972. But surely we must not be so complacent as to rest on our laurels and do away with the one measure which is a forceful deterrent. Some hon. members hide behind the belief that it has not been proven that it is a deterrent. It is a deterrent, Mr. Speaker. A deterrent is in the eyes of the person attempting to commit a crime. If 80 per cent of the people of the country believe it is a deterrent, then it is.

There is no question that the kidnappers of James Cross believed they might be shot if an exchange of gunfire took place between them and the police. A great deal of caution was taken in what might even be considered the preliminary negotiations when anonymous notes were dropped off at a radio station, and so on. They went to a great deal of trouble to keep the negotiations at more than arm's length because they were fearful for their lives. That suggests to me that those who kidnapped James Cross believed that the death penalty was a deterrent The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre suggested that Her Majesty has not requested it. Certainly, I believe that in many instances Her Majesty would extend clemency to those whose who made an attempt on her life.

Another thing should be mentioned in regard to treason, Mr. Speaker. Murder is committed by those who deliberately attempt to take the life of another. Treason is committed by a person or persons deliberately acting against the wish of the government or, in this case, the wish of Her Majesty or against the country. It is quite often the case that such persons are zealous believers in a cause. I suppose if their cause has a strong following in the country, that would be taken into consideration in deciding whether their sentences should be commuted.

I am saying that clause 2 should be left in this bill, and sections 46 and 47 should be left in the Criminal Code. They may be used only rarely, but they would serve a purpose, namely, to promote peace and security. That is what this whole legislative package is about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: Sections 83 and 84 are to promote peace and security. We find ourselves in an era where international terrorism is widespread. It does not seem to be on the wane, although there has been some success in recovering hostages. We are entering a period of particular importance to Canada. I think everyone in this House and in Canada would like to see the Olympics come off in grand style.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: This is the first time Canada has been host to the Olympics. The Olympics are being held in the city which in 1972 gave rise to some fear in the minds of the government of the day that there was a force there capable of some kind of armed insurrection.

Mrs. Sauvé: You said it was nothing.

Mr. Horner: I said it had not been proven, and this House has not learned the facts about whether it was any more than nothing.

Mrs. Sauvé: Now you are invoking it as something important.

Mr. Horner: I am saying to the hon. lady, who is now a member of the cabinet which convinced this House at that time, that it was in fact an armed insurrection, that they owe it to the Canadian people to come forth with the evidence so that we can judge.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: If that evidence were laid before this House of Commons today, many members on the hon. lady's back benches, and maybe even within the cabinet, would support this amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). They would see if the government's action was as great as she is convinced it was. That is the case I am trying to make. Lay the evidence on the table and then we will be able to judge. Do not ask us to judge—

Mrs. Sauvé: That's right.

Mr. Horner: —on the actions of this Prime Minister who one day blows hot and on other days blows cold.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benjamin: You voted with him.

Mr. Horner: I want to say one more thing about the law, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre suggested that the law is good for the rich and bad for the poor. I like to look upon it as good for those who have hope, and not so good, I suppose, for those who are hopeless. One does not have to be rich to have hope; one does not have to be poor to be hopeless. But the law should be fair and equal to all, and the death penalty for treason should be applicable to all, whether they be rich or poor. It is the duty of the courts to administer it fairly and apply it equally. It is the duty of the legislators to make the law and to amend the law, and it is the duty of the courts to apply it equally. Certainly, those with hope will use every avenue available to them before their hope is exhausted. Those without hope, I suppose, will resign themselves to what they consider the inevitable, in any case.

I sincerely urge this House, at this time in Canada's history, when it is faced with an overwhelming desire of the Canadian people to see retention of capital punishment, an overwhelming desire of the Canadian people to see a successful and harmonious execution of the Olympic games, and an overwhelming desire of the Canadian people to see that justice not only appear to be done but is in fact done, to delete clause 2 from the bill. If it is deleted and the bill carries, then capital punishment will apply to those people who have been proven to have either killed or attempted to kill Her Majesty, who have levied war against Canada or have used force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada.

I am simplifying the three major clauses, Mr. Speaker. This law would only be applied if it were proven that a person committed such an act or was a party to committing such an act. That is of the utmost importance, because I am certain that anybody involved in the least way in threatening the life or security of a cabinet minister during the October crisis would not have had a fair trial under this government. He probably would not even have had a chance to go to court. In fact, he probably would have been shot. There is the irony of this same government now coming forward with a bill to delete a fair trial for an act of treason.

● (1730)

However, if somewhere down the road members of the government desire to call in the armed forces again at the flick of a television camera by saying that an armed insurrection is arising and they must call in the troops to deal with those attemping to overthrow the government, they are permitted to do that. The passage of this bill will not prohibit the government from doing that without first proving to parliament and the country that there are forces attempting to overthrow the government. That is the sham of this abolitionist cabinet. Its members want to do away with justice and take the law into their own hands.

This cabinet says we do not need the death penalty for treason, just leave it to them. If they think someone is trying to overthrow the government, they will not bother with a trial. They will call in the army. That is the injustice of clause 2 of this legislation.

There is supposed to be a free vote on this legislation. I therefore urge all members of parliament, including those on the government side, to think seriously about this. By supporting this amendment they will not defeat the bill. In fact it will probably result in the Olympics running a little smoother. The bill would then allow Canada to be governed a little more smoothly. It might even make the cabinet a little less eager to hoodwink parliament and the Canadian people by bringing in the War Measures Act when they believe there might be some kind of insurrection.

I therefore ask this parliament to support this amendment. I repeat that it will not defeat the bill. It will help our system of justice. It will help Canadians, whether they come from Regina-Lake Centre or not. Every Canadian would be assured of a fair trial.

Mrs. Sauvé: A judicial system that would be civilized.

Mr. Horner: Yes, that is right.

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

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I could have completed my remarks at that point. What I was saying before I was interrupted by the hon. lady is that it would be better to keep this provision in the legislation. If that were the case, those hopeless people who would attempt to overthrow the government would be at the mercy of this cabinet which jumps at its own shadow and brings in the War Measures Act.

Mrs. Sauvé: We would shoot them?

Mr. Horner: I do not believe the hon. lady would shoot them. However, a police officer attempting to do his duty, possibly protecting the hon. lady, might accidentally shoot and kill someone. I therefore urge this House to support

the amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta. It is a good amendment. It is a timely amendment at this point in Canada's history when the world is fraught with the dangers of international terrorism.

There is a deep concern about the Olympics. The primary purpose of the Olympics used to be a sporting contest. However, today there is political manoeuvering creeping in. Even the forthcoming Olympics have not been free of that. Surely it would be far better to keep Sections 46 and 47 in the Criminal Code. I therefore urge all members of all parties to support this amendment.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of my colleague's amendment which proposes that clause 2 of Bill C-84 be deleted, the net effect being to preserve the treason provisions that now exist in our Criminal Code.

Frankly I am quit surprised to hear people who have taken part in this debate state this afternoon that they do not understand what treason is. They ask for the definition of treason.

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) seemed to be confused about what the government is doing through Bill C-84, namely, attempting to make us not just an abolitionist state by law for ordinary crimes, but attempting to make us an abolitionist state in total. I say that because it has become a kind of Liberal misrepresentation that the world is gravitating toward abolition, that somehow or other Canada is out of step with the rest of the world by not being an abolitionist nation along with what they fancy is desirable. As we stated in the House and in committee, that is absolutely wrong. It is a falsehood.

At the present time, the vast majority of the nations of the world are retentionist nations. In fact if we pass Bill C-84 in its present form we will become part of 1 per cent of the world's population that lives in a state that is in effect totally abolitionist. Surely it is us who will be out of step with the world, not the reverse which the government is indicating. I mention this because in committee the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) made a point of stating that democracies in the western world are taking to abolition as opposed to the retentionist traditions. I pointed this out to the committee. Even if one takes into account nations such as the United Kingdom, which have limited the use of the death penalty, one finds they did not limit the death penalty with regard to treason. This is one of the reasons for which I believe the amendment by my hon. friend is well worthy of consideration.

● (1740)

I should like to give briefly a little of the background to show where this concept of treason as an offence originated. This was an offence in Roman times, and is one of the most fundamental concepts of criminal law in existence. I would refer hon. members to the 1973 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica where it is stated that treason is the crime of betraying the nation or its sovereign by acts considered dangerous to their security. The article states that among most nations from very early times the punishment for treason has been severe. Death has been the mandatory sentence in England, and that provision was not affected by the limitation on the application of the death penalty effected by that country a few years ago.

That is the first point I wish to make. We have been told repeatedly by the government that we were somehow introducing into our own penal system laws which already existed in countries such as the United Kingdom. That is not true if we include the treason provisions contemplated in Bill C-84. The Encyclopedia goes on to say:

> The law of England regarding treason corresponds to a considerable extent to Roman law . . . The offence of high treason was not precisely defined by the common law until the passing of the Treason Act in 1351.

So the section of the Criminal Code we are today proposing to do away with—irresponsibly, I suggest—is one which has been in our criminal law as far as Britain is concerned since 1351. And in the eyes of the British courts the statute of 1351, so far as it defines the offence of high treason, is still law.

I refer to Britain because, of course, most of our common law and criminal law come from that country. But take the practice in the United States. The crime of treason was written right into the constitution by its framers back in 1776.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): 1789.

Mr. Stevens: In section 3(3) treason is defined in the United States constitution, and in section 3(2) it is stated that Congress shall have the power to determine the punishment for treason. It is interesting to note that U.S. criminal law states that whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies . . . is guilty of treason and shall suffer death. There are other alternative sentences provided. So that is the practice in the two countries to which we traditionally look—the United States, our neighbour, and Great Britain from which we derive the bulk of our criminal and common law.

Speaking of the United States, I am sure no one in this House will have failed to note the judgment which came down from the U.S. Supreme Court making it clear—there has been some doubt—that the death penalty is not to be held as contrary to the constitution of that country. I am curious to know whether the Solicitor General took time this week end to read the judgment which was handed down in Washington because it is timely as far as Canada is concerned. I hope every hon. member who retains the wishy-washy impression that somehow or other the Americans are tending to favour an abolitionist state will read that judgment and note what some of the judges of the U.S. Supreme Court say about the use of the death penalty in the system of criminal law.

What is happening in the United States? The fact is that the death penalty there has been extended, not lessened, contrary to misleading statements sometimes made by government members in support of this bill. I should like to refer to some of the statements which were made in the course of that judgment by the U.S. Supreme Court. The court made it clear that the death penalty was a constitutional penalty and should not be considered otherwise, and further that its imposition could be left in the hands of judges or jurors.

Perhaps I should comment that this ruling was the first on the death penalty since June 29, 1972, when it ruled by five to four that the law then on the books gave too much discretion to judges and juries. That decision invalidated death penalty laws of 36 states, the District of Columbia and of the federal government. In the aftermath of the 1972 decision, 35 states re-enacted the death penalty, but in one of them, Illinois, the law was struck down by the state's Supreme Court. The U.S. Supreme Court, in its judgment, said the enactment of capital punishment by state legislatures was "a marked indication of society's endorsement of the death penalty for murder."

When this question came up in committee I was surprised to find the Solicitor General unaware that while there were 13 abolitionist states at the time he introduced his last abolitionist or partial abolitionist legislation in this House, there are only ten today. He had to correct himself. He was not aware of this until he was so advised by his officials. Opinion in the United States has been reversing itself in the two or three years during which the minister has been attempting to make Canada an abolitionist nation.

It might be helpful, in considering whether the death penalty for treason should remain, to consider the differences in outlook between our Solicitor General and that of the solicitor general of the United States. The Solicitor General of Canada and the solicitor general of the United States are charged with a similar duty, that of upholding the law, yet both have such divergent views. For example, the solicitor general of the United States had this to say:

● (1750)

> The United States believes that imposition of the death penalty may sometimes be a necessary and appropriate measure to achieve the traditional goals of criminal justice . . .

He points out that, following the 1972 decision I have referred to, Congress enacted a statute providing the death penalty for aircraft piracy that results in death. Again the solicitor general of the United States, in sharp contrast to the weak-kneed approach of our Solicitor General, at page 5 of his brief said that the death penalty is a traditional sanction for those offences society considers the most dangerous. He went on in his very extensive brief to express the view that capital punishment serves other purposes as well. He said:

> The death penalty serves a vital function as society's expression of moral outrage, and marks off some crimes as so repulsive that they are to be avoided by those individuals with even a trace of social responsibility. Some crimes, too, are so vicious, so offensive to society's standards of decency, that they call out for an ultimate sanction in order to reinforce the social feeling of revulsion to acts of that character. This response—retribution perhaps, although without vindictiveness—has been endorsed by respected commentators and seems an essential ingredient of a healthy society.

I am quoting directly from the brief of the United States solicitor general submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States, which court in turn held substantially in favour of his representation. The U.S. solicitor general continued:

> Finally, capital punishment incapacitates some individuals who, if allowed to remain alive, would be so immune to normal forms of social control that they would continue to commit murders even if sentenced to life imprisonment without possibility of parole. The federal prison system now confines at least one man who, since his incarceration for murder, has committed and been convicted of murders within prison on three separate occasions.

How often has it been pointed out in this House, Mr. Speaker, that if a man is sentenced to prison for life for committing murder, what is to prevent him from murdering a second or third time? The U.S. solicitor general makes that very point. He says that there is at least one person in the United States who, on three separate occasions, has committed murder after being sentenced to life imprisonment. He continued:

> This man, and others like him, will find opportunities to kill again, regardless of the care taken to guard them . . .
>
> Although there may be legitimate differences of opinion regarding capital punishment's acceptance by modern society, its value as a deterrent, and society's need for it to reinforce social values and incapacitate dangerous offenders, those differences of opinion are to be resolved by the legislature; and the legislative judgment on these matters should be accepted by the judicial arm.

I could quote many similar portions of the U.S. solicitor general's submission, but I wish only to highlight the sharp contrast between the present trend in the United States in terms of retaining and even extending the death penalty and Bill C-84, if it should finally pass this House—heaven forbid. The reason I raise these points is to preserve the fundamental view that a crime such as treason, which I have defined for the House, is at least one crime for which any person found guilty should expect to pay with his life.

I suggest that we were right today to indicate our approval for the effective and speedy action taken by the government of Israel in rescuing refugees from the terrorists who held them in Uganda.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: As I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe we were right in making that response. Bearing in mind that those who were involved in treason were "eliminated", to use the terminology of the government of Israel, surely we are being inconsistent, having congratulated earlier today one government for taking such speedy action, to propose a little later on the same day the removal from the Criminal Code of the death penalty for this same crime of treason. That, Mr. Speaker, is just plain inconsistent, and even if in spirit hon. members are in favour of abolition generally, I call upon them to call a halt to this nation becoming totally abolitionist even when the crime of treason is committed.

In his submission to the U.S. Supreme Court, the United States solicitor general highlighted why he felt capital punishment does in fact deter crime. Further on in his brief he said this:

> In enacting death penalty statutes, the legislatures throughout the country have not acted irrationally. Capital punishment serves several important social purposes, among which are deterring crimes and expressing society's moral outrage in a manner that shapes and reinforces the community's standards.
>
> There is an inherent logic to the belief that the death penalty deters at least some people from committing crimes.

In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, how can we be so sure that our Solicitor General, who is a babe in the woods so far as criminal offenders are concerned, is right in proposing that we become—

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

He may continue with unanimous consent. Has he unanimous consent to continue?

An hon. Member: No.

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. It being six o'clock p.m. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock later this day.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I should like to inform the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) that he did not receive the unanimous consent of the House, therefore his speech has ended.

Mr. Stevens: Who said that?

An hon. Member: We agree.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): There was a nay from the right hand side of the House, therefore you may not continue with your speech.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that my colleague would be allowed the privilege of speaking following the dinner recess. However, I am pleased to make a few comments on this amendment which would retain the punishment of death to be administered in some form for high treason. It has been mentioned by previous speakers that at this time there are only nine countries in the entire world which have total abolition, that is, no death penalty for any crime whatever. It would seem that the present government intends to do its best to see that ours becomes the tenth country. Certainly this is a very small percentage of the total number of countries in the world. I believe my colleague mentioned that it was less than 1 per cent.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Darling: This is a so-called free vote. At least it is a free vote in this party, and that is more than can be said for that party over there. A lot of you sanctimonious ones over there deep down in your hearts are retentionists.

It may interest my colleagues from the government side to learn that on Friday evening I appeared on a television open line show broadcast out of North Bay, which is not even in my riding. Most of my colleagues are aware that there are certain issues of vital importance to the people of Canada other than capital punishment. But on that open line show which lasted for 35 minutes there was not one question in respect of any of the other issues, including air control and the pilots' strike. There was not one question on an issue other than capital punishment, and that is absolutely true. Of all the people who telephoned in there was one in favour of abolition and the rest were for the retention of capital punishment.

An hon. Member: So what?

Mr. Darling: This just gives you an idea of how important this legislation is in the minds of everyone. Certainly in my view, and in the view of the great majority of my colleagues on this side, there should not be capital punishment just for high treason but for many types of murder as well. After spending the week end in my riding I am sure what the feeling is. I was also outside my riding in Sudbury and North Bay, and this is something that came through loud and clear.

I represent a riding which could be classed, as we say, in the near north Ontario, namely, Parry Sound-Muskoka, that great vacation riding. Of all the northern Ontario members I am the only one in favour of the retention of capital punishment. All the rest are abolitionists. The people in northern Ontario are certainly pioneers, and I am sure of their views. The majority of them would feel the same as I do.

Another thing I pointed out to the listeners was the fact that a lot of my colleagues who were abolitionists in their vote, whether they are abolitionists at heart, are going to have a pretty hot summer when they return to their ridings, and I am not talking only about the weather.

An hon. Member: What about their principles?

Mr. Darling: They will have to defend their principles. Let me also tell some of the hon. members who voted with the government, and not necessarily because of their own principles, they may have a pretty tough time returning here in 1978.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would address the Chair. I would suggest to other members that the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) has the floor and we should allow him to speak.

● (2010)

Mr. Darling: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do not mind being heckled by my colleagues over there. So far as I am concerned certainly every member of parliament who wants to do a job should be re-elected. I do not want to sell my principles down the river on the basis of being elected, but in this instance I know I have the backing of the great majority of the people in my riding and, I am quite sure, the backing of most of the people in the ridings of the members facing me, believe it or not. So shake your heads, my illustrious colleagues; I bet that if you spend any time in your ridings this summer you will find out what your constituents say about the stand you are taking if you speak or vote in favour of this bill.

When we consider high treason, the crime of attempted murder of a sovereign, or an attempted overthrow of a government, I must say there might be extenuating circumstances which would prompt one to try to overthrow the present government, whether or not it be a capital crime for which death would be the ultimate penalty. In my view, regardless of the present government, the Government of Canada supposedly represents the opinions and the wishes of the people of Canada. However, this is not

the case in this instance because the government knows it is flying in the face of public opinion.

An hon. Member: No!

Mr. Darling: This is one thing I do not have to prove. It is a fact in no uncertain terms. I might return to the matter of the television show I was on on Friday night. Because of unemployment and inflation and the fact that these are very important matters in the eyes of the people of Canada today, I had thought there would have been questions along these lines but there were not. This indicates how emotional the people are about this particular bill, C-84. I am hoping that some of my colleagues, and I include those on all sides of the House, will have second thoughts to that when the bill comes up for third reading they will vote on that basis that although it is fine to vote with one's party on certain things, even the best party member who votes on that basis will not accomplish a hell of a lot of good if he is defeated in 1978.

Some members over there shake their heads. I think the important thing in this business is to be re-elected, because if one wants to be in a position to present his views he cannot do so sitting back in the riding, which will be the case when he flies in the face of public opinion in his riding. When this vote comes up—and as I say I am not sure when that will be—and the votes on the amendments that have been presented by some of my colleagues, and especially this one in respect of high treason, surely even the most sanctimonious members will agree that the ultimate penalty of death should be available and should be mandatory.

Mr. Caccia: How about your own leader?

Mr. Darling: Fine. I do not agree with my leader in all things. To my illustrious colleague from Davenport I say: how about your leader? There is a hell of a lot about him which you do not agree with, but you do not have the guts to say so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. Darling: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I wish to state in no uncertain terms that I feel on this particular amendment the entire House should vote in favour of the retention of capital punishment for high treason, attempting to overthrow the government, and so on.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to speak to the amendment to clause 2 dealing with treason and high treason. I think for the record it would be interesting to members, particularly those opposite, to have an indication of what countries have abolished capital punishment in its entirety and what countries have abolished capital punishment by law for only the ordinary crime of murder.

I should like to indicate that Austria, Columbia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Equador, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Sweden, Uruguay, and Venezuela are all countries which have abolished the death penalty. The remaining countries provide the death penalty for treason. I think it is also interesting to note that with the exception of three of four of these countries the majority are in the southern hemisphere, South America, Latin America or Central America. I shall not embarrass the countries by naming them specifically, but surely the diplomats, the consuls and the ambassadors know to which countries I allude. These countries have their own forms of capital punishment which, to the people of the democratic or free world, are repugnant. Whether capital punishment be carried out by black boots or brown boots according to the philosophy of the country, nevertheless it is still enforced.

I believe that unquestionably throughout the world we have entered into a period of change in the thinking of nations which at times, in my view, borders on madness, perhaps brought about by extreme degrees of frustration and, in some instances, suppression. Nevertheless we have seen the advent of a new time, a new era, throughout the world when countries are divided, with despots seeking the platform on some popular public issue and carrying a country on a wave of independence, only subsequently to rule that country with an iron fist. This bears on one thing. It bears on the absence of tradition.

I suppose any nation has a tradition, but the true, deep-seated, ingrained definition of tradition, that lies in the hearts particularly of Canadians and people associated with Great Britain or her dominions, is not easily dispelled. I know that today in Canada there are those who speak with scorn about Her Majesty, and yet there are thousands upon thousands of Canadians who fought for Her Majesty and who refer to her with admiration.

● (2020)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brisco: That was my schooling, and I am proud of it, totally proud of it. I ask you to reflect back to those grim days when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of this country had, at least for a time, the support of the nation. I think you could hear a pin drop throughout Canada as the Prime Minister went on television and told us of the terrible things that were happening in Quebec and why he would have to implement the War Measures Act. Those were serious times, times that challenged the very thread of Canadian morale, but not the thread of Canadian morality.

I ask every member of the House to ponder on what kind of a television appearance the Prime Minister would make if he were to announce that at the Olympics some mad dog of an assassin attempted or succeeded in killing the Queen. What would that type of horrible tragedy do to this nation? Would it tear us apart? It would certainly tear us apart as far as our hearts are concerned.

You may say, you are just thinking in terms of revenge if you are going to hang the individual concerned, if the crowd did not tear him asunder first. We have to go back to the very root of treason, born on tradition, carried through ever since by nation after nation, and I refer you to the Encyclopedia Britannica which says the following about treason:

> Most nations have from early times provided for the punishment of treason. Punishment has characterically been severe . . . death is still the mandatory sentence—

and let hon. members on the opposite side ponder this.

—in England, and that position was not affected by the Murder (Abolition of Death Penalty) Act, 1965.

An hon. Member: What about Joe's position?

Mr. Brisco: I am concerned with my view and those supporting it. If hon. members opposite have something to say that they think is constructive, I think it befits them to join the debate. Either put up or shut up.

The subject of treason has been one that has been brought forward at the United Nations, because it is a separate and distinct entity. How did the U.N. agonize over the issue? In a review by the United Nations on the current situation the following was stated:

In academic circles it has sometimes become unfashionable to support capital punishment: civilization is tolerance and severity in punishment a sign of backwardness and regression, and so liberal thinking and the abolition of the death penalty are expected to coincide. Therefore the writing available on the death penalty leaves the impression that there is a certain inevitability about the movement to more "civilized standards" and fewer executions. A reader could be excused for concluding that throughout the world there is in fact an irresistible and ineluctable trend towards the abolition of capital punishment or that even where death is still a last legal resort, the penal codes have fewer offences leading to capital punishment or that methods of execution are becoming more humane or that the persons liable to the extreme penalty will usually have the benefit of the best legal safeguards.

The world at present provides no such assurances. Moreover it seems clear that in many cases governments satisfy public opinion by using the sentence, but no so in Canada. There is evidence that even the countries totally abolishing capital punishment have sometimes, if not always, acted contrary to the majority view of the population. However, that is nothing new for this government, and I do not care whether those on the opposite side would like to say that they have the opportunity to vote freely. I shall never forget that date when I watched the Prime Minister sit there as he has never sat there before through any vote, and swivel his head back and forth like a tortoise or an owl. He looked at every member who dared vote against the Prime Minister and Prime Minister's views.

Mr. Allmand: Nonsense!

Mr. Brisco: Let me say that the names of those members are firmly imprinted on the mind of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Brisco: If you cannot stand the heat, get away from the stove. If the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) has something to contribute, it would be for the first time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Would the hon. member please get back to the terms of the bill, and would he address his remarks to the Chair?

Mr. Brisco: I will have great pleasure in getting back to the terms of the bill were it not for the rude interruptions by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain and those of his associates. If they had something valuable to contribute, I would not mind.

An hon. Member: They are his accomplices, not his associates.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, my interruptions were not intended for the hon. member at all; they were intended for the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member is not raising a point of order but rather a point of debate.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, thank you for advising the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain that he did not have a valid point of order. I certainly agree with you that this is nothing unusual for that member.

Let me continue my remarks with regard to the position taken by the U.S. government. The United States believes that the imposition of the death penalty may sometimes be a necessity and an appropriate measure to achieve the traditonal goals of criminal justice. Congress enacted a statute providing the death penalty for aircraft piracy that results in death. How many hon. members recall the incident over Canada's air space when those murderers who kill for profit caused an aircraft to blow up, taking many lives with it? What happened to them? I clearly remember without any regret that they paid the supreme penalty.

The government would have us believe that those who are prepared to destroy the lives of 100, 200 or 300 people in one fell swoop by blowing up an aircraft, can be rehabilitated, and I ask: rehabilitated to what, to kill again? The statistics are there; the minister has his own statistics, and I have read them. The facts are there, that certainly murderers who have been released have murdered again. Why should that be allowed to happen? Particularly with regard to crimes against the state and crimes against the sovereign, this should not be allowed to happen. Does the government condone the action of some mad dog who would commit treason?

● (2030)

Let me warn hon. members that I am aware of the fine line between sedition and treason. I am aware of the definition, and I am aware of the difference between espionage and treason, but these things do exist, and on the basis of present day technology they are highly possible. Hon. members tell me that 25 years, 10 years or 7 years will rehabilitate the mad dog who, with full foreknowledge of his action and with every degree of premeditation he can summon, sets out to murder Canadians through an act of treason, or sets out to murder the sovereign. Do hon. members think that the penalty should be a few years in jail and that he would then be rehabilitated?

Speaking of tradition, I must say thank God the tradition in Canada, at least thus far, has not been to shoot presidents or prime ministers. Tradition in the United States would certainly seem to be the contrary, and from an examination of those who have committed this horrible act, the majority of them have paid the supreme penalty. It is only in the more enlightened days of the immediate past that we have seen attacks on presidential candidates not lead eventually to that supreme penalty.

On behalf of all those Canadians who have risen with one voice, either through the medium of the press, through the medium of writing to their MLA's and their members of parliament, through the medium of hotlines or whatever medium, I say that by a vast majority they have indicated

that they have been treacherously dealt with by the government, and that they consider that members of parliament who represent them here and who do not carry out the wishes of their constituents are demonstrating a failure to respond to the demands and views of Canadians.

I have no difficulty with my conscience on this issue at all. Not only do I support the wishes of my constituents, but it should be clearly elucidated and pretty well a matter of fact, and there should be no doubt in the minds of those here tonight, that my position fully supports the fact that the amendment with reference to treason should stand, that the supreme penalty should be paid as far as treason is concerned, and that this clause should be removed from the bill and dealt with as a separate entity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, motions Nos. 7 and 10 highlight two clauses of Bill C-84 which caused me the other day to make an observation, that is on June 29 when Mr. Speaker was considering whether there was a central principle to Bill C-84, it being the abolition of capital punishment. At that time I suggested that that was not the case, and further reading of the bill has convinced me that I was right at that time. There has been a failure to appreciate one single fact with regard to Bill C-84. It is an amending bill, and all an amending bill does is amend a number of sections in existing law which themselves each embody a principle. Then there is the central theme in a total bill—new legislation. That aspect of Bill C-84 has been lost sight of. It is a bill to amend the Criminal Code. That is its principle.

When one considers clause 2 of the bill, there is created there a totally new offence, high treason. What has that got to do with the so-called central theme of the abolition of capital punishment in this bill? All the clauses which follow with regard to parole following life sentences are already dealt with under the Criminal Code, but the terms of parole thereunder are being changed. Is the central theme the abolition of capital punishment? Hardly. Therefore I am glad to participate in this debate, but I underline those arguments.

I accept Mr. Speaker's ruling. I listened to it, I must conform to it, but that does not mean I must agree with it, and I respectfully draw to the attention of the Chair this particular aspect of my remarks.

Let us look at sections 46 and 47 of the Criminal Code. Treason is dealt with in section 46, and there are eight paragraphs enumerated there which constitute treason and have constituted treason in the history of Canada much longer than you, Mr. Speaker, and I have been around. But now, for some fanciful reason, three types of treason are to be elevated to high treason, and one of the forms under section 46(1) is being totally eliminated. I wonder why? I ask the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) why it is that conspiracy to kill Her Majesty should not be high treason if the killing, the attempting to kill or doing bodily harms is to be high treason? It was formerly part of treason. It was dealt with in section 46(1)(d). However, that has disappeared in the shuffle of setting up high treason and, I suppose, second class treason. We now have this treason affecting the life and the person of the reigning monarch.

[Mr. Brisco.]

Then there is the second question of levying war against Canada or doing any act preparatory thereto, but why would not conspiracy to do that be part of it? Is the only one who actually is levying the war the one who will be guilty of high treason? Are his partners—and I say "his" in the general sense—to escape entirely? That is not a crime under the new bill.

The third category is assisting an enemy at war with Canada, or any armed forces against whom Canadian forces are engaged in hostilities whether or not a state of war exists between Canada and the country whose forces they are. High treason? Well, the wording is the same as the first three paragraphs of what it was for treason, so what is new? It has been made high treason. That is the principle of the amending clause. It has nothing to do with capital punishment.

Then we deal with every one who commits treason, and we have the paragraphs broken down. In section 46.(1)(*f*) of the Criminal Code it provides that everyone commits treason who:

● (2040)

conspires with any person to do anything mentioned in paragraphs (*a*) to (*d*);

We had a whole series of forms of treason where there was also conspiracy which in itself was treason, but it is no longer there. At worst it is treason to conspire with a person to commit high treason. I find it extraordinary that to conspire with a person to commit high treason is simply treason. The Solicitor General has a great deal to answer for a regard to setting up this section and the wording of it.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): He does not understand it, I am sure.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): In one form or another they tried to arrive at what was contained in section 46 in the definition of treason. I wish the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) had done his reading instead of that awful drivel he put on the record this afternoon about what he imagined that some other people imagine, what other people quite ungrammatically and incorrectly call treason or treasonable. We were paraded through a long speech on that point.

Let us look at what the penalty is. High treason calls for life imprisonment. That is a minimum punishment according to the terms of the bill. It means 25 years without the possibility of parole.

When I was a student whether in high school or at university one of the things that was emphasized to us was confinement to the Bastille by lettre de cachet. In other words it was possible to be banished for life into the confines of the Bastille. These provisions, Mr. Speaker, are the equivalent of lettre de cachet, although I suppose the physical conditions have changed. There will be better food and better accommodation than in the Bastille there is no doubt, but there is not guarantee that another prisoner or prisoners will not murder within the prison. Perhaps the state wants it that way, as I speculated the other day.

There was another type of punishment that was always emphasized to us as the most heinous that man could inflict upon his fellowman. That was a life sentence to

Devil's Island. That was at least 25 years. As I said the other day on second reading, we have devised our own sadistic torture of our fellowman. Has anyone here contemplated what 25 years in prison can do?

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It is worse than hanging them.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): In many instances, Mr. Speaker, it is calculated exposure to the wolves of the prison system. Is that what we are going to do? All those high moralists in this Chamber and outside who insist that capital punishment is immoral are people whose own morality now—

Mr. Caccia: What about your own leader? What did he say?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) is a beautiful one to talk about the leader. In this bill and in this amendment it is every man for himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member demonstrates a craven subservience to the views of leadership—the present views of his leader on this particular subject. The other day it was apparent in the debate, and it is apparent today.

We have this sentence of 25 years for high treason, ten years certain for treason, and the judge may impose an additional period. I think there are inconsistencies here. Why should there be any difference between an attempt to kill the reigning monarch and a violent attempt to overthrow the lawful authority of the state? Why would there be any difference between assisting an enemy during a time of war—that is someone performing that act outside the country—and someone inside carrying on a guerilla command?

One is guilty of high treason if, sitting on the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, one were to discharge long range firearms at the coast of Newfoundland, but if within the province of Newfoundland one were to discharge those self-same guns in order to upset the government of Newfoundland or the power of the Government of Canada, that would simply be treason. Can anyone in their right senses explain the difference? Who shall be the more guilty—he who stands on the shore of St. Pierre and Miquelon and fires at the coast of Newfoundland, or he who stands within a few miles of St. John's and fires the same gun at St. John's? This is treason and high treason—an act of war. I shall let my colleagues figure that one out a little later.

I am more than satisfied that my colleagues who put forward these amendments are correct—the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin). I think they highlight a most important and a very substantial amendment to the Criminal Code. Incidentally, it drags in by the tail the question of capital punishment. It is only consequential on the division of the crimes. Therefore I am more than happy to support both motions, Nos. 7 and 10. I think it is an illogical mishmash in so far as all those treasonable acts that have existed in the past are concerned and which are now supposedly being redefined in some sort of modern context which exists in the mind of the draftsman alone. His logic and that of the sponsors escapes most people. Therefore I would ask all members of this House to delete clause 2.

● (2050)

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, before speaking on the amendment this evening I wish to congratulate our American friends on their decision just a few days ago in which their Supreme Court upheld the death penalty. I have an article here headed "Supreme Court Decision on Death Penalty Hailed". I quote:

> The Supreme Court is thinking like the American people are thinking," said a state senator from Maine.

It is unfortunate that this House is not thinking like the Canadian people are thinking.

> And there was little doubt the court ruling upholding the concept of capital punishment for murders brings the court a lot closer to the thinking of most Americans.

I wish I were reading that it was bringing our courts closer to the thinking of most Canadians. However, that will not happen with this government.

Unfortunately many members of the opposition, especially NDP members who are supposed to be the champions of the people, are totally opposed to what the majority of Canadians want. I find this very strange.

I will read to hon. members the law as it is now so that there will be no mistake about it. This law has been on the statute book for years. I quote the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) who saw the weaknesses in this bill probably better than any other member. He is to be commended for the research he has done into this piece of legislation. I quote:

> The Canadian Civil Liberties Organization has not asked that the law regarding treason be repealed. Again I challenge the government to name one organization or anyone of responsibility across Canada who has asked for this. The sections in question should be placed on the record. Sections 46 and 47 at present read as follows:
>
> 46(1) Every one commits treason who, in Canada
>
> (a) kills or attempts to kill Her Majesty, or does her any bodily harm tending to death or destruction, maims or wounds her, or imprisons or restrains her;
>
> (b) levies war against Canada or does any act preparatory thereto;
>
> (c) assists an enemy at war with Canada, or any armed forces against whom Canadian forces are engaged in hostilities . . .
>
> (d) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province;
>
> (e) without lawful authority, communicates or makes available to an agent of a state other than Canada, military or scientific information or any sketch, plan, model, article, note or document of a military or scientific character that he knows or ought to know may be used by that state for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or defence of Canada . . .
>
> 47(1) Every one who commits treason is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable
>
> (a) To be sentenced to death if he is guilty of an offence under paragraph 46(1)(a), (b) or (c)—
>
> That is the killing or the attempted killing of the Queen of Canada, to levy war against Canada or to assist an enemy at war with Canada. Why has this been changed at this time? Nobody has answered that. Again I repeat: there is something gratuitous about the government's action in this regard. Then so far as penalties are concerned, if all one does is to use force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the

government of Canada or a province, they may be sentenced to death or to imprisonment for life.

There is something behind this, and that is what we have not found out. What has activated the government of Canada to bring before the House legislation which will make Canada an open place for assassination and treason subject only to a jail sentence in a world in which terrorism marches and assassinations and kidnappings with assassination take place all over the world? Just at this time the Government of Canada decides that it must be kind to terrorists, international murders and those who raise rebellion.

The only government member who has entered into the debate in the past few days has talked in defence of a number of charges contained in letters to Hamilton newspapers. It is unfortunate that he has not expounded on capital punishment because of the two different stands he has taken on it. It would be a great contribution if he would expound on this issue. I see he has left the Chamber. Possibly later this evening the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) will expand on the two different stands he has taken with regard to capital punishment.

As I stated earlier, they have brought back capital punishment in the United States. A number of states have passed laws bringing back capital punishment. I wish to go into a bit of the history and the reasons why the United States has brought it back.

In 1965 New York abolished capital punishment except for someone convicted of killing a peace officer acting in the line of duty, and for a life convict who murders a guard or inmate in prison or while attempting to escape. The same year Vermont abandoned the death penalty except for treason, kidnapping for ransom, and for those who have been convicted of murder in the first degree and commit a second "unrelated" murder and for those convicts who murder any employee of the state prison or house of correction or a person known by the offender to be a law-enforcement officer performing the duties of his office.

I presume all hon. members received today the latest communication from the Public Service Alliance of Canada. It is addressed to "Honourable Members of the House of Commons". It points out the concern of our prison guards. These guards could soon be looking after prisoners convicted of treason. With the Olympics coming up, we can expect just about anything. Enclosed with the letter is a full statement on their concerns for their lives and the lack of protection in our prisons today. They state, and I quote:

Please find attached a copy of a paper presented to the Solicitor General of Canada, Honourable Warren Allmand, in his office on June 29, 1976.

In our closing paragraph to the Solicitor General of Canada we have requested that this bill be tabled until he is able to provide a special institution to ensure the security and safety of all penitentiary personnel working in institutions.

Of course the answer we will receive from the government with regard to dealing with murderers is that it will build smaller, more comfortable jails. That is not the answer.

We humbly urge you on behalf of all penitentiary personnel and their families to defeat Bill C-84, otherwise you will have to bear the responsibility that will ensue from the chaotic situation that will result from your negative vote on the security of all law abiding citizens of Canada.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

● (2100)

This is the second document I have received from prison guards in the last ten days. They go into explicit detail concerning the problems they are experiencing. This brings me back to my original speech on capital punishment in which I suggested that the abolitionists might change places with the guards and take responsibility for looking after Mad Dog Kelly and other ruthless killers of his type, men you cannot turn your back on for one second. If hon. members want to learn in detail what it is like to look after individuals of his sort I suggest they contact some jail guards.

In the United States there are certain crimes against government and there are two crimes in particular which fall into this category, treason and perjury. Our concern today arises from the proposal to drop the penalty of capital punishment with respect to treason. Treason is the act of levying war against the government of a jurisdiction or of giving aid and comfort to its enemies. Twenty jurisdictions punish treason with death. Twelve of them demand death on conviction—there is no alternative sentence. This places treason third in the rank order of offences punishable by death and first in the rank order of mandatory sentences.

Also there are crimes against property which can become capital. They include train wrecking, arson and burglary. I should like to add another crime—that of hijacking. I am reminded of a case in San Francisco a couple of years ago. A retired couple were on a United States jet aircraft which was taken over by hijackers. There was an exchange of gunfire within the aircraft and the husband was killed before the eyes of the wife. He was down in the States looking for a place for retirement. I find it very strange that abolitionists would want to deal so leniently with hijackers. Fortunately, in this case, the two hijackers were killed by FBI agents when they left the aircraft. But our Canadian retired railway worker lay in the aircraft in a pool of blood.

Train wrecking is generally any act such as tampering with switches or signals or burning trestles with intent to derail a train. In most jurisdictions the offence becomes capital only if someone dies as a result of such wrecking. Eighteen jurisdictions provide the death penalty for train wrecking; three of them make death mandatory.

Arson is the wilful and malicious burning of the building of another. Georgia, for example, has six arson statutes all making arson a capital crime. Four of them make arson imputed murder if death occurs as a result. Arson is ninth in the rank order of offences with nine jurisdictions punishing it. There are no mandatory jurisdiction. The death penalty in relation to all these crimes is being removed and those who commit them will simply receive a nice life sentence in a comfortable jail in return for these very serious offences.

With regard to the relation between the law, crime, and executions, let me say that anyone who hopes to understand the place of capital punishment in contemporary American society must have a grasp of the latest information on at least four aspects of this subject. First, he needs to know what crimes in each American jurisdiction are at present punishable by death. Next, he needs to know how many of each of these crimes actually occur. Third, he

must understand the scope of liability for a death sentence, especially as juveniles are affected. Lastly, he should have some idea of the ultimate fate of a typical group of persons originally sentenced to death by reference to a record of those who have been executed.

It is probable that few Americans have any idea how many crimes still carry a death penalty—anywhere from 33 to 67 crimes depending on how they are classified. They range from familiar ones such as murder, kidnapping, rape, and treason, to such crimes as desecrating a grave (Georgia), attempting to set fire to a prison (Arkansas), and sexually assaulting a girl under 18—so-called "statutory rape" (Nevada and Texas). Just in the past week there has been another violent rape and murder of a nine-year-old girl in British Columbia. The answer to this is apparently to build smaller and more comfortable jails in which to look after these criminals. I know the Canadian people will not accept this.

What do Americans think of the death penalty today? Their attitudes obviously govern the likelihood of retaining, extending or abolishing it in that country in our time. In 1964 Governor George E. Chamberlain, in his inaugural address to the legislature, recommended that all executions should take place within the walls of a penitentiary. In the same year a law was passed requiring that all executions take place at the state penitentiary at Salem, and two years later Governor Chamberlain said he was sure this law would be most beneficial in its results.

Just before closing, I should like to make a brief comment. A 25-year-old youth from Winnipeg, the city from which I come, was found dead in the streets of New Orleans as last week. He had been knifed to death by a mugger. Murder on the streets is becoming almost a daily event, and the majority of Canadians are demanding that we return to capital punishment. We should bow to their wishes. I have conducted two polls in my riding which show that 80 per cent want the retention of capital punishment. And one poll carried out this year shows that 90 per cent want capital punishment retained.

I hear an intervention by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain to whom I referred earlier in my speech. I hope he will explain to us tonight why he has taken two different stands on this question of capital punishment. I believe he owes us some explanation, not just a brief interjection such as he made last Wednesday. I think it might prove to be an excellent contribution, one which would help us understand the two different stances he has taken.

Mr. MacFarlane: On a point of order, the hon. member seems to be seeking an answer to a question. He may be thinking I will give an explanation for something he has misread, misquoted, and misrepresented. The explanation I gave him on Wednesday was very detailed, it was very clear, and I think it will suffice for him if he will read it.

Mr. McKenzie: I made no specific reference to those contradictory newspaper articles. I simply asked the hon. member to stand up and give an explanation of his two different stands. I am asking him to make contribution to the debate. We are not hearing from anyone on the government side other than by way of brief interjections. Let the hon. member stand up and make a ten or 20 minute speech on his position. I am not particularly interested in a little controversy about a short newspaper article.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Oh, come on! We do not want to be here all summer. That is a filibuster going on over there. I am a retentionist but I would not lower myself to that.

Mr. Nystrom: Hear, hear!

● (2110)

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You are filibustering. As I say, I am a retentionist but I would not lower myself to do what you are doing.

Mr. McKenzie: The hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) will be getting another reward for being the most abrasive MP in the House.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Yes, and I am proud of it. I don't waste the time of the House by saying nothing.

Mr. Forrestall: You can do better than that, Joe.

Mr. McKenzie: No, he is getting weaker and weaker.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I am still going to vote against the bill but I won't talk all night and say nothing.

Mr. McKenzie: I am not going to be talking much longer so I hope the hon. member for St. Boniface will be making a contribution.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): If I do, I won't have to read what I say.

Mr. McKenzie: We would welcome the opportunity, whether you read it or not, to have you make a contribution. Get up on your feet. You are the government whip and you can get the deputy whip as well to make a real contribution, instead of sitting there, bellowing night after night.

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

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, whether I am chief government whip or not has no bearing on the vote. I am a retentionist and I feel that my position in this House has no bearing whatever on the vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for St. Boniface will have the chance, if he so chooses, to express that point of view. In the meantime I would bring to the attention of the House that the time of the hon. member has just expired, but in view of the interruptions I will give him a few minutes extra to compensate.

Mr. McKenzie: I am just concluding, Mr. Speaker. May I point out that I agree with Your Honour entirely. I think that the whip and deputy whip should get up on their feet and make a contribution, instead of engaging in these ridiculous interjections.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I will make my contribution when I vote against the bill.

Capital Punishment

Mr. Sean O'Sullivan (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak very briefly on the motion moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), I should like to take a minute or two to address myself to the allegation that has been made by a couple of members on the other side that we in the official opposition are conducting some kind of filibuster. That is not only untrue but is an unworthy allegation. In a matter as serious as this, one literally involving life and death, there is no great advantage in seeking haste to make a decision.

I would point out to hon. members, through you Mr. Speaker, that on this very day a spokesman for the official opposition put forward a proposal to speed up this process in an orderly fashion so that we might hold votes on Wednesday or Thursday of this week. Yet we are still waiting for an answer from the government, which seems to be unable to get together with the spokesman for the NDP. This suggestion would bring about a vote this week, not delay the vote, as has been suggested. I think that should be put in its proper perspective. We are not party to delay. But we are party to the belief that good government demands careful consideration of legislation, especially legislation as important as this, at a time, I might add, when the people of Canada are with too much just cause losing faith in their parliament.

The motion put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta is one that members, be they retentionists or abolitionists, can support and remain consistent. One of the favourite arguments of the abolitionists was to quote the example of other countries, the so-called abolitionist countries, in which the death penalty had generally been done away with. Up until this past week we frequently heard about the judgment of the United States Supreme Court, once removed, and its attitude to capital punishment. This argument is no longer quoted by the abolitionists because, in light of experience in intervening years, the U.S. Supreme Court has come down with a new ruling.

Hon. members have also looked to the mother of parliaments, the United Kingdom, where moves to bring back capital punishment had been turned back. It was said they were ahead of us in the abolition of capital punishment. Yet in both the United States and the United Kingdom capital punishment remains in effect for the crime of treason. As a matter of fact the United Kingdom act providing for the abolition of the death penalty contains the provision that the sentence of death can only be imposed in cases of high treason and piracy with violence. It goes on to provide that when a person is convicted of treason, sentence of death must be pronounced. That is the law in an abolitionist country, Mr. Speaker, an example so frequently quoted by abolitionists in this House. The parliament of Great Britain considers itself abolitionist, yet it retains the death sentence for treason.

There is a very logical reason for that. A nation is no more and no less than the group of individuals that comprise it. When we discuss laws to protect individual rights under the law, we always start from the premise that every individual's natural instinct is to survive. Therefore if he has to take measures to protect his own life, up to and including the taking of another person's life, then he is not guilty of any crime. He is not acting out of revenge, he is not an aggressor. If an aggressor seeks to take his life, and he then responds with equal force, he is seeking his own protection and preservation. He is seeking to ensure his own safety for future life. So it is with a nation, with a collection of individuals. Any nation must have the right, the privilege under the law, the ability, to ensure its own self-preservation. No individual would give up his right to self-preservation, and no nation—no collection of individuals—should do that either.

The subject of treason has been dealt with in detail by my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie). Treason might generally be described as an attack which attempts to undermine the life and future of a nation. When society responds to such an attack it is justified in taking a life to ensure its own life, its own self-preservation.

Like it or not, Mr. Speaker, we live in times of danger and uncertainty. However much we would prefer not to resort to measures such as this, they are necessary and vital to the self-preservation of this nation. By its own action the government has made us aware of the fact that there are groups in this land that seek to undermine the country, that seek to snuff out that dream that we call Confederation, that actively plot to undermine the government and the society that we call Canada. Following the October crisis there was set up the police security planning and analysis group, a special pet of the former solicitor general. It was set up to respond to the activities of highly trained, organized thugs who are trying to damage this country and are ready to commit treason.

All of us are looking forward to the Olympics in the hope that they will be a great success for the nation. But every one of us also looks forward to the Olympics in fear and with trepidation. I am sure no member of parliament would deny that concerns are being expressed in every constituency as to what might happen during the Olympics. The government reinforces this sense of fear by spending, as has been stated in the House, up to $50 million on security measures. That is not saying that nothing might happen or that it does not have to take action, or that the most horrendous crimes might not be committed. The government is saying that they may be committed, and in fact it is taking measures to ensure that they are not. The government, in its undue haste to get this bill through, is undermining all of those efforts.

● (2120)

The government is taking away its most important weapon, that is, in saying to those terrorists, who in their own devious ways are preparing even as we debate this issue to create havoc here and in other lands, that if they so plot to take the lives of others and to undermine the life of this nation, they shall forfeit their own lives. If we can save one innocent life through such deterrence, that alone would justify retention of capital punishment, and that alone would justify maintaining in this bill, in whatever form it may pass, the provision that treason is an offence for which a person will have to pay the ultimate penalty.

In recent weeks we have uncovered or discovered in this nation, or perhaps just opened our eyes to something that we wish we did not have to face, the situation of growing concern, unrest, and animosity among our own people.

This has been manifested in a strange and unpredictable way, through this issue that is known as bilingualism in the air. It in itself belies a far more serious problem. It tells us that what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said some weeks ago regarding those who would cause Canada to end as a nation is simply wishful thinking, is not true.

There do exist organized forces in this land prepared and ready to do our country in, to end Canada. We know now that we cannot hide from that awful fact any longer. We must be prepared to face the dire consequences that may be caused by the actions of those individuals and groups. The lesson of terrorism has been brought home to us this very day in the wake of the situation in the Middle East. There we saw an example of why the penalty for terrorism, treason and acts of piracy, which will be dealt with in another amendment similar to this, should be and, indeed, must be kept in the law.

I would ask you why those guerrillas hijacked the plane and held those innocent people captive? It was for the purpose of freeing other people who had committed political crimes, crimes of terrorism and crimes of air piracy, yet because they had not paid the penalty for these heinous crimes they were still alive in jail providing sufficient motivation to these people to commit this terrible act. They played with those people's lives so they could spring from prison their associates and accomplices in international crime.

I submit to you that the same type of devious mentality is open to committing the crime of treason. If we just lock up so-called political prisoners after they have tried to take the life of the nation, we make heroes of them to that small sect in society. What do we offer these people and their accomplices who are still on the outside and have not yet been arrested? We offer them a reason and an opportunity to commit more crime by holding other people hostage and by performing other acts of terrorism only to push forward this demented cause.

As never before, the future of this country is on the minds and in the hearts of hon. members and all Canadians. I came to Ottawa, to Parliament Hill, in 1972 prior to the general election of that year as executive assistant to the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). I did not know at that time, nor in the years I was at school and knew him through correspondence and occasional visits, that we would ever have the opportunity of sitting together in parliament. To me that seemed an unreachable goal and a dream that just could not be realized. Following the election of October 1972 an unusual set of circumstances allowed me to come into this House and sit as a colleague of the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert and that was an honour given me by the people of Hamilton-Wentworth that no words can adequately express.

The right hon. gentleman and I have been associated for many years. As I said, prior to coming into this House I worked on his staff. We have not always agreed, and he has never asked me to always agree with him. He has often told me that his outlook in this House and in a lifetime of politics is that strong men have strong opinions, that they are bound to disagree, but that should not interfere with the maintenance and growth of their friendship. That is how it has been with us. His record here, before the courts, and in all his public life has been that of an unswerving abolitionist. He has said so in this House. His contribution to this country is unmatched in our lifetime. He now places before us the value of his experience. It is something to all hon. members, be they retentionists such as myself, or abolitionists by nature, such as the right hon. member for Prince Albert, and, worth bearing in mind.

He has told us that on the basis of his experience as Prime Minister of this country and as a private member that, while he still favours abolition, he would not and could not support a bill that would contribute to the demise of this country by doing away with the right of the state to impose capital punishment for the commission of the crime of treason.

Let me conclude my remarks with a non-partisan appeal to all members, be they abolitionists or retentionists, to support the amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta, and be consistent. There is no difficulty in doing that. I say to all of them, through you, Sir, that we would all like to live in a kind of world of which we dream, and the kind of world we came here to work for, but we dare not confuse that kind of world with a dream world, a world that still eludes us and is not here and will not be here if we capitulate to the forces of international terrorism. That world will continue to elude us if we open up this country to the heinous crimes that can be committed, indeed, it is sad to say, would be encouraged by leaving out this right of society. That kind of world will elude us as long as those forces are at work. They are at work today, and it is about time we got to work to make sure that the people of Canada are protected and that the future of Canada is ensured, by supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta.

● (2130)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred pursuant to order made Tuesday, June 29, 1976.

Capital Punishment

The House will now proceed to the consideration of Motion No. 10 in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) and Motion No. 11 in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds).

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) moved:

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 3.

[*English*]

Mr. Reynolds moved:

Motion No. 11.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 3.

The hon. member for Lotbinière.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I move this motion for the purpose of deleting clause 3 of Bill C-84. I should like now to explain this motion and the reasons which warrant it.

Section 75(2) of the Criminal Code, notwithstanding the provisions of Bill C-84, states:

(2) Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life, but . . .

And it is this part of the quotation which the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) has struck out:

. . . but if while committing or attempting to commit piracy he murders or attemps to murder another person or does any act that is likely to endanger the life of another person he shall be sentenced to death."

Such was the section of the Criminal Code in effect in Canada. The Solicitor General proposes in Bill C-84 that the clause that I have just quoted be struck out and that the following be substituted therefor:

(2) Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that the Solicitor General by including a clause on piracy in his bill recognized that it is a kind of crime and therefore recognized its existence. In committee, before the end of the proceedings, the minister said that there had been no crime of piracy in Canada since 1900 and that consequently it was not necessary to include it in our bill.

Mr. Speaker, what seems to motivate the Solicitor General is that it is a crime. It was in the Criminal Code. It might look bad to abolish it completely. There has been no such crime in Canada since 1900. It is not that serious and we are going to include it to appease the conscience of Canadians. Then, piracy is still a crime but we will eliminate the penalty provided for attempted murder or premeditated murder.

Mr. Speaker, for this minister, piracy is not a crime punishable by death. I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues on that. What is an act of piracy? Is it the kind of pirate stories we had in the Middle Ages? Everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, that it is not that. Modern piracy is when an individual or a group of individuals decide to take hold of a private or public transportation means. It might be an airplane, a train, a boat or a bus. A group of criminals takes over that transportation means in a systematic, premeditated, organized way and while doing it, they endanger the lives of passengers.

Mr. Speaker, it is then a serious situation. It is a mordern phenomenon. The minister said before the committee that it has not happened since 1900 and consequently, it was not really serious. Is it necessary, Mr. Speaker, to have it happen just once and that fifty people be treatened, held hostages on any transportation means in Canada and that there be many victims for the minister to open his eyes and recognize that it is a modern act?

● (2140)

The minister suggested in committee that it was an outdated crime that was no longer committed in our modern times. Well, as everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, there are hijackings, piracy acts in which citizens are held hostages, acts such as what took place in Montreal, some time ago, where a criminal seized a school bus and held children—not adults but children—hostages and threatened them, because he wanted something in return and therefore, he resorted to blackmail, using children's lives, and it happened in the city of Montreal in 1976.

This is therefore a serious and modern act which must be treated seriously and positively. This kind of situation will not be solved by simply glossing over them. I suggest that clause 3 of the Solicitor general's Bill C-84 should be completely removed and that we should come back to the old Criminal Code wich provided for capital punishment in all cases of murder or attempted murder and during piracy acts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a protection and a positive step we must take. This afternoon, I was listening to the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) who said that capital punishment was something abominable and totally regressive, that it is regressive to speak about capital punishment, that we are being as violent as criminals. The minister has controlled information since the very beginning of this debate by referring chiefly to Professor Fattah's studies. He published a number of booklets that were sent to hon. members. Did the people who had the opportunity, the experts who were in favour of capital punishment get the same financial resources from the Department of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) to express themselves? No, only those who shared the Solicitor General's view.

Let us use his literature. In the booklet entitled "The fear of punishment", issued by the Law Reform Commission of Canada, it is said in page 73, and I would emphasize that this is a plea that the Solicitor General is using all the time in an attempt to convince members of the House of the value of and need for abolishing capital punishment, in the same kind of argument as the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre. The argument put forward by Professor Fattah, which the Solicitor General repeated many times like a real parrot, is that first, capital punishment is not an effective deterrent; second, it does not solve the problem and third, we should improve our deterrent methods.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring forward the following argument by beginning with a quotation. On page 72 of the booklet entitled "Fear of punishment" one can read, and I quote:

According to Ball (1955), "there is ample evidence that the complete cessation of police operations is quickly followed by a surge of crime and a chaotic social situation".

Andenaes (1965) . . .

Other examples follow. In Denmark, among other places, in Copenhagen, things have happened. I shall spare the House these quotations. I shall relate an incident that occured in Montreal on October 7, 1969, which is related in the booklet ordered by the Solicitor General, and I quote:

On October 7, 1969, the Montreal police went on strike; nearly 1600 officers and 600 policemen out of a complement of 3833 stopped working. The strikers were claiming wage parity with their Toronto colleagues. The work stoppage lasted 16 hours. During that time, there were nine bank robberies by armed people and seventeen qualified robberies in commercial establishments. A number of stores on St. Catherine Street were pillaged, in centre town. Crimes against property were four times higher than usual in this area. In others, the increase varied between 20 and 300 per cent. On the other hand, they went down in certain areas where people had reinforced surveillance of their stores and houses, certain establishments having moreover closed earlier than usual.

And more figures are used to show that as soon as there is a relaxation in police activity, there is an increase in the number and the seriousnous of crimes. This proves, Mr. Speaker, that the police constitutes a certain deterrent. Everyone recognizes this without a doubt. This is generally preventive force. I refer to the incident in Montreal where a ganster held a group of students hostage in a school bus. At that time, the Montreal Urban Community police intervened. There were called in. They tried to discuss with the criminal, but to no avail. The police forces were armed, the bandit was armed. Mr. Speaker, this was therefore an act of piracy where on the one hand a criminal committed an act of piracy by taking over a public transport vehicle, and this in a manner that was well organized, well thought-out, what we call premeditated.

On the other hand, there are the police forces, those that we pay with our taxes. These police forces are armed, prepared, trained, paid to protect private property, public property, and especially the lives of our fellow citizens. What choice is left to the policeman called in to the scene of this act of piracy by bandits in Montreal, where the criminal had taken over a bus full of children, and I repeat that they were school children? Shoot to kill? Not shoot and hope that the bandit will come to his senses, or else take roundabout ways to try to solve the conflict?

Mr. Speaker, if the bill is passed with clause 3 in its present form, the minister would like us to abolish the death penalty in the case of the bandit who is guilty of an act of piracy, who hijacks a school bus or a plane or a train, who threatens to run it off the tracks or to blow it up, who kidnaps Canadian school children. He is asking us to trust that the criminal will save the lives of those children. That is the first point. Here is the second point: he asks us to trust the police forces to try and solve that very serious problem of threat by armed criminals, but once again without risk, and therefore, I conclude that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) would ask, in a case of piracy, would ask the police force to simply watch the crime without interfering, without using their weapons, to just stand there to show that we have a police force.

I say to the Solicitor General, in conclusion, that it would be ridiculous for the police to put their lives in danger to catch somebody who threatens the lives of thirty children, when they know very well that because of this bill and clause 3 even if they risk their lives and the lives of the children during the shooting, the criminal himself is in no danger. He is protected by the Solicitor General, in clause 3. He says that it is an old-fashioned crime that has not happened since 1900. Apparently he has not been in his constituency of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce for a long time, Mr. Speaker. I say that to carry out its duty the police force needs the legal, if not the moral support of the government.

In the accompanying documents, the minister refers to several cases where police action must be reinforced, and there is proof how ridiculous the minister's argumentation can be. What appears even more shocking to me is that in the case referred to in Montreal, among others, we will all remember the press reports and the general outcry raised among the very ones who want the most probity, the most broadness of mind possible with respect to criminals. So there was a great many people, including journalists, observers, the League for Human Rights, the Solicitor General and such other people to blame police agents for having taken action too fast and, thus, having threatened the existence or life of anyone of the children who were in the bus. This, Mr. Speaker, is the height of absurdity! There are even people to blame police forces for having taken action not fast enough, or too fast, thus risking the bandit's life.

Mr. Speaker, that beats all! I understand the point of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Center. As far as he is concerned, we should be very understanding, we should be more trusting. He told us this afternoon that we had not reached the point where we should mistrust our neighbours and look under the bed before going to sleep at night. I understand him, Mr. Speaker, but I would like him to explain the logic in his argument. He claims the death penalty must be abolished in all cases. Oh, come on!

In this case, that, of the school bus, we are dealing with an act of piracy. Or of attempted murder, if not murder, because the police have to put a stop to it. Will the hon. member for Regina Lake Centre carry his argument to its logical end and disarm the police? I ask the question in all seriousness. Why let the police keep their arms when they run the risk of wounding children in the cross-fire when they try to capture the criminal? Why not simply stand there to prove that the criminal is doing wrong?

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre will tell me that it is a deliberate act and that, in any case, the criminal would have committed it. So, let us twiddle our thumbs and let him do whatever he pleases. Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre to see one of his children in such a bus. I would like him to tell me and to explain to me why policemen are armed in such a situation?

Mr. Speaker, this is my point. On the one hand, in the publicity it makes, the government tells us that we must strengthen the police measures and, on the other hand, he speaks about a deterrent. It says that an act of piracy makes no sense and, consequently, that its perpetrator must simply be liable of life imprisonment. Consequently, if there is a murder or a murder attempt, the death penalty will be abolished. Mr. Speaker, I claim that it is not an old crime, it is not something out of fashion, but it is an act that is committed almost every week now throughout the

world. The perpetrator of a such act committed in Canada should be recognized as being liable to the death penalty, as was provided for in the old Criminal Code. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the House to study this question very carefully.

As a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I was saying at the outset, must a single act be committed, must dozens of people die or be killed following an act of piracy for the minister to recognize that it is a modern crime, a crime which could be committed tomorrow morning.

To finish my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like hon. members to understand that my amendment proposes that we simply revert to the application of the old Criminal Code. If, as the Solicitor General told the committee, it is true it is a crime which does not exist, which has not been committed in Canada since 1900, so why does he change the Criminal Code? It does not bother him, he might as well leave it as it is and the problem will be solved.

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) said earlier, we are accused of demagogy or, as the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre said, we are accused of getting angry because we present amendments or arguments.

But as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of every hon. member in this House to analyze each line of this bill since it is life and death issue, not only for criminals but also for innocents. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for hon. members who analyze this bill only on the basis of criminals to analyze it on the basis of the protection of society and of punitive legislation, to the extent that people are punished according to the intensity or the gravity of the crime they committed.

● (2150)

[*English*]

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I should clarify one point. The hon. member has called it ten o'clock. Is it agreed that the hon. member will retain his right to speak first tomorrow on the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that there is a House order under which the House leaders would meet to discuss the taking of votes either at the report stage or at third reading. The House leaders have met and have decided to recommend that there be votes on Thursday evening of this week at 9.30 p.m. on all the amendments upon which votes have been deferred up to that particular time.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the recitation which has been made by the government House leader is a proper one, and I think we should underscore that this means that the vote on the first set of amendments—I forget the numbers, but hon. members know the ones I mean—under the House order would normally have been held on Wednesday but are also now deferred to Thursday, so that the House order which was made has been amended to that extent to accommodate those votes. I want the House to understand that completely. I must say that I am a party to that agreement, and I concur.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, what has been said represents our understanding. In other words, on Thursday night at 9.30 there will be votes on motions Nos. 4, 9, 18, 38, and 7, and on any other amendments the debates on which have ended and concerning which votes have been requested up until 9.30 Thursday evening. This is what we understand to be the agreement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, the government House leader (Mr. Sharp) consulted us on this subject, and we gave our consent on the votes which will have to be held on Thursday on the motions which will be discussed, once the discussion is over. And I specify that we are always dealing with the amendments at the report stage. We are not dealing with third reading. So we agree on this proposal.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Because of the fact that it is my interpretation that the previous order was to have the vote within one week of any deferred division, I hope this will be done by unanimous consent. That would exclude any possibility of a question on Wednesday about taking a vote. Is it unanimously agreed that any deferred division at the report stage—

[*Translation*]

. . . at the report stage as stated by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) concerning this bill . . .

[*English*]

—with regard to Bill C-84 will be deferred to Thursday, July 8, 1976, at 9.30 p.m.?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so ordered.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

An hon. Member: He is not here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Because of the fact that we called it ten o'clock earlier than ten o'clock, perhaps we can proceed with the calling of another question. Three hon. members have put questions for the adjournment debate: the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, the hon. member

for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. Benjamin: Where have all the Tories gone?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We did in fact finish early.

Mr. Benjamin: No, you didn't; it is ten o'clock.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It may be that there is some difficulty in terms of the time.

Mr. Benjamin: It was your man who called it ten o'clock. What are you complaining about?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): No matter what, it does not make much difference, does it?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The only contribution I can make to the discussion is to indicate that I met the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) in the hall a few minutes ago, and he said he cancelled his debate for tonight.

Mr. O'Sullivan: Say goodnight, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Here's Walter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will call upon the hon. member for Brandon-Souris.

● (2200)

POST OFFICE—APPLICATION TO OLYMPIC STAMPS OF PROVISION TO WITHDRAW TWELVE MONTHS AFTER ISSUE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I seem to be late but I understood I was No. 2 on the list tonight. Now that I have the priority position I want to raise the question that I brought up in the House last Wednesday with respect to the proliferation of commemorative stamps being issued by the Post Office Department. There has been a growing concern and restlessness in the philatelic community because, as is well known in those circles, it is quite easy to kill the goose that lays the golden egg in the desire—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is that not treason?

Mr. Dinsdale: Not in this respect, I might tell the hon. member. In the desire to make as much profit as possible there is a tendency to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Whether the department is trying to reduce the soaring deficit in the Post Office Department, which I think is currently about $675 million, or to make a dent in the soaring Olympic debt which is close to $1 billion, I do not know. Certainly the practice is not enhancing Canada's reputation in the international philatelic community.

In the question on Wednesday I dealt specifically with the issue of the Olympic statue stamp which came on the market on March 14, 1975, and according to a quite specific arrangement should have been withdrawn 12 months later. In his reply the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) indicated that this interpretation was accurate—that there was an understanding with the association to which Canadian stamp collectors belong that new issues would be withdrawn following a 12-month period. When I drew attention to the fact that this $1 and $2 Olympic statue stamp was still available over post office counters, he revised the answer by saying it does not apply to Olympic stamps; indeed, they will not be withdrawn until one year following completion of the Olympic events.

As I have indicated, rather than enhancing the coffers of the Olympics, an over issue and over exposure of stamps means that the total return will be reduced. The market cannot possibly absorb the number of stamps being issued.

This matter came to a head in 1973. Dealers were called into a special meeting at the headquarters of the Post Office on December 5, 1973. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Bill Eyre, who is the manager of the philatelic retail products and market development section. The deputy postmaster general made an appearance to reinforce the significance of the meeting. Out of the meeting came a communiqué which purported to cover the matters that were raised. As set out on page 3, paragraph (e) of the memorandum the meeting reached the conclusion that the new public sales policy of the Canada Post Office to be explained in detail at a meeting on February 1, 1974, would mark the implementation of some significant changes. All stamps would be sold in a package format and would be available for 12 months only from the date of issue. That was the reply the Postmaster General gave to me last Wednesday before he issued the revised version. I have confirmed by discussion since last Wednesday with people who are knowledgeable in the field across the country that this is a restatement of policy upon which there has been no consultation.

The Canadian Stamp Dealers Association assure me that their understanding of the results of that meeting in 1973 are precisely the same as the conclusion I read indicated, namely, that there is a definite agreement with the trade that all stamps will be removed after 12 months exposure on the open market. It even goes further than that. The promise was made that any remaining stocks will be destroyed. Usually popular issues of stamps are sold out within a few months. Because of the over-issue tendency, the market has been adulterated.

I think whoever replies for the Postmaster General tonight, and I presume it will be the parliamentary secretary, will agree that it would be a much more profitable venture if the number of issues were kept on a marketable basis and if the promise that was made to the trade were kept, as has been requested.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I always welcome questions and the chance to debate with the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) because he is very knowledgeable about the Post Office.

There may be some confusion here. Perhaps we can clear it up this evening. Postage stamps are divided into two categories. There are the philatelic quality commemorative stamps sold to all collectors, and the regular stamps used to prepay postage.

Philatelic quality commemorative stamps are sold from philatelic outlets and the headquarters mail order service for a period of one year, in the various forms such as full

panes, corner blocks, and so forth. In addition semi-annual pre-packs containing a single stamp of each issue are made up and sold for a period of 12 months. These also are sold only from philatelic outlets and the mail order service.

Regular quality commemorative stamps are usually sold out at post offices within a few weeks. However, a special situation has arisen with the Olympic $1 and $2 commemorative postage stamps (sculptures) which were printed in sufficient quantities to be on sale in post offices for a longer period in order to give full publicity to the holding of the Olympics in Canada. These stamps were on sale in post offices after the first anniversary of the date of issue. While they are no longer being supplied by our distribution depots, some post offices may be selling the residue until the supply is exhausted.

If philatelic quality stamps were being sold from philatelic outlets, other than the special packages, after March 14, this was in error. We are inquiring into this now, and if we find an error has been made it will be corrected immediately. I would appreciate any information the hon. member can give us to support an investigation of this kind.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST—ALLEGATION MR. BISSONNETTE IS LINKED WITH COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DUMPING TRIBUNAL

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I refer to the question I asked on June 21 with regard to the activities of Mr. A. L. Bissonnette, a member of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal. My question arose as a result of inquiries made in this House by my colleagues, the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. McKay) and the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), relating to the activities of the chairman of the tribunal, Mr. Gauthier.

I realize that the next day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) made a statement with respect to the activities of the chairman of the Anti-Dumping Tribunal and with respect to Mr. Bissonnette, a member of that tribunal. Unfortunately I was not able to be present at the time of the statement and the questioning of the minister and it occurred to me there were some questions with respect to this whole situation which the minister might not have answered at that time.

● (2210)

We shall have to draw attention to the whole question of conflict of interest with respect to the order in council activity of the government, with respect to the activities, in this case, of the chairman and members of the board which might infringe the guidelines covering conflict of interest in relation to public servants. The minister was at great pains to explain that the conflict of interest guidelines did not apply to this particular area of quasi-judicial appointments.

What bothered me about the answers the minister gave at that time was that under the act members of the board are required to devote their full time and attention to the activities of the anti-dumping tribunal. In such a situation I find it difficult to come to terms with the minister's explanations with regard to the members of the board holding directorships in various corporations, as this reflects upon their responsibilities to the appointments they hold. In the case of Mr. Bissonnette, the minister stated he had been asked to divest himself of his seat on various boards of directors, but it seems to me the government ought to give serious consideration to establishing a particular administrative procedure to deal with situations of this kind.

In cases of this sort, where appointments are made by order in council, particularly when there is a statutory requirement that those appointed should devote their whole time and attention to their duties, such persons might be required to make a declaration periodically that they had in fact refrained from carrying on activities other than those they were required to carry out under the legislation, in this instance as members of the anti-dumping tribunal. When the act is as specific as it is in this instance, it seems to me it raises an issue quite apart from that of conflict of interest.

We could discuss ad infinitum the question of the propriety of members appointed to any tribunal involved in export and import activities acting as directors of other corporations engaged, perhaps, in similar activities. We may question that, but it seems to me that in this particular case the point was missed by the minister that there was an explicit and specific prohibition against any of these members acting in any other capacity.

The point of my grievance with respect to the answer of the minister when he undertook, in response to my question, to give a full and detailed explanation of the requirements that the government felt were incumbent upon Mr. Bissonnette, is that there is only a request by the minister that he divest himself, subsequent to the disclosure of his activities, of his directorships of corporations. There is no coming to terms with government policy regarding whether or not there should be some administrative procedure by the government respecting order in council appointments, that such people in fact make a declaration, not necessarily of their holdings but whether they are contravening the statutory provision that they shall devote their full time and attention to their particular responsibility.

This question is very important to us since we find ourselves questioning people who have been appointed by order in council using government facilities and expertise for private purposes and interests. Notwithstanding the question of conflict of interest, it seems to me that this matter—I see you are rising in your place, Mr. Speaker—is one in which this whole question of devoting full time and attention to a position should be answered by the government.

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that it is true that the hon. member was not present when the minister made a statement the day after the question was raised in the House. The minister assured him that he would be making a statement in the House. The question was raised prior to that, on June 15, by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) who participated in the debate the following day when the minister made his statement. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) also participated in the debate in regard to the procedure followed by the minister when he made the statement.

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) raised some very interesting points, but had he been in the House following the questions raised by the hon. member for York-Simcoe he would have heard the same apprehensions suggested to the minister. I feel from reading the record of that debate that these apprehensions have been answered. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar says that they were not, and indeed goes beyond that. I think he is referring to section 21, subsection (7), and to the question of whether the minister made a statement that is in accordance with what the hon. member was expecting; I think that is the point at issue at this time.

The second point I should like to devote some attention to is that we should have an annual review of the investments or directorships that the various members of the board may have. It would be of some interest to the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar to spend some time reading the comments made in the other place on the subject of conflict of interest. Possibly there are some areas that are not clear, but I think the two officers the hon. member mentioned did comply with the conflict of interest guidelines. They have taken notice of them, know what they are, and have answered all the clauses contained in the conflict of interest guidelines. This may not be satisfactory, and in the way he has raised the question there may be another procedure, but this has not been determined. It can certainly be considered when this is reviewed. As I say, it would be of some interest to the hon. member and to ourselves to look at the report which has been tabled and act on it, perhaps including some of the recommendations made this evening.

● (2220)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.22 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 6, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed from Monday, July 5, consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motions No. 10 (Mr. Fortin), No. 11 (Mr. Reynolds).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta raised a point of order about the allocation of time to speakers on report stage motions, it being within the Standing Orders that the mover of a motion is entitled to 40 minutes. Since there are groupings of motions which in fact reduced the possibility of speeches on separate motions, the difficulty which remains is this: should the mover of a motion which has been filed in time be deprived of his right to make a 40 minute speech within the standing orders just because it has been grouped with other motions?

I would be pleased to listen to contrary views but I must say I cannot see how the Chair can deprive the mover of a motion of his right to make a 40 minute speech simply because motions have been grouped for the purposes of discussions and voting. I think it would be an unfair extension of the rule to say that the mover should be deprived of his 40 minutes because his motion has been grouped in that way. Further, it would be extremely difficult for the Chair to decide which motion had been moved first, or which mover should, so to speak, have priority.

Thus it would seem fair to say that any mover of a motion, whether it be debated alone or in common with others, ought to be entitled to all that is coming to him, at least in terms of time allocation under the Standing Order, although I am sure it is not the hope of all that maximum advantage will be taken of that opportunity by every speaker.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I am rising to agree wholeheartedly with what you have just said. I might mention one further point. Under Standing Order 75, the Chair is given a great deal of latitude when it comes to grouping motions which are to be considered. I would not want this discretion to be impaired by the feeling that certain groupings should, perhaps, not be made in order to preserve the rights of individual movers to their 40 minutes.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think the statement you have made is fair. I do not see there is any problem having heard your ruling.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker since what we are discussing involves the use of time I shall avoid using too much of it at this point. Furthermore, since there seems to be agreement with the position the Chair has taken, I find I am a voice crying in the wilderness. Nevertheless I should like to express unhappiness at the way things are going.

● (1110)

Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker. There are 16 members of this party. Supposing we have an issue on which we feel very strongly and all 16 of us put down the same amendment. Would all 16 of us have the right to speak for 40 minutes? It seems to me that concomitant with the right of the chair to group motions for debate in order to save time should be the right of the chair to say that only one mover will have 40 minutes. However, I have stated my opposition. I realize that opinion seems to be the other way, but I just wanted to enter my view.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): On behalf of our party, the Social Credit Party of Canada, we are quite pleased with your ruling that each mover is entitled to use, in accordance with Standing Order 75, 40 minutes to make a speech. In reply to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who said that he is somewhat frustrated in the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must say that in other cases, when his party is carrying on the fight, he surely speaks in a different way.

However, I would like to remind him that there is a difference at the present time. If all the NDP members wanted to introduce the same motion, it would certainly be new tactics or a collusion among the members of that party. I will humbly point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is no collusion between the Progressive Conservative Party and the Social Credit Party of Canada. It is merely coincidence if some motions are repeated and consequently I feel that the Progressive Conservative and Social Credit members enjoy the same privilege. This is why I am very pleased with your very wise ruling.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In respect of the point of view raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I think a brief comment is warranted. The ruling of the Chair last week with respect to motions to delete was, of course, different in a very fundamental way from the ruling with respect to motions to amend. Motions to

amend were held to a strict line and ruled out of order on the basis of their contravention of the principle of the bill. There was an argument that the Chair could and should have done the same thing with motions to delete, but a result of doing the same thing in respect of motions to delete would, in my opinion, be to deprive a private member of this House of a very important right to a counterbalancing power from that which takes place in standing committee. I do not think it was ever intended that the only time the House can be put to a count on the clause of a bill is when clause by clause analysis of the bill takes place in standing committee. A private member has the right to do this here by way of a motion to delete. I think that is a separate, independent and very important right, and it is the basis of the differentiation between the two.

With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the quickest way to persuade the Chair that that right ought to be interfered with would be for 16 members of the same caucus to put down the same motion. Indeed, if report stage motions to delete or any report stage motions do become at any future time the subject of abuse in that sense, it may not be within the power of the Chair to take that right away, but certainly the attitude of the Chair would have to change, and likely the attitude of the procedure committee as well.

In any case, so long as we are now dealing with what appears to be a conscientious use of report stage motions, in respect of the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I would think the situation that he has described would be somewhat different. In the present context it seems to me impossible to expect the Chair to choose between two movers of the same motion acting independently and deprive one of them of the right to an extra 20 minutes. Again, I hope all hon. members will be conscientious in the advantage that they take of that rule.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, now that you have ruled that I can take 40 minutes I do not intend to take that time. However, I must say that I am a little shocked at the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to the effect that we might be trying to delay the House. As the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) has said, there is no collusion between our parties or between him and me in regard to these two motions. We just happened to agree and placed them on the order paper. I am rather shocked that such an hon. member would do anything to inhibit the free speech of the members of the House, or even suggest such. If you refer to *Hansard* you will find that in the past had not members of his party, such as Frank Howard, delayed this House with the divorce legislation—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I suggest that the hon. member return to a discussion of the terms of this bill.

Mr. Reynolds: I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that we should get back to the bill, but hon. members took 20 minutes of the House's time talking on a point of order. I think that one of the points in this bill that should be brought out relates to comparing clause 3 of the present legislation with clause 3 of the proposed legislation which we are now debating. Subsection 75(2) of the act at present reads as follows:

> Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life, but if while committing or attempting to commit piracy he murders or attempts to murder another person or does any act that is likely to endanger the life of another person he shall be sentenced to death.

Clause 3 of this bill provides as follows:

> Subsection 75(2) of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "(2) Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life."

What concerns me about these provisions is that now the penalty is going to be the same for someone who hijacks an aeroplane, whether he or she attempts to murder or does murder. There is no deterrent at all for anybody—

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The Solicitor General is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I should make clear that the section under discussion does not relate to hijacking but to piracy. Piracy relates to the piracy of ships. Subsection 75(2)—

An hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Mr. Allmand: Read the Code. Section 76 is the hijacking of aircraft section and we are not dealing with that in this bill at all. The section being amended by the hon. member relates to the piracy of ships, and that is all that is under discussion, not the hijacking of aircraft.

Mr. Reynolds: Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister is using legal terms in talking about the difference between piracy and hijacking. The point I am making is that if somebody took a ship by means of piracy, it is the same sort of thing as hijacking. Under the present law, if the person who takes the ship by piracy kills somebody or attempts to kill somebody, he is going to pay the supreme penalty. Under the law that the Solicitor General is putting forward, if he kills everybody on the ship he is going to pay the same penalty as if he is caught and just walks off the ship. I think that kind of law is dangerous and it is why I think this section should be changed.

We have been talking about deterrence, and many times during the committee hearings the Solicitor General tried to show that Professor Isaac Ehrlich's studies on economics were not relevant. He quoted other people in committee who had said that everything that Professor Ehrlich had said was not relevant. I came across an article written by Michael T. Malloy headline "Punishment is a deterrent to crime; so say economists whose data seemingly refute reform the criminal theories".

What I think we should be arguing here is whether this provision of the bill constitutes a deterrent. It is a very important part of the bill. I should like to put some of this article on record because it contradicts some of the points made by the Solicitor General in committee. Mr. Malloy also refers to some very well known economists who support Dr. Ehrlich's theories. Mr. Malloy says:

One of the reasons we stoppped hanging, gassing, and electrocuting murderers in the United States was that the experts said it did no good. In study after study, they found no connection between a state's use of capital punishment and the rate at which its citizens were murdererd. The death penalty had already fallen into disuse when the Supreme Court struck down most capital punishment laws as unconstitutional in 1972.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, this decision was reversed a short while ago. He continues:

Even though the deterrent effect of the death penalty was not a major issue in that ruling, at least five of the nine justices took note of the scholarly evidence in their written opinions. The best studies, wrote Justice Thurgood Marshall, "demonstrate that there is no correlation between the murder rate and the presence or absence of the capital sanction."

● (1120)

Now a new breed of experts has come along with studies that challenge this and other beliefs about crime and punishment. If their findings become accepted by judges, politicians, and voters, they could shift the emphasis of our legal system from trying to reform criminals to deliberately punishing them.

Prof. Isaac Ehrlich of the University of Chicago has challenged the conventional wisdom about capital punishment. Using the economists' arcane techniques of econometrics, he seems to have demonstrated that the death penalty does work: His analysis suggests that seven or eight innocent lives are saved with every execution.

Ehrlich's analysis could affect the fates of hundreds of death-row prisoners, because the Supreme Court is expected to rule this year on whether all capital-punishment laws are unconstitutional.

As I mentioned earlier, the Supreme Court has made that ruling and has held that they are constitutional under certain conditions.

The article continues:

His study was so striking that even before it was published last year, the Justice Department submitted a typescript copy to the Court along with its brief in favour of the death penalty.

That is the point I think we should talk about. The United States Justice Department is in favour of capital punishment because the studies have shown there is a deterrent effect. I think in this clause especially we should be talking about deterrence.

To continue:

Erhlich's work on the death penalty may be ignored by the Court or discredited by other scholars. But other yound economists are bringing their computers and equations to the study of robbery, burglary, and crime in general. Poaching in a field that was long dominated by psychologists and sociologists, they approach it from a substantially different point of view.

"The standard criminologist has been living in a dream world for at least 150 years," says Prof. Gordon Tullock of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. "They've thought that the cause of crime is not the economic return sought by some people, but an illness or some sort of disease. Eighty per cent of the people who seriously think about crime think about punishment as a deterrent—except for the sociologists, and they wrote all the books."

Some of the books state flatly that punishment does not deter crime. More say there is no evidence that it does. This belief has changed the official mission of the criminal-justice system. Parole, probation, and the wideshpread use of indeterminate sentences (0 to 20 years for the same kind of crime) are largely based on the goal of reform rather than punishment. Even prisons are officially defined as "correctional" institutions and "reformatories."

"Economists tend to believe that crime, far from being the result of sickness or mental disorder, in most cases is simply a business-oriented economic activity which is undertaken for much the same reasons as other types of economic activity," Tullock and David Meiselman wrote in the preface to The Economics of Crime and Punishment.

"To reduce the frequency of crime, economists generally recommend we raise the costs of crime. It would be difficult to find a more revolutionary departure from the conventional wisdom."

"We postulate that people only decide to enter crime if they expect it to pay," says Prof. Gary S. Becker of the University of Chicago, who helped pioneer the application of econometrics to crime in the late '60s. "Whether, in fact, it does pay is more difficult to get numbers on; there have been studies indicating it does pay.

"Much of my work has been on the question of deterrence. I think we have reasonably strong evidence that people are deterred from crime (by the prospect of punishment). It is not committed only by sick persons who can't help it. The assertion has been made until now that criminals are not deterred. What evidence there is goes the other way."

"When imprisonment is more certain and more severe, those states that have more punishment tend to have less crime," says Alfred Blumstein of Carnegie-Mellon University, who heads a National Academy of Sciences panel that is examining all the evidence on deterrence. "That's what the statistics show. That's what everyone finds."

Blumstein is not convinced, however, that the connection that economists find between crime and punishment proves that punishment deters crime. He says the same figures could just as well show that crime deters punishment because out-of-hand crime rates overwhelm police and courts and prisons, making criminals less likely to be caught, convicted, or jailed.

There's a more obvious reason to challenge the economists. Remember that they start by assuming that people don't commit crimes unless the benefits outweigh the costs, and that therefore punishment should deter crime. Isn't it questionable when their econometric answers confirm their assumptions?

No, they reply, that's the way econometrics works. The practitioner starts with a set of assumptions, turns them into equations, and assembles the equations into a mathematical model. If his model works when it is fed known data from the past, then it is probably a fair approximation of the real world. If it doesn't, he goes back to the drawing board. Erhlich's model was fed murder and execution data from 1933 through 1967, and it seemed to work best when its equations were consistent with an estimate that one death sentence deterred seven or eight murders.

Mr. Erhlich's work has been backed up by some very strong professionals in this field. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) has presented arguments before the committee which I do not think have convinced many of us, yet the people who back up Dr. Erhlich's work are well respected in the fields of both economics and crime.

I suggest that in respect of this clause of the bill dealing with piracy we must think about deterring. I think there can be a deterrent in this area when you are thinking of a man who has pirated a ship and is holding hostages. If the penalty is the same as if he had murdered a few people this leaves those hostages in very great difficulty. Perhaps the individual might think that if he gets rid of all the evidence he would have a much better chance of getting away. I hope those listening to this debate will think about this very seriously. This clause is another very much like clause 2 which members of this House, even abolitionists, should consider very seriously supporting in order to protect those people who may be caught in this very serious situation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity to say a few words on motions Nos. 10 and 11 that have been grouped because they are dealing with the same clause, since it is the only opportunity available to us to show our opposition to Bill C-84 to abolish completely capital punishment. I also congratulate my hon. colleague from Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin)

who moved motion No. 10 on June 28, 1976, which reads as follows:

That Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 3.

And I quote section 3 in the former act which reads as follows:

● (1130)

"(2) Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life, but if while committing or attempting to commit piracy he murders or attempts to murder another person or does any act that is likely to endanger the life of another person he shall be sentenced to death."

And here is what is provided in clause 3 as proposed by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand):

"(2) Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life."

Mr. Speaker, we can see the trick used by the minister probably to minimize the impact of his amendment. He completely puts aside what was essential in the previous bill, namely the condition that someone kills while attempting to commit piracy. The minister uses only the first part of the present bill, with which we all agree, to remove the part that is now controversial. It reminds me of the second reading vote which he regarded as an acceptance of his bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to talking nonsense. Everyone knows full well that the vote was merely intended to refer Bill C-84 to the standing committee of the House for detailed study, and mainly to call in witnesses. Indeed, it often happens that hon. members vote for a bill on second reading to refer it to committee and, when they are not satisfied with that study, those same hon. members vote against the bill on third reading.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are simply disgusted with the government's refusal to call in witnesses before the committee. We had intended to call in many witnesses but the minister simply refused to have it that way. He told us we had no need of that. That is why we brought in 14 amendments which you accepted, Mr. Speaker. All those amendments are intended to allow us to do in this House what we were unable to do in committee, because of the dictatorship of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this must open the eyes of the population. Indeed the people are very much awake, and we now know that 90 per cent of them are against the action of the minister, are in fact in favour of keeping the death penalty.

Needless to say, I support the amendment on piracy.

A while ago I heard the Solicitor General call one of my colleagues back to order again with regard to the subject of piracy, saying that he was merely referring to the pirates of old, the old sea pirates. I think it might be wise to ask ourselves what piracy is today. Today, we are no longer living as people did 2,000 ago. In days of yore, a pirate was defined as an adventurer who combed the seas in search of brigandage. But with the years, we have come to call a pirate any man who grows rich through plunder. That is the modern definition of a pirate. Today, he may be a banker and nowadays in our sophisticated and mechanised society the most dangerous pirates do not operate either on the sea or on land but in the air. They are what we normally and logically call air pirates and I was about to include among them all public transportation pirates who use the powerful weapon of human hostages to reach their goals. The reasons for all that piracy are many but I shall mention only the main ones. First of all the lust for money which involves sacrificing even human lives to get millions. Second, the release of some prisoners who are friends of the pirates, third piracy for national and ideological issues. Piracy may also be used to upset governments. To try to upset the government to protest against the establishment is also a kind of piracy which endangers human life and may even require murder.

Right now, we are going through a period of high crime rate and over the last 15 years we have witnessed all possible crimes in modern piracy. Scarcely one week elapses without the newspapers reporting a plane hold up by well armed and well trained terrorists, hostages taking a high official being kidnapped to fulfill political ends, and so forth. And what about kidnappings as they happened in the last few years, even in our small regions where sordid murders took place, following seclusions to get a few thousands dollars? I still remember the sad autumn in Quebec when minister Laporte was executed by a gang of terrorists, after being kidnapped and secluded for a long time. Even buses filled with schoolboys were used as hostages by bandits to get to their ends.

We see so many kidnappings and crimes increasing at the same pace as the law is flouted because responsible people became irresponsible, wishing to abolish the only punishment that might clean up our society from all these crooks, who are multiplying every time they win a battle over law and order forces. As far as I am concerned, I say that pirates are winners when they manage to get everything they want from some country's authorities and even having themselves flown into a country of their own choice at public expense after disturbing peace and often committing the worst assassinations.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the government, instead of acting hypocritically as it does today, will wake up and come to support police forces and all prison guards who are clamouring for government action, for more rigid legislation, first to be protected and then to protect the entire population. Far from doing this, we are letting everything go. One of these days we are going to wake up in the most complete anarchy. The present minister will probably not be here any more. He will have run away, but the people will face the consequences of his action today. In the face of all this, the minister has nothing better to do than proposing life imprisonment for misfits in clause 3 of his bill C-84. But what does life imprisonment mean to the minister? This is a question we have to ask ourselves now because we cannot trust what he says. We judge man according to his actions because he must indeed be judged so. Past actions stand as evidence of things to come and the past is not good at all. Here is the evidence for this. Over the years, although he had promised to impose capital punishment on all those who would kill police officers and prison guards, what has he done? Nothing at all, Mr. Speaker. Since then, many police officers have been killed by the bandits they were trying to arrest, and never did the present minister have the courage to live up to the promise he had made here in the House. Are we doing to trust him again when he suggests life imprisonment for acts of

piracy? In my opinion, when the minister says "life imprisonment", he may mean, depending on his whim, 25 years, or 10 years, or even 5 years.

The Solicitor General should cease making meaningless promises which he never keeps. For, if this clause is not eliminated, air pirates—and God knows we hear of many of them every day, people who take over airplanes and keep hundreds of passengers as hostages—will continue to multiply, because they will know they can count on the laws of this country to protect them. Society is so insecure today that a great many people dare not travel by plane, for fear of meeting a new group of bandits. And yet, everybody rejoice when military authorities carry out some daring action, such as the successful one by the Israeli forces, even at the possible cost of innocent lives. Let us suppose for a moment that these pirates had succeeded in their blackmail attempt, the main purpose of which was to obtain the liberation of their partners held behind bars; there would now be eight more heroes among these air pirates. And the fear among the public would be eight times greater, and so would be the fear within the country. After all this killing, these acts of piracy, the minister cannot help crying over the fate of the killers, but what has he done and what is he doing for the victims of these hired killers? Nothing, less than nothing.

They do not even mention their names. Whereas those victims will be handicapped for the rest of their lives, our noble murderers will have an easy time in other countries or comfortably accommodated in our detention centres at the expense of all Canadian workers. Some will wait for parole which the minister, as ever, will grant them generously, while others will watch for an escape opportunity to get out and commit other heinous crimes or even murders since they do not have anything to fear any more in this respect.

I have always held the principle that the most efficient way to clear out weeds is to get rid of them. It is the same for society, Mr. Speaker. I am not wondering whether capital punishment is a means or the best deterrent to prevent other crimes. I say that the best way to prevent other crimes is to do away with criminals. Contrary to life imprisonment, capital punishment prevents any escape and all law abiding citizens can live peacefully.

● (1140)

[*English*]

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the two motions now before us which deal with the matter of piracy which is now found in sections 75 and 76 of the Criminal Code. First, I should like to challenge the comment of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) that somehow or other skyjacking is not piracy under the existing law. I find that very surprising and I think it is another example of the Solicitor General perhaps not even understanding the Criminal Code which he has been called upon to administer.

The motion that we have before us proposes that clause 3 of Bill C-84 be deleted. Clause 3 simply refers to subsection (2) of section 75 of the Criminal Code. To make this debate relevant I think it is necessary, first of all, to look at subsection (1) of section 75. Subsection (1) states: "Everyone commits piracy who does any act that by the laws of nations is piracy". In short, what we must do to define piracy—whether or not the Solicitor General likes it—is to find out what the law of the nation says is piracy.

If I may, I should like to go through the history of piracy to show what happened in the Harvard draft which, was when first introduced, proposed sanctions for various forms of piracy as defined in the Harvard draft, the Geneva convention and right down to the Montreal convention. Then, I would like to refer hon. members to the treaty signed between the United States and the Republic of Cuba dealing specifically with skyjacking.

Before I speak on that, however, I should like to draw hon. members' attention and, particularly the attention of the Solicitor General, to other sections in the Criminal Code. We are now dealing with subsection (2) of section 75. Section 76 of the Criminal Code sets out various piratical acts, as they are called. Skyjacking in 1972 was referred to specifically, not in a separate section under the Criminal Code, but in subsections under section 76 dealing with piracy. I am referring to section 76.1, 76.2, and 76.3. I suggest that that was a very natural section for the government to amend when it wanted to have more severe penalties with regard to skyjacking because they knew that under the laws of nations skyjacking is an integral part of piracy. So where else would you amend the Criminal Code but simply under the piracy sections?

The reason I raise this point is that I think we must then read section 75 and all of 76, including the skyjacking provisions, to see their impact if the Solicitor General and the government get their wish in the amendment they are now proposing to Bill C-84. In short, they will put Canada in the position of being the most hospitable nation for skyjackers in this area of the world. In 1974, the United States Congress passed a law dealing specifically with piracy in the air, as it was called, and specifically providing for the death penalty in cases where any plane from the United States is involved. As I have said, Cuba has a treaty with the United States dealing with the question of air piracy, and as we know, Cuba is a retentionist nation. Russia, Japan, Ireland, St. Pierre and Miquelon are all retentionist. In fact, every nation around Canada is a retentionist nation, and if the minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) make piracy an offence punishable only by imprisonment for life, that will mean we are the most hospitable nation in this part of the world for those who would seize planes for whatever purpose.

● (1150)

In support of what I am saying I refer hon. members first to the Harvard Draft, which was prepared in the early 1950's. It was a draft prepared in anticipation of the Geneva Convention, and again I emphasize that I am trying to look for exactly what the law of nations is as referred to in section 75(1) with regard to piracy. In the Harvard draft under the title "Piracy"—and I emphasize that; there was no equivocation—various definitions which were used in their proposed convention were set out. Item 5 states:

> The term "ship" means any water craft or air-craft of whatever size.

It goes on to mention, for example, that a ship may retain its national character although it has become a pirate ship, and that the retention or loss of national

character is determined by the law of the state from which it was derived. In short, it is only a draft. I simply draw hon. members' attention to the fact that in the initial draft before the Geneva Convention there was no question that piracy was something which involved not only ships on the high seas but also aircraft in the skies.

I have here the Convention of the High Seas signed in April, 1958—by Canada, incidentally—known as the Geneva Convention. It states:

> All states shall cooperate to the fullest possible extent in the repression of piracy on the high seas or in any other place outside the jurisdiction of any state.

Article 15 states:

> Piracy consists of any of the following acts: (a) any illegal acts of violence, detention or any act . . . committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or private aircraft, and directed (a) On the high seas, against another ship or aircraft, or against persons or property on board such ship or aircraft; (b) Against a ship, aircraft persons or property in a place outside the jurisdiction of any State;

It goes on to mention the various things which were to be included in that Geneva Convention. I re-emphasize that Canada signed that.

A refinement of the Geneva Convention was the Tokyo Convention in 1969, again signed by Canada. Incidentally, when I say that these conventions were signed, I think it is very interesting because these conventions have been signed by Canada right up to recent times, and who signs right beside us? The Republic of China. We saw fit to sign conventions dealing with piracy along with the Republic of China, but for some odd reason we are now told that in terms of Olympic sport the same Republic of China has no business using that name in Montreal. I mention that because surely that is another example of the inconsistency of this government.

Let me again go through the various conventions. On December 12, 1969 the United Nations General Assembly dealt with this question and set out that there should be severe penalties for such things as skyjacking, which comes under the general definition of piracy. The Hague Convention of 1970 was signed in December of that year and states:

> Each Contracting State undertakes to make the offence punishable by severe penalties.

In that case they were referring to the offence of piracy of aircraft, or skyjacking, whichever term hon. members prefer.

The Montreal Convention was, I suppose, the last main convention signed by various states of the world touching on this subject. That convention was signed in September, 1971 and came into force in January, 1973. It specifically set out that there should be severe penalties for the kind of thing to which we are now referring, and I re-emphasize that it simply highlighted the fact that the whole question of skyjacking is simply part of an over-all international approach to attempt to halt piracy.

With that background I would now like to discuss the response of the United States. The United States as well as Canada signed the Montreal, the Hague, Tokyo and Geneva Conventions. What have the Americans decided to do with regard to air piracy? I refer hon. members to the anti-hijacking act of 1974 which provides under the heading "Aircraft Piracy Outside Special Aircraft Jurisdiction of the United States" the following:

> Whoever aboard an aircraft in flight outside the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States commits 'an offense' as defined in the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft . . .

That is the longer name for the Montreal Convention.

> . . . and is afterward found in the United States shall be punished—
>
> (A) by imprisonment for not less than 20 years; or
>
> (B) if the death of another person results from the commission or attempted commission of the offense, by death or by imprisonment for life.

That was passed in 1974 by the Congress of the United States, and I suggest that it is comparable to the section the government now proposed to delete from the Criminal Code of Canada. The following is the government's wording as it now stands in the Criminal Code:

> Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life, but if while committing or attempting to commit piracy he murders or attempts to murder another person or does any act that is likely to endanger the life of another person he shall be sentenced to death.

If the Criminal Code is left intact with regard to aircraft piracy or piracy on the high seas, then a law exists which is comparable to the law passed in 1974 by the Congress of the United States, I suggest in answer to the conventions the Americans signed along with Canada at Montreal, the Hague, Tokyo and Geneva.

Is it not strange that our biggest neighbour passed a law as recently as 1974 to put teeth into what they call their aircraft piracy law in the form of the death penalty while we in Canada have that provision in our Criminal Code and choose, if we follow the pattern set by the government, to delete that provision? Even if all hon. members in this House were abolitionists, surely they would not be acting responsibly if they expected Canada to become the only totally abolitionist nation in this part of the world with respect to aircraft piracy. Let us think of what will happen if this section is deleted, as the government proposes. It will mean that a person who has taken over an aircraft might deliberately direct that aircraft to be flown to Canada because he will know that there is no death penalty here.

If this section is deleted, he could execute everyone on that aircraft, and the law of the land will say that the worst penalty he will have to pay will be imprisonment for life. Is that really what even abolitionists are willing to live with? I can see some argument that if the United States, Russia, Ireland or any other country was abolitionist as far as air piracy is concerned, there would not be that kind of pressure put on Canada where we might end up with an air piracy that has nothing to do with us except that the pirates know this is a safe haven; that even if people die as a result of it, the maximum penalty the government could enforce is life imprisonment. I think that is the crux of the two motions now before us. Do we, as members, want to go that far, bearing in mind that, like it or not, this is a retentionist world, and the nations around us have chosen to say that air piracy is an offence and if death occurs as a result, the death penalty may be prescribed?

● (1200)

I could read various other sections of the act passed by the United States Congress which deal with this question. Section 104 states:

(1) Whoever commits or attempts to commit aircraft piracy, as herein defined, shall be punished—

"(A) by imprisonment for not less than 20 years; or

"(B) if the death of another person results from the commission or attempted commission of the offence, by death or by imprisonment for life."

Again, under the heading "Procedure in respect of penalty for aircraft piracy", it reads:

(c) (1) A person shall be subjected to the penalty of death for any offence prohibited by section 902(i) or 902(n) of this act only if a hearing is held in accordance with this subsection.

It goes on to express many jury provisions, and that type of thing, which would apply in the case of someone who was being tried on charge of aircraft piracy. I raise this point because I think it is important to refute what I would suggest was the misrepresentation of the Solicitor General that somehow skyjacking is not piracy. Our own law is clear, Mr. Speaker. Subsection 1 of section 75 of the Criminal Code is not going to be changed. It makes it very clear. It reads:

Every one commits piracy who does any act that, by the law of nations, is piracy—

Note that, Mr. Speaker, "by the law of nations". I believe the Solicitor General owes it to this House to explain what he understands to be the law of nations as far as piracy is concerned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: I have cited the various conventions where this question has been dealt with. I have shown the history in some 20 years of how the various nations have interpreted and defined piracy. I think it is now up to the Solicitor General to tell this House why he believes piracy does not include skyjacking. Certainly, there is no definition in the Criminal Code that he can rely upon that would automatically say that in respect of the law of nations, piracy somehow means something different in Canada from what it means in the other nations of the world. Bearing this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I think those who have already expressed, much more ably than I have, the terror of aircraft piracy have a good point. Surely, in our rush to amend, to become an abolitionist nation, we should hesitate and look at what is happening in some other nations.

I believe, and I think I am correct, that somehow this government has become obsessed with waiting to be one of the first nations in the world to become totally abolitionist. The world is not ready for that, Mr. Speaker. The people of Canada are not ready for that. I think even the government agrees that about 80 per cent of the Canadian people believe we should retain the death penalty for at least some crimes. I think if you were to ask the people of Canada—and I would challenge the government to have a plebiscite on this—if they think the death penalty should be retained with respect to air piracy, or piracy generally, well over 80 per cent of the people would say yes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: That is why I ask that all members of the House, regardless of their personal feelings, accept the world as it is. It is a retentionist world.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for allowing me a few additional minutes. I will sum up by saying that I can understand abolitionist members in this House stating that they believe, in conscience, that we should do away with the death penalty. I ask them also to consider whether it is wise to do away with the death penalty with respect to an offence such as piracy, bearing in mind that piracy is not something that will occur only within the boundaries of Canada but has an international relationship. Piracy occurs on the high seas or in the air, under no direct sovereign control. Is it right that we should allow Canadians, through our Criminal Code amendments, to get out of step with the rest of the world so that Canada may become a haven for those who commit air piracy? I believe the majority of Canadians—80 per cent or more—would say no. I think those in this House who would support the government with regard to abolition for all, in the sense of ordinary crime, would stop at the crime of air piracy.

That is what is before us today, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely hope that those who up to this point have rather generally supported the government will say, on the question of air piracy, "I call a halt. I think the death penalty should be retained."

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), and the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) have argued that section 75 of the Criminal Code, which deals with piracy, also covers air hijacking or air piracy. I have said it does not, because in 1972 this House passed legislation dealing specifically with aircraft hijacking. Section 76.1 of the Criminal Code deals with the hijacking of aircraft, section 76.2 deals with endangering the safety of aircraft in flight and rendering aircraft incapable of flying, and section 76.3 deals with carrying offensive weapons or explosive substances on aircraft or putting them on aircraft. Section 75 does not deal with air piracy, because we have that very specific and particular section following it which deals with the very subject. This amendment was passed in 1972 by this House in response to the air piracy and air hijacking question at that time, following international discussion.

I have consulted the Department of Justice and am told that because we have specific sections dealing with air hijacking, these prevail over the general sections and that is the general interpretation of the law. When we passed these sections in 1972 we provided that the penalty for aircraft hijacking, endangering aircraft or pirating aircraft would be life imprisonment. I can understand some hon. members who believe in capital punishment wishing to change the penalty to death. But they would have to

propose amendments to sections 76.1, 76.2 and 76.3 of the Criminal Code. This cannot be done simply by moving a motion to strike out clause 3 of Bill C-84.

● (1210)

A charge was last laid under section 75 of the Criminal Code, the section we are now discussing, in 1872, in Victoria, British Columbia. Four individuals charged under that section were sentenced to death, but their sentences were commuted. That was the last time a charge under section 75, which deals with piracy involving ships, was laid in Canada.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Some countries have changed all this.

Mr. Allmand: The hon. member suggests that some countries are applying the law relating to piracy at sea to air piracy. This would have been the case in Canada if we had not passed in 1972 specific amendments to the Criminal Code dealing with aircraft hijacking and if we had signed the convention referred to. If it were not for these provisions, the old sections on piracy would apply to air piracy as well. I am informed by the Department of Justice that we have specific provisions dealing with air hijacking, or air piracy, which are not in section 75. I am referring to section 76, the heading above which is "Offences relating to aircraft." Offences relating to aircraft are covered under the provisions of that section and not by section 75. As I say, I can appreciate some hon. members wishing to make death the penalty for air hijacking. But to achieve their purpose they would have to move amendments to section 76 and following sections of the Criminal Code.

In this bill we are merely removing the death penalty with respect to piracy involving ships, in order to be consistent with other things we are doing. Some hon. members may disagree with this, and I respect their position. I merely say that one cannot deal with the question of capital punishment for air piracy or air hijacking by amending section 75 of the Criminal Code. One would have to amend section 76 and sections following. As I have said, the last time anyone was charged under section 75 was in 1872.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The allotted time of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) has expired. He may ask a question only with the unanimous consent of the House. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand)? Bearing in mind that Section 75(1) of the Criminal Code reads, "Every one commits piracy who does any act that, by the law of nations, is piracy," will the Solicitor General indicate why he does not believe that one can include, under the law of nations, aircraft piracy under the heading of piracy, bearing in mind the terms of the Geneva convention to which we are party and the various other conventions emanating from that convention?

[Mr. Allmand.]

As I understand it, skyjacking at present is an offence included under the general heading of piracy. I should think a strong argument could be made, if the section is left the way it is, for a skyjacker to be charged under section 75 or under the broad heading of piracy. I say that since the law of nations has made it clear that piracy includes aircraft piracy as well as piracy involving ships on the high seas. Does the Solicitor General feel that the law of nations does not include, under piracy, aircraft piracy?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I am advised—and I sought legal advice on the point—that if we had not in 1972 introduced specific provisions with respect to aircraft hijacking and offences with respect to aircraft, the hon. member's contention would prevail. We would look to the usage definition, to international custom, and so on, or we might even examine treaties to see how piracy, under section 75, might be defined. However, in Canada parliament makes the laws of the country and the laws of parliament prevail over any treaty or international usage. In this case, the particular sections which parliament has passed prevail. If we had not introduced those sections, piracy could have been interpreted, according to the legal opinion I have been given, in the way the hon. member suggests.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, may I direct one last question to the Solicitor General? Section 75 of the Criminal Code covers the occurrence of death during piracy. Is it not reasonable to say that when that happens, the ultimate offence has been committed? If you commit the offence of aircraft piracy and death occurs, you may be punished with death. On the other hand, subsections dealing with skyjacking do not refer to the situation in which death occurs. They simply say that if you make off with an aircraft, you can be sent to prison for life. Surely there is a sharp distinction to be drawn between the situation contemplated under section 75, where provision is made for the death penalty if death occurs, and the situation contemplated in section 76, where there is no suggestion of what the penalty shall be if death occurs.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. member's question, I am advised that anyone who causes the death of an individual on an aircraft, either deliberately or otherwise, through negligence or some act which endangers the aircraft, can be charged with murder or any substantive offence related to murder. We have checked with the Department of Justice and have learned that eight charges have been laid in Canada for aircraft hijacking since the introduction of the relevant sections in 1972.

In addition, we also amended the Aeronautics Act in 1972. I do not have those provisions before me at present. Those provisions were passed as a result of the international conferences referred to by the hon. member. Nations which signed those agreements were obligated or responsible for doing something serious about aircraft hijacking and terrorism involving aircraft. Some countries, like the United States, introduced provisions providing for the death penalty. In Canada we introduced provisions which provide for life imprisonment.

To be fair to the hon. members although I mentioned a legal opinion concerning section 75, I must confess that I

do not think it has been tested in the courts, mainly because so few charges have been laid under section 75. In other words, I do not think anyone has laid a charge under section 75, with respect to aircraft piracy, which has been challenged and tested in the courts. But the opinion is that because we have such specific sections in Canada, they cover that specific issue.

Mr. Horner: The minister has defeated his own argument.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the debate on clauses 10 and 11 of the bill. Last night I spoke on the treason clause; this morning I wish to speak on the piracy aspect of the bill. I was most interested to hear the exchange between two competent lawyers. I hope that the Department of the Solicitor General will enlighten us about the matter which has been raised in argument. I should like the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) to bring forward necessary amendments to the Criminal Code and reintroduce the death penalty for skyjacking. That move would simplify matters.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Hear, hear!

Mr. McKenzie: May I put on record some figures relating to skyjacking attempts since January, 1975. Altogether there were 277 successful attempts and a total of 452 attempts. These figures show that we face a serious problem with regard to skyjacking and that such piracy is still taking place. We all know of incidents which took place in the last two weeks. One attempt was made last night. To remind hon. members, especially abolitionists, what happens when a plane is skyjacked I shall read part of a news report headlined, "Two killed, 10 hurt in Iraqi hijacking." The report says:

> The pilot of an Iraqi Airlines domestic flight felt a hard object on his temple and heard a click.
>
> "I'll blow your brains out if you don't immediately fly out of Iraq," said a man who had suddenly appeared in the cockpit.

Just imagine if that had happened to the Solicitor General's brother or to some other relative of his. How would he have liked it? How would he feel if any of his relatives were in such a position?

We should be given complete protection against these individuals and there should be swift justice in dealing with the characters who are putting guns to pilots' heads, instead of finding ways to pamper them. The intruder, wielding a pistol, was one of a trio of anti-Iraqi Kurdish hijackers aboard a Boeing 737 carrying 85 passengers and seven crew members on a flight from Baghdad to the northern town of Mosul. The pilot flew immediately to Tehran airport, ignored a refusal to land, skimmed over fire engines blocking runways, and almost flipped the plane as he brought it down on uneven, muddy ground beyond a landing strip. The first thing the hijackers did was to order $5 million ransom and the release of 85 Kurdish prisoners held in Iraq. They threatened to blow up the plane, with all aboard, if these demands were refused.

● (1220)

This is how the drama ended. Soon after, a shoot-out between the gunmen and Iraqi security officers on the aircraft resulted in the death of a female passenger and one of the hijackers. Ten other persons were injured. As bullets whizzed, passengers tumbled out of the plane through an emergency exit. The two remaining hijackers jumped out of another door to surrender to Iranian authorities when they ran out of ammunition. How fortunate that they had run out of ammunition! Many people find it hard to get over incidents such as this. A lot of them are affected for the rest of their lives. This is an aspect which should be given consideration, rather than the fate of the hijackers. If it were known that swift justice would face these people, if they had realized they would be sent before a firing squad or to a gas chamber, I am sure many of them would have had second thoughts.

There was another case recently which was reported in the press under the headline, "Hijacked jet takes to air after guerrillas kill 36". The news agency reported the affair as follows:

> Arab terrorists who killed at least 36 people at Rome and Athens airports began a search for a haven in the Middle East today in their hijacked West German jet liner.
>
> After a night of terror at the Athens airport during which they are reported to have murdered four hostages, the gunmen took off with 12 hostages in the Boeing 737.
>
> The Lebanese government refused to let them land in Beirut and they put down in Damascus, the Syrian capital.
>
> Twenty-four hours earlier at Rome's Leonardo da Vinci airport the guerrillas had killed 30 people in a fire-bomb and machine-gun attack, the bloodiest Arab commando strike yet.

This is what is happening. This is why I hope the Solicitor General will bring in necessary amendments to the Criminal Code to enable the supreme penalty to be imposed on hijackers. In some cases these people are being treated far too leniently. Some of them have even been getting day passes. One man who hijacked a Pacific Western Airlines' plane and demanded $2 million for its safety has been placed on a pre-release program from Riverview Hospital by a provincial cabinet. I hope we are not releasing any of the other skyjackers, if there are any in custody. They should be kept behind locked doors at all times, not given weekend passes.

Here is a further instance of the danger we are encountering almost daily. I have before me a news agency story headed, "Ransom demand for jet hostages—free 53 prisioners". This is what we read:

> Kampala, Uganda—Palestinian extremists have demanded the release of 53 "freedom fighters" imprisoned in Israel and four other countries in exchange for 256 hostages and a hijacked French airliner. They said severe penalties would follow if demands were not met.
>
> France immediately said it would not give in to the guerrillas who commandeered an Air France airbus Sunday over Greece during a flight from Tel Aviv to Paris. Israel, with 40 prisoners on the list and an estimated 100 citizens being held hostage, said it has to consult. Top officials in Israel, which since 1968 has steadfastly refused to yield to terrorist demands, said they hold France responsible for the passengers.

Here is another case in which 36 people were murdered by terrorists in a hijacking. Such things happen regularly and the situation presents a growing menace. The cost of additional security measures in astronomical. For instance, the United States has had to spend more than $5 billion on extra security at airports, including the searching of passengers to ascertain whether they are carrying guns or knives.

The hon. for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) mentioned earlier the position taken by Cuba. Castro is giving every indication of being fed up to the teeth with criminal types who arrive in that country aboard commandeered U.S. aircraft. On November 15 he offered to negotiate a broad agreement which would halt the hijacking of U.S. planes to Cuba. The U.S. accepted and said talks would soon begin. The White House and Congress, after sparring over the details of a tough, new anti-hijacking law, now appear to be close to agreement. This measure would create a new federal police force to keep potential hijackers off U.S. airliners.

I understand that a strong anti-hijacking law narrowly missed passage as Congress hurried to adjourn last October. At that time most differences between Congress and the White House had been ironed out. It is now predicted that approval could come soon. Hon. members will have noted the creation of a new federal police force to deal with hijackers. This is an indication of the extreme steps which have become necessary for the protection of passengers. The cost, as I say, is astronomical. It is another important reason why we should impose the supreme penalty on skyjackers, to let them know we mean businesss. It is true that many of these incidents have taken place in other parts of the world, but we should not forget that there are often Canadian passengers aboard these planes. In the recent case where the Israeli commando troops released the hostages, there were five Canadians among the passengers.

When President Nixon was in office, after the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled against the death penalty for many crimes he said he hoped the ruling did not apply to skyjacking. That ruling has, of course, been changed and the supreme penalty is applicable to skyjackers in most states. As part of the measures which have been taken to deal with hijackers, Canada and the United States have entered into certain informal agreements. Officials responsible for aircraft safety in both countries realize, as never before, that the two countries share one piece of airspace and that it is time to set up a procedure for handling transborder airplane piracy. It is too bad there is not in Canada the same penalty for hijackers as there is in the United States.

In closing, may I express the hope that the Solicitor General will reconsider his position and consult the Department of Justice in order to bring in necessary amendments to the Criminal Code to impose the supreme penalty on hijackers.

● (1230)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I will of course yield the floor to the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) and I will resume right after.

[*English*]

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on the motion, and I appreciate the co-operation of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) in allowing me to speak at this time. I am not going into the discussion whether the proposed amendment dealing specifically with piracy also involves the more critical crime of hijacking in the air which, as several members have outlined, is one of the great problems facing our civilized community at this time.

I think it can be argued, as the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) did argue, that the crime of piracy does embrace hijacking. But rather than get into the legal aspects of that problem, I would just re-emphasize that any attempt to remove capital punishment from crimes of piracy, acts of treason or, to put it in a separate category, the crime of hijacking, is contributing to the breakdown of law and order in the civilized world. I listened to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) explaining a moment ago that this subject really is not very important since the last trial for piracy—

Mr. Allmand: The last conviction.

Mr. Dinsdale: —the last conviction for piracy was in 1876, I believe was the date. So that for those who have their minds set against capital punishment there is not much danger of our carrying out the ultimate penalty for the specific crime of piracy.

What I want to debate this afternoon is the principle involved in the government's attempt to delete, as it has in a rather subtle way, the death penalty as punishment for a very serious and heinous crime. It is interesting to note that as the government of Canada, and the governments of some other countries as well, have lessened the impact of the death penalty on what we used to call capital crimes, the process of the breakdown of law and order has proceeded apace. In this country, statistics before us show that in 1967, when the subject was first debated in the House of Commons in a free vote, the vote for abolition was 105 and the vote for retention was 70. When the next vote came in 1973, the abolitionist vote was 119, to 106. The two groups were coming closer together.

In the most recent vote in the House just a couple of weeks ago, the verdict expressed by hon. members was 133 for abolition and 125 for retention. There will be two more retentionist votes, at least, when the third reading vote comes along. I will be voting for retention on the basis I put forward when I first entered this debate some weeks ago, namely, that there is an urgent need for dividing the crime of murder into the two categories of first-degree murder and second-degree murder.

I suggest that the statistical trend demonstrated by the changing vote moving more and more toward a retentionist position, is the result of an increasing wave of permissiveness in Canada, North America and Europe during the last decade or so. There has been an increasing breakdown of law and order. Statistics for murder have doubled.

Furthermore, as the debate for abolition has gone forward, Mr. Speaker, statistics for attempted murder have not only doubled but quadrupled and a wave of violent crime, such as rape and similar acts of violence, has gone on apace, so much so that today it is one of the urgent concerns of social scientists, as expressed in some of the books heading the lists of popular publications dealing with the crime of rape. It is obvious that when the state takes a permissive attitude toward horrendous crimes of that kind, it is aiding and abetting the ultimate breakdown of law and order.

I feel sure that there would be a much larger retentionist vote but for the attitude of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet. They had to remove themselves from the principle of the free vote, which is supposed to be at the basis of this debate, and use absolute cabinet solidarity and extreme coercion to hold some of their concerned backbenchers in line. Otherwise, I am sure the vote that took place some two weeks ago would have been quite different.

I congratulate those who are carrying on this debate, even though it means sitting extra time into the summer months, because I am sure that as members opposite and some members on this side contemplate what is involved here in terms of fundamental law and order issues they, too, will change their vote when we come to the final vote on third reading.

The government itself has now become concerned at the trend toward permissiveness. It is now engaging in a trade-off operation with its Bill C-83. It is attempting to substitute for the death penalty for deliberate, premeditated, horrendous kinds of homicide such as would be perpetrated by an act of piracy or hijacking, a mandatory life sentence for those offenders found guilty of such crimes. But as I pointed out when I spoke for the first time in this debate, this is a snare and a delusion because the government is trying to have the best of all possible worlds. The government is trying to face in two directions at once. It is emphasizing a rehabilitative and reformative posture in our penal institutions, and at the same time trading off the death penalty for a mandatory life sentence, which would make it impossible for our penal institutions to have any element of reform or rehabilitation.

● (1240)

This is also working against the recommendations of the law reform committee which this government appointed to consider and recommend reforms to our penal system. That committee suggests that penal institutions—largely based on statistics of increasing repetition and recidivism—have failed utterly in becoming institutions of reform and rehabilitation. The committee's recommendation to the government is that sentences for criminal activity of all kinds be reduced, rather than expanded. Notwithstanding this recommendation which is already before the government, the government is proposing a mandatory life sentence which would be a living death much harsher than the death penalty itself.

To anyone who has been abroad in recent weeks it is interesting to hear the reaction of people in other countries regarding the debate taking place on peace, order and good government, that is, Bill C-83, and this bill, C-84. With tongue in cheek they ask Canadians why Canada is beginning to sound more and more like a banana republic regarding law and order measures. If we remove the absolute penalty for the crime of treason, the ultimate crime against the state, and if we remove the death penalty for the crime of piracy or hijacking as the government is proposing to do, we are leaving ourselves wide open to all the terror and violence that is proliferating in the world today. No wonder Canadians travelling abroad are being asked why we are moving away from the reputation as the true north, strong and free, to a Canada which acts more like a banana republic.

Capital Punishment

In view of the crime which took place in the past week and its spectacular dénouement at the airport in Uganda over the weekend, if the government persists in this doctrinaire approach—and it is doctrinaire because it is an approach not related to any facts or statistics or anything that might be based on reality—and in removing the power of the state to deal decisively with violent crime on an international scale, then instead of being known as the banana republic of North America we will become known as the Uganda of North America. We will be leaving ourselves wide open to the rising incidence of crime that is causing so much concern around the world today.

I would urge hon. members, as they contemplate this amendment, to consider that it provides them, particularly backbenchers on the government side who are of two minds, to express their concerns. They are concerned over the breakdown in law and order and the increasing trend toward immorality. This amendment does provide them with that opportunity, and I trust they will have the courage of their convictions and support it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I rise on the issue of capital punishment, for it has been on the order paper quite a few times since I have had the honour to represent the residents of Bellechasse in the House.

However, in previous debates I wanted to express my views objectively on this serious issue and I must say that until now I found no valid reason to change my mind on the matter. This being said, I must sincerely admit that the whole Canadian nation is watching with much interest and attention the debates being held in the House on Bill C-84, which proposes many amendments to the Criminal Code. All members will certainly agree with me that the House is under pressure as all Canadians are, for this is a very serious topic and we must take all the possible steps and use all the possible means to avoid any mistake which would be detrimental to an individual who, by mistake or by profession, would have committed the serious crime of taking the life of another person.

Mr. Speaker, while the news media seem less interested in this matter at this time, the fact remains that public attention is still focused on the proceedings at the report stage and in the proposed amendments to Bill C-84. Everyone is concerned about the real meaning to be considered when it comes to evaluating the responsibilities of an individual within Canadian society.

What are the responsibilities of an individual towards another? What must invite him to respect the rights of another, specifically his right to live as an individual? At the family level, what are the responsibilities of the head of the family? On what grounds can an individual take the life of the head of a family—man or woman—who bears responsibilities for the children both parents wanted to have and who had met their responsibilities and done their duties during the normal course of their life?

At the municipal level, what are our responsibilities? As many members in this House, I had the opportunity once in my life to play a role at the municipal level and all those who have worked in municipal politics did so because they were dedicated to society and although they were some-

time criticized and even threatened they still accepted to take their responsibilities and the same applies at the provincial level. All hon. members, all ministers, all provincial officials have responsibilities which they must fulfill but, as far as we are specifically concerned today, it is our duty as members of the Canadian Parliament to represent the population in the highest authority that exists in our country, I mean the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) proposed an amendment to Bill C-84, which I have the honour of supporting. I want to defend it objectively, to explain why we were prompted to move this amendment and I want to ask my colleagues of the House to adopt it so that, in the future, the Canadian population can say to me: Here is a Parliament which has fulfilled its responsibilities. The members have adopted a bill providing for penalties against those who do not want to respect the lives of their fellow beings and who do not want to abide by the true code of liberty and of respect for the lives of their fellow beings.

Mr. Speaker, clause 3 of Bill C-84 says:

"(2) Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life."

It does not say that the court must condemn this person to life imprisonment but rather:

. . . is liable to imprisonment for life."

Consequently, before the court, if that person has been guilty of an act of piracy, if the court decides to condemn him to life imprisonment, if, of course, he is found guilty, he must serve his sentence.

● (1250)

We must maintain the current law which the legislators before us passed after considerable thought, in other words maintain the status quo as concerns subsection 75(2) of the existing legislation which reads as follows:

Every one who commits piracy while in or out of Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life—

And it goes on because we know that the legislators at that time surely knew that some other acts were added to that which is studied in the subsection. And so it goes:

—but if while committing or attempting to commit piracy he murders or attempts to murder another person or does any act that is likely to endanger the life of another person—

. . . and the law says . . .

. . . he shall be sentenced to death.

I suppose that the legislators who sat in this House and enacted the law I just quoted were intelligent and responsible people. If at that time those persons seriously assumed their responsibilities and if they included that provision in the Criminal Code it was to ensure the greatest security of the Canadian people against criminals whose vocation is to deny the rights of other citizens, particularly their right to life.

Mr. Speaker, this is why my colleague the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) and I decided to ask the House to maintain the status quo and I urge the Solicitor General to give a second thought to the wording of Bill C-84 relating precisely to that question of piracy.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

In the Larousse dictionary to which I referred this morning, I checked the meaning of the word "piracy". I understand that the Larousse dictionary is not published every year. I understand that the people responsible for defining the words in the French language thought that the idea of piracy applied particularly to sea transportation because at that time, the other means of transport had not yet been invented. Those responsible for defining the words dealt only with navigation. We can read the following:

Pirate: Adventurer who practices brigandage on the high seas.

Here is a second idea:

Any man who gets rich through pillage or robbery.

These days, we know that there are thousands of such pirates who get rich through legal or illegal pillage, and who get rich through legal or illegal robbery. I have often had the opportunity in the House to denounce the legalized pillage allowed by our statutes through which certain organizations can rob individuals, society, the whole population of Canada, by the means which are placed at their disposal. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that it is one o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRY POLICY—REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF PENALTY FOR OVERPRODUCTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with a very important question.

Considering the refusal of the government to reassess the whole dairy policy announced in April last which creates insuperable difficulties for dairy producers throughout the country; considering the unavoidable disappearance of a substantial number of those producers who have let it known that they intend to get rid of their herds for the above-mentioned reasons, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner):

That this House unanimously recommend to the minister responsible the immediate removal of the penalty of $8.60 on overproduction and a reduction of $1 a hundredweight on the amount now withheld from producers for the export of powdered milk.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDERS CONCERNING CERTAIN HOLIDAYS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to put forward a motion about a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Since under Standing Order 2(3) June 24 and July 1 are days when the House shall not meet, and that when those days fall on a Thursday the members have to be present in the House on the following Friday, the day after these public holidays, which prevent them from being in their constituency for the celebration of those holidays, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras):

That the House agree to amend Standing Order 2(3) by adding the following:

When the holidays of June 24 and July 1 fall on a Thursday, the House shall not meet on June 25 and July 2.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House has heard the terms of the hon. member's motion. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, the unanimous consent of the House is required to put the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Since the House is giving unanimous consent, I will put the motion. Seconded by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras), the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) moves that:

When the holidays of June 24 and July 1 fall on a Thursday, the House shall not meet on June 25 and July 2.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

[*English*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

SUGGESTION CANADA FOLLOW CONDITIONS SET OUT IN ORIGINAL BID FOR GAMES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the May, 1970 city of Montreal bid to host the 1976 summer Olympic Games was presented to and accepted by the International Olympic Committee and endorsed by all levels of government including the government of Canada, and that this bid assured the IOC and thereby the international sporting community that, and I quote from the bid

itself: "All necessary entry permits will be available to delegations from all the national Olympic committees," and whereby the same government now has made it abundantly clear that it is not prepared to respect that agreement, it has therefore become evident that in retrospect the government has in fact double-crossed the city of Montreal—

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member has a motion to propose pursuant to Standing Order 43, he could perhaps put it forward.

Mr. Jelinek: —so that further embarrassment will not be caused—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a motion to propose perhaps he would do so.

Mr. Jelinek: I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner):

That this House instruct the Secretary of State for External Affairs to convey his apologies on behalf of the Liberal administration to the city of Montreal, to the province of Quebec, and at the same time for the sake of not only the Olympic ideal but more importantly for Canada's pride, follow the conditions as outlined in the original Olympic bid as presented by the city of Montreal.

An hon. Member: Would it be in both official languages?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

POST OFFICE

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF DELAYS IN DELIVERY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity to ask for the unanimous consent of the House pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the importance of mail delivery in a country as vast as Canada, and since western Canadian companies have been disallowed bids by the Department of Supply and Services because it takes longer than seven days for air mail from Vancouver to arrive in Ottawa, and because mail from Great Britain marked "special handling" with postage paid in the Canadian equivalent of $1.50 is held up in Montreal and now takes up to 14 days to arrive in Vancouver where it used to take two to three days, and because first class mail paid in the orient is now held up and handled as fourth class mail upon arrival in Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker):

That this House order an immediate investigation of mail delays and order that any person employed in the Post Office who obstructs efficent delivery of mail be fired.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There was some difficulty earlier about the functioning of the translation equipment and it is being looked into at the moment. I do not know whether hon. members would want to begin the question period while it is being looked into or whether it would be better to wait until it is functioning.

Some hon. Members: Wait.

* * *

● (1410)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF HAIDA EAGLE DANCERS

Mr. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting I should like to draw hon. members' attention to the presence in the gallery of the Haida Eagle Dancers of the Queen Charlotte Islands in British Columbia who will be Canada's representatives at Bad Segeberg, Germany, at the Aboriginal Cultural Festival to be held there next week.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I can indicate to the House that there will be a delay of only a moment before the commencement of the question period. We have found the cause of the difficulty and we hope it will be cured in a moment or two. The question period would have begun at ten minutes past two, and I will take that into account when we start the question period.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DATE GOVERNMENT INFORMED OLYMPIC COMMITTEE CANADA DID NOT RECOGNIZE TAIWAN AS REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it is about the government's conduct with regard to the International Olympic Committee which, I wish to add, does not raise questions about Canada's policy towards China, but about our integrity as the host for the 1976 Olympics. When the government recognized the People's Republic of China in 1971, did the government immediately and formally advise the IOC that according to Canada's normal regulations Taiwanese atheletes could not attend the Montreal Olympics as representatives of the Republic of China and that the then existing position of the IOC would have to be changed?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question as to whether we communicated immediately with the International Olympic Committee as to the status that would occur when Canada had decided to recognize the People's Republic of China. What I did say yesterday, and what I repeat today, is that we had recognized well over a year ago that a problem existed and we communicated with the IOC more than a year ago. We are continuing, and are ready to continue, discussions with Lord Killanin and his officers in order to resolve this difficulty so that the games can go forward and Taiwanese athletes can compete in the games.

Mr. Jelinek: It is very difficult to comprehend why it has taken the government even the five or six years that it has taken before making their application to the Olympics. Since Lord Killanin told the Department of External Affairs in April of last year that as far as he could see there would not be a change in the China situation, I should like to ask the minister why the government at that time did not tell him that it would consider the extraordinary step of refusing entry to Taiwanese athletes if the AIC policy was not changed.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, we have, as I indicated yesterday, been awaiting action from the International Olympic Committee, the body in which the problem basically resides, to resolve this difficulty. However, when that was not forthcoming we took our own responsibilities and indicated to the International Olympic Committee that we were not prepared to admit athletes to Canada who would present themselves as representatives of the Republic of China, because we recognize the People's Republic of China and we are not under this guise proposing to import into our foreign policy a two-China policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

REASON FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR GAMES

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister may I direct my final supplementary question to the Acting Prime Minister? Since it can now be taken for granted that the government has reneged on the original Olympic bid by the city of Montreal which would have allowed free entry into Canada to all or any delegations belonging to the IOC, in short, because it is evident that the government does not support this bid in accordance with its undertakings and assurances—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Since, after all, the hon. member is asking his final supplementary question, perhaps he will put it and keep it short?

Mr. Jelinek: —Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister to explain to this House why the government consequently presented this parliament with legislation supporting the Games while allowing parliament to believe it supported the Montreal bid all along?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I deny the premise of the question. The government has never reneged on any undertakings on this score.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fraser: Oh, yes you have. You reneged on the fundamental undertaking to allow athletes in as recognized by the IOC.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY WHETHER AUTHORITIES REFUSED ADMISSION TO ACCREDITED TAIWANESE ATHLETES

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

According to our information, accreditation cards were issued in the name of Taiwanese athletes by COJO. These cards had been approved by the Department of Manpower and Immigration and indicated that these athletes were known as the Republic of China's representatives. In such circumstances, how can the minister refuse today Canadian entry to these men; further, was he aware of the fact that the Department of Manpower and Immigration had accepted such cards enabling these athletes to represent the Republic of China to the Olympic Games of 1976?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we will not refuse the admission of those athletes to Canada if they come forward as representatives of Taiwan. We are quite prepared to follow the precedent—and have so proposed—set in 1960 in the case of Italy when, at the request of the International Olympic Committee, athletes from Taiwan competed in those games as representatives of Taiwan. In those circumstances we would be quite happy to admit those athletes to Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Considering the problems and concern this whole situation represents for organizers both at the international level and at the Montreal level, can the minister tell us whether he will be able to take a final decision on this matter to avoid aggravation of the problem? On account of all concerned it is important to settle this matter and ensure the orderly progress of the Olympic Games in Montreal.

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, there is no question about any lack of decision. The Canadian government has made a decision on this question.

An hon. Member: It was the wrong decision.

[*Translation*]

POSSIBLE RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION TO EXCLUDE TAIWANESE FROM OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another supplementary. If I understand the minister's answer correctly, it seems clear that the government does not intend to change its mind. In view of Mr. Killanin's statements according to which the representatives of some countries have expressed the desire to refrain from attending the games, which might prevent these Olympiads from taking place, it seems clear that some countries wish to support Taiwan. In the circumstances, is the minister prepared to state that he will not change his mind, even if this meant the cancellation of the games?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the solution lies in the extreme course the hon. member is suggesting.

Mr. Fraser: Answer the question.

* * *

● (1420)

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REASON FOR LACK OF NATIVE PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare but I notice he has just stepped out of the chamber; I will direct it to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. On July 9, three federal cabinet ministers and five Ontario cabinet ministers are meeting to discuss the mercury pollution on the White Dog and Grassy Narrows Indian reserves. Can the minister explain why no Indian representatives have been invited to this conference although major decisions may be made there affecting the lives of native people?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Chief George Manuel has obviously been in touch with the hon. member as he has been with a number of my colleagues. We have been considering this matter. I might say, though, that I have been up to Grassy Narrows and met with the chiefs, and that at some point the governments concerned have to get together to make decisions. Consultation up to a certain point is good, but the right to make decisions must rest with the governments.

Mr. Symes: Having regard to the seriousness of the situation at Grassy Narrows, many of the Indians having lost their livelihood and some of them having shown symptoms of Minamata disease, will the minister assure us that representatives from the bands in Northwestern Ontario and from the National Indian Brotherhood will be invited to the meetings as full participants?

Mr. Buchanan: I have indicated to the hon. member that we will consider that matter.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSAL TO BAN SPORT FISHING ON WABIGOON AND ENGLISH RIVERS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): A supplementary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare arising from his statement that Ontario should ban sport fishing in the polluted English-Wabigoon river system. Will the minister assure the House that should he fail to get Ontario to agree to his proposal he will exert federal authority to bring about this result by declaring the area a water management control zone under the Canada Water Act?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this question is not within my departmental jurisdiction.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

POSSIBILITY OF BUILDING SECURE FACILITIES FOR DANGEROUS CRIMINALS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General.

Following the request by prison guards to provide supermaximal security institutions to hold the most dangerous convicts, especially those under death sentence, does the minister intend to respond to this request and, if so, when?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): This question is now under study, Mr. Speaker.

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

In view of the seriousness of the situation and the concern expressed by police organizations as well as the association of prison guards, could the minister give the House the assurance that the study now being made on the matter will be done as quickly as possible to further reassure the people in charge of supervising those categories of prisoners?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I hope to give a reply to their suggestions before third reading of the bill.

* * *

[*English*]

ENERGY

ALLEGED LOSS AS RESULT OF SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—POSSIBILITY OF SELLING ANOTHER REACTOR TO ARGENTINA

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and arises from a statement by Dr. Carlos Castro Madero, head of the Argentine National Atomic Energy Commission that the new contract for the Candu Cordoba reactor will still entail the loss of a substantial sum of money by Canada. Will the minister confirm or deny Dr. Madero's figures which show that the Canadian Crown corporation, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, stands to lose $24.5 million on this deal?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I am not in a position to confirm or deny those figures. In answer to a question by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands last week I indicated that renegotiation of the contract was virtually complete and that the documents had been prepared for signature. I can tell the hon. member there has been a great deal of very hard bargaining and that the arrangements under the original contract, which did not provide sufficiently for the effects of inflation in the two countries, have been very substantially improved.

Mr. Lawrence: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Bearing in mind that either the minister's own or AECL's commercial ineptitude has resulted in a situation where the Canadian people will have to pay out $25 million on a reactor deal that is highly questionable on moral grounds, will the hon. gentleman indicate whether Dr. Madero has been told, as reported, by Canadian officials that once the economic situation in Argentina stabilizes, Argentina will have no trouble obtaining from us yet another reactor?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, without in any way accepting the preamble to the hon. member's question, let me say that there have been no undertakings on the part of the Canadian government or officers of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to offer a second reactor to the Argentinians.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO ENSURE SPENT FUEL FROM NUCLEAR REACTOR IN ARGENTINA NOT REPROCESSED INTO PLUTONIUM

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, may I put my final supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In light of the statement by Dr. Castro Madero of the Argentine national atomic energy commission that Argentina is studying the possible acquisition of a fuel reprocessing plant, a technology unnecessary for the operation of CANDU reactors, will the minister say whether he has made or intends to make representations to the Argentine government to ensure that spent fuel from the CANDU reactor is not reprocessed into pure plutonium?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the present safeguards agreement with Argentina would preclude that possibility.

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT WITH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND ON PRICE DIFFERENTIAL ON BEEF AND CHANGE IN QUOTAS

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and it relates to the critical situation facing the beef producers of Ontario, particularly in southwestern Ontario. May I ask the minister whether agreement has been reached between Canada, Australia and New Zealand to remove the price differential which has destroyed the beef producers' competitive position and in many instances forced them out of business; and if there has been agreement reached, would the minister table the contents of that agreement in the House?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there has been no formal agreement at this time, but I think it would be presumptuous of us to suggest that the kind of beef coming from Australia and New Zealand, which is being used for processing and for hamburger meat, competes with the high quality beef that is produced in southwestern Ontario.

Mr. Holmes: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding that inadequate answer, would the minister indicate whether he will be announcing in the immediate future a new mechanism regarding import quotas which will ensure the future stability of the cattle industry? Is the minister prepared to do that rather than let the industry die, as he did with the sugar beet industry in southwestern Ontario?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will also recognize that there has been a change of heart on the part of some of the beef producers, even those in southwestern Ontario, regarding government intervention and how much we should intervene in the beef industry. I am prepared to move so long as I am sure I have the backing of the entire beef industry of Canada. There are still some reservations on the part of the official organization for the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, the western stock producers and Saskatchewan stock producers associations. I am going to meet a group of western Ontario beef producers in my constituency office in Windsor this Saturday.

With regard to the Australia-New Zealand meat problem, I think we are about to find a solution to it. Again, this is a world problem with which we are confronted. Australia and New Zealand are trading partners of ours. I have some reservations about whether they have lived up to what they said they would do last February; I think a lot of people are concerned about what they are doing. For instance, they are selling meat in Canada much cheaper than they are in the United States and we are not happy about that. If the hon. member, or the official spokesman for his party, have some suggestion regarding what we should do with the Australians and New Zealanders, I should like to hear it.

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO AID COMOROS ISLANDS

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Can the minister tell the House what the government intends to do to help the people of Comoros Islands in view of the urgent situation in which they find themselves since their independence, and also because of the interest several of my colleagues have expressed in this serious matter?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I missed the earlier part of the question but I am advised that the hon. member has asked about possible assistance to the Comoros. Representations have been made by a number of hon. members of the House to provide assistance to the Comoros particularly in the field of medical assistance. I wish to advise my hon. friends that I have approved a grant which will be distributed through appropriate non-governmental organizations that will provide much needed medical health assistance to these islands.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INFORMATION PROVIDED OLYMPIC COMMITTEE CONCERNING REGULATIONS GOVERNING ADMISSION OF ATHLETES

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Yesterday the minister quoted a letter of November 28, 1969, as proof that Canada placed conditions on its Olympic bid, and I quote:

> I would like to assure you that all parties representing the National Olympic Committees and national sports federations recognized by the IOC will be free to enter Canada pursuant to the normal regulations. I should be pleased to provide any further information respecting these regulations should you desire it.

Did the IOC request any further information regarding these regulations and, if so, were these regulations provided to the IOC before the games were awarded, or at anytime?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would have to check the record to see whether a request was made by the IOC for an analysis or interpretation of the normal regulations. Certainly, at an appropriate point Canada did volunteer to the International Olympic Committee its understanding of what conditions would determine the admission of athletes from Taiwan to the games. Just at the end of May, that interpretation was made very explicit.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a further question as he seems to be mixing regulations with conditions, and I do not think that goes unnoticed. Since Mainland China was not recognized by Canada until October, 1970, after the games were awarded to us in May 1970, how could those regulations referred to in that letter

have indicated to the IOC that Canada would take the position it is now taking regarding athletes from Taiwan? How can the minister use that letter and its mention of "normal regulations" as an excuse for a complete breach of undertakings given by both the winter bid and the summer bid?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, there has been no breach of understanding or breach of commitment. I think that has been made clear by the Acting Prime Minister. I presume it ought to be clear to any of us that, notwithstanding any undertaking to a private organization, no matter how respectful, such as the International Olympic Committee, no state would relinquish its sovereign rights to determine those who enter its boundaries.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Obviously in any circumstances any sovereign country retains that authority, and obviously the words "normal regulations" would apply to that rather obvious conclusion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE PROPERLY ACCREDITED ATHLETES WILL BE ADMITTED FOR OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I think it is pretty clear we are not debating the right of the government to try to change the position of the IOC, but whether it is moral and appropriate in the circumstances for the government to use its leverage as host to accomplish that end.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In light of the government's lack of candor on this matter, which can only be interpreted as blackmail and eleventh hour bad faith, will the government consider now restoring our good name and the country's good name by assuring the House that it will not use its visa powers to prevent any athletes coming to the games who are duly accredited and meet the personal, if not political, regulations of the government? Can he give that assurance?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if the good name of Canada is being affected in this incident this will arise from irresponsible comments made—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: The record speaks for itself.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: It is the irresponsible record of the government.

Mr. MacEachen: What I have said, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, is that Canada is quite prepared to admit the athletes from Taiwan. Canada is quite prepared to follow the formula that was formerly approved by the International Olympic Committee when it insisted that athletes participating in Italy enter that country as representatives of Taiwan. I would ask the House why that formula, which was used in the past with the approval of the International Olympic Committee, is not appropriate as a solution to this problem?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the problem with this government arises because it wants to speak out of both sides of its mouth at the same time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I think we hit a responsive cord.

REASON ADMISSION OF TAIWANESE ATHLETES WILL AFFECT FOREIGN POLICY BUT NOT ADMISSION OF PLO OBSERVERS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Since the government has claimed that the admission of the PLO observers to the Habitat conference by ministerial permit has in no way changed the government's fundamental position that the PLO should not have been recognized by the United Nations, because we were hosting a UN conference according to its rules and not our foreign policy, will the Prime Minister explain why the government now feels Canada's foreign policy would be jeopardized unless the IOC changes its rules? The government cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question put by the hon. gentleman, I fail to see any similarity between the situation we confront and the admission of the PLO as observers to Habitat, a group that we have not in any circumstances accorded, and another group from whom we have withdrawn, official recognition. That is quite a separate matter from the present situation in which are involved the policies of the government to extend recognition to the People's Republic of China as the sole and legal government of China. We do not propose in these particular circumstances to adopt solutions that would compromise the well established practice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF REPRESENTATIVES OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I draw to the attention of the House the presence in the gallery of the foreign minister of the Netherlands, His Excellency Max Van der Stoel, in his capacity as President of the Council of the European Communities, and Sir Christopher Soames, Vice President of the Commission of the European Communities. Both these gentlemen are in Ottawa at the present time to participate in the signing ceremonies for the frame-

work agreement for commercial and economic co-operation between Canada and the European Communities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

AGRICULTURE

PROPOSAL TO AID DROUGHT STRICKEN LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS OF NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, as a representative of one auto producing area to another, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question about the drought circumstances faced by the recently established dairy and livestock industry of northwestern Ontario. Could the minister tell the House whether he has been approached by the Government of Ontario with regard to a cost-sharing agreement in which the Government of Ontario would put up $25 per ton if the federal government would put up $25 a ton as a subsidy to bring in hay from Manitoba to help out these hard-pressed farmers?

● (1440)

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I met with the Minister of Agriculture from the Province of Ontario last week. We discussed this and no decision has been made at this time.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, since the situation is a very pressing one indeed for many people who are on the margin of existence in the industry there now, which as the minister well knows has just been established in the last few years, could he tell us when a decision will be reached on this, hopefully it will be a positive one, and what in addition does the federal government plan to do to help these hard-pressed farmers?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, both the Minister of Manpower and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister in charge of the Post Office have made this representation to me on behalf of the producers and the farmers in that area, as have some of the farm organizations. In the past, as always, we have responded to realistic requests and we are considering this request on its merit at this time.

* * *

TRANSPORT

ALLEGED UNFAIR APPLICATION OF FREIGHT RATES ON RAPESEED TO UNITED OIL SEED PRODUCTS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport having to do with the application of freight rates to various rapeseed processing plants in western Canada and specifically one of Canada's newest rapeseed crushing plants, United Oil Seed Products in Lloydminster which has been placed in a highly uncompetitive position relative to other processors which the officials suggest will jeopardize their company to the extent of $3 million as a result of the application of the freight rates and the withdrawal by the railway companies of the CTC interim decision on freight rates that was applied in June of 1973. I wonder if the minister could advise the House what action he is taking on this very important matter, if any. Has he met with the CTC, has he discussed the matter with the railways, and can he advise the House whether any action is being taken to seek redress for this particular company?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member somewhat misstated the situation. The railways quoted freight rates, as I understand it, for the plant to which he referred on the basis of their ordinary price setting which were the way they have applied rates to other plants prior to 1970 when the first appeal was heard against those rates. By 1976, this resulted in a far higher rate than was in effect for the plants with frozen rates. The order which was eventually passed by the Governor in Council and which directed the CTC not to allow a rate higher than the compensatory rates is to be applied to the new plant as well according to my understanding by communication from the railway. Therefore at such time as the new rates are ascertained by the CTC, there should be a similar basis for the rate setting on the existing plants, previously existing plants, and on any new plants.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, since the new rate that was provided for by the Order in Council to which the minister referred will not take effect until after the Snavely Commission has completed its study, and in view of the fact that United Oil Seed Products has made a specific request to the Canadian Transport Commission to be joined to the interim decision of June 1973, could I ask the minister if he is aware of this action and what specific steps he will take personally to intervene in this question.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not share the hon. member's view that those rates will not take effect until after the Snavely Commission has reported except in a very technical sense. I understand from the last information I had from the CTC that they may have the rates ready for promulgation by the end of July. I have not had a recent report from the CTC to change that date in the past several weeks but I will check with them again as to whether that date still holds.

* * *

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR MEASURES TO PERMIT LOW INCOME GROUP TO PARTICIPATE IN CO-OPERATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for housing. In light of the fact that tremendous changes have been made in the AHOP program of 1976 as compared to the AHOP program of 1975, with particular reference to co-operative building thus creating a hardship for those on low incomes who would like to build under the co-operative housing program pioneered by the extension department of St. Francis Xavier University, would the minister check into the situation immediately and ascertain if corrective action can be taken to bring it back to what it was so that the people on low incomes can participate.

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, they serve somewhat different purposes. I am pleased to advise my hon. friend that my parliamentary secretary and one of my staff are in Cape Breton at this moment looking at this very problem because we want to continue to serve the people in Cape Breton as we do the rest of the country to the best of our ability.

Mr. Muir: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his reply. He must have a mystic sense of power. In view of the fact that in 1976 there were 1,100 families in Nova Scotia who submitted their names for co-operative self-help housing to the Nova Scotia Housing Commission and when the new regulations were explained to them 90 per cent of those interested were unable to participate, would the minister make his postponed trip to Cape Breton as soon as possible to discuss this serious problem further with officials of the extension department and others interested in housing for low income families. That is the question. Now, when he gets a report will he do his utmost to correct the situation whereby now one must be making $12,000 a year before he can get into the program.

Mr. Danson: Well, Mr. Speaker, naturally my parliamentary secretary and my staff, the people who are there together with the CMHC people, are looking into this with a view to serving the client's needs; it might not be for that specific program, but certainly to see that the low-income people who are our highest priority have access to proper housing and co-operative housing which I happen to favour.

PROGRAM FOR VETERANS SUBMITTED BY NEWFOUNDLAND COMMAND OF CANADIAN LEGION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is another segment of veterans in the province of Newfoundland who have been trying to help veterans obtain approval for veterans housing because of their low income, I wonder if the minister would indicate if any progress has been made with regard to the program the provincial command of the Canadian Legion has submitted, and when they will receive a reply concerning the funding of that program.

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have looked at this study done by the Newfoundland-Labrador Command of the Canadian Legion with great interest. It has extreme potential for all veterans in all parts of Canada, but especially Newfoundland. It is one of those things which, in terms of priorities and spending limitations, we look at with a view to the over-all requirements in respect of the housing budget for lower income people generally. I would like to repeat that the proposals are interesting and are being studied. I would not want to build false expectations because of budget limitations at this time, but it is the sort of program that I would hope to move on when funds are available.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ARRANGEMENTS WITH SOVIET UNION FOR FAMILY REUNION AND VISITS BY RELATIVES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Hon. Martin O'Connell (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Would the minister consider approaching the USSR authorities under the Protocol on Consultations to try to iron out the practical problems faced by Canadians in arranging visits from relatives in the USSR and in the matter of family reunions?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker; I would be happy to follow up that question. As the hon. member may recall, when the Prime Minister met with Mr. Brezhnev a procedure was put into place by which there would be consultations between the two governments, particularly with regard to reunification of families. I will obviously take the hon. member's representations to heart and see what can be done under the protocol to accelerate these cases.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ALLEGED STUDY BY MR. PITFIELD OF LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister confirm that an in-depth study of the government's fiasco in the Lockheed dealings was made by Mr. Pitfield from the Prime Minister's office, and will the Prime Minister say that the study concluded regarding the expenditure of $16 million for which there was no value received. Perhaps he would be good enough at the same time to state whether it absolved Mr. Stopforth of responsibility, and is he going to table this report?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are several areas of the question which appear to confuse the facts. Mr. Pitfield is in the Privy Council Office, not the Prime Minister's office. The study in depth which the hon. member terms a fiasco has not been made by the Secretary to the cabinet. It is a subject which has been examined by the cabinet itself and of course by the ministers more directly involved. On the issue of Mr. Stopforth, I understand he has taken legal action outside this House and it is not appropriate for me to comment on that.

* * *

● (1450)

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

REPORTED LAWSUIT BY MR. STOPFORTH—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): My supplementary question is for the Minister of Supply and Services. In view of the reported lawsuit by Mr. Stopforth against the minister, will the minister say whether he intends to contest this lawsuit?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is asking for a legal opinion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Ask your seat mate.

An hon. Member: It was rough justice to put you two fellows together.

Mr. Goyer: The answer will come at the proper time in the normal fashion.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGATION OF FRAUD AGAINST BANK OF MONTREAL IN DEALING WITH ARVEE CEDAR MILLS AND OTHER SMALL FIRMS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): My question is for the Solicitor General. Could he elaborate on the possible charges of fraud involving the Bank of Montreal and its dealings with Arvee Cedar Mills of Salmo, B.C., and has the RCMP who are currently investigating this case given the minister an indication that there may be other cases involving the Bank of Montreal and its relationship to small business in British Columbia?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): The RCMP is involved in this investigation but only in an assisting role. The principal investigating police force is the Nelson B.C. police force. I requested further information about the investigation, and that is yet to be received.

Mr. Brisco: My supplementary question to the minister is to inquire whether he has had the opportunity to consult the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and be informed by the department that it is examining another case if not of illegal then at least of improper, scandalous, or unscrupulous behaviour by the Bank of Montreal in its dealings with small businesses, particularly with reference to the case in the Windermere Valley of Fairmont, B.C.

Mr. Allmand: I have not been in touch personally with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and I do not know whether officers of the RCMP have. I will check that as well.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

REQUEST FOR REVISION OF POLICY ON IMPORTATION OF WINTER CLOTHING FROM ASIA

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my question, directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, arises from a statement by M. D. Friedman, a member of the Canadian Textile Importers Association and President of Transcontinental Sales Inc. a firm engaged in imports, who expressed concern regarding imported winter clothing from Asian countries as a result of the government's import policy. Will the minister tell the House if he intends to review this policy regarding imported Asian winter clothing and if so, what step does he intend to announce in the House in this regard?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I have not seen the comments to which the hon. member refers. I can tell him that a number of sectors are now being examined, as indeed is the case on a continuing basis. I announced some changes in import quotas recently and I expect I will be making a statement with regard to polyester yarn, for example, within a matter of a few days. But I will look at the statement and perhaps may be able to give a more detailed response at that time.

[*Translation*]

PENSIONS FOR TEXTILE WORKERS WITH MORE THAN TWENTY-FIVE YEARS SERVICE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Considering that the House already passed legislation which enables people with more than 25 years of employment in the textile industry to receive retirement benefits, and that this legislation does not seem to be implemented most of the time because of employers, is the minister prepared to tell the House whether he intends to review this legislation to enable those who earned their living in the textile industry to benefit from a retirement plan or from relocation in the labour force?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Well, Mr. Speaker, that particular program is still in effect. I gather from what the hon. member has said that he would like to see some changes in it. I have not heard any representations along those lines. I do not know that applications are still being received for people under this transitional program, but if he has some specific ideas, I would be glad to look at them with a view to making changes.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO EXPEDITE ADMISSION OF CHILEAN REFUGEES IN ARGENTINA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Yesterday the minister acknowledged that 27 refugees of Chilean origin have sought refuge in the Canadian embassy in Argentina and are being considered for admission to Canada. In this connection a news statement was published a few days ago which attributed to spokesmen of the Department of External Affairs the view that it might take up to six months to service these applications. My question is whether it would be possible to do something to expedite this process as the people in question are in fear of their lives. Also, I should like to ask the minister if he would not collaborate with his colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and consider sending a spe-

cial team to check on these cases and to expedite their applications.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Intensive discussions are presently taking place between my officials and the officials of the Department of Manpower and Immigration with a view to reaching some solution in this matter. As the hon. member knows from my answer yesterday, we have been in contact with the government of Argentina and we have been assured of their co-operation in reaching some solution, so the matter is being looked into.

Mr. Blackburn: One part of my question was not answered. I was wondering if the Secretary of State was considering, along with his colleague, sending a special team to Buenos Aires to expedite this as quickly as possible. If these are genuine refugees, there is no reason why they should be forced to stay there for six to eight months and go through the normal processes.

Mr. MacEachen: I do not foresee under any circumstances that the processing period would require six to eight months, but the matter of establishing entry requirements and deciding whether these persons are refugees is a matter exclusively for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

NEWS REPORT OF REVENUES ACCRUING TO PROVINCES UNDER FEDERAL PROPOSAL—PRIME MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Right Hon. Prime Minister. In view of the feature article in the *Globe and Mail* concerning revenues the federal government would turn over to the provinces in the present negotiations, can the Prime Minister say whether this report was given to the media before the conference and whether the provisions are substantially as detailed in the article?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I did not read the article, but I will take note of the question.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED PROHIBITION OF REMISSION OF SENTENCE FOR DANGEROUS SEXUAL OFFENDERS—MEANING OF MANDATORY SUPERVISION

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. In view of the tragic death last week of little Jeanne Doove in Mission, British Columbia, and in view of the fact that the man charged with her death, Gary Francis Marcoux, had been sentenced for rape in 1971 but was released because of the provisions of statutory remission, would the minister consider amending Bill C-83 so as to prohibit any remission earned or otherwise, in the case of dangerous sexual offenders?

[Mr. Blackburn.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the present law does not provide any remission for dangerous sexual offenders. The individual in question was not classified as a dangerous sexual offender but had received a sentence for rape.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Is that all?

Mr. Allmand: Hon. members do not seem to know the distinction between provisions of the law dealing with dangerous sexual offenders and other provisions in the Criminal Code.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: Under rape provisions in the Criminal Code, a man can be sent to prison for life but a dangerous sexual offender can get an indeterminate sentence with no day parole or temporary absence or remission. With respect to the question, Bill C-83 does provide for the abolition of statutory remission.

Mr. Patterson: If Mr. Marcoux was under mandatory supervision, how was he able to perpetrate this dastardly murder? In other words, what does mandatory supervision in such case really mean?

Mr. Allmand: Supervision means that he must report on a periodic basis to a parole officer or probation officer and that he is subject to certain conditions. In the peace and security program we have proposed that the supervision time be doubled, and if the House would facilitate the passage of that bill we could correct some of these things.

* * *

● (1500)

PENITENTIARIES

DORCHESTER—ALLEGED FINDING OF DYNAMITE AND ESCAPE PLOT FOR PRISONERS HUTCHISON AND AMBROSE

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Solicitor General. Could the minister please inform the House whether some weeks ago at Dorchester penitentiary some seven sticks of dynamite and a small cache of arms were found which were relatable to the prisoners Hutchison and Ambrose, who were convicted of the killing of two police officers in Moncton?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I will have to consult with the penitentiary authorities on that question. There was an incident a few weeks ago, but I cannot recall the exact details.

Mr. Dick: Is the Solicitor General aware of, or can he find out and report to the House, the details of the escape plot uncovered by officials which was being planned for the escape of the prisoners Hutchison and Ambrose?

Mr. Allmand: There was evidence that some inmates at that institution were planning an escape for Hutchison and Ambrose, but the plot was found out and quashed.

MILLHAVEN—DATE OF TABLING HANSEN REPORT ON GASSINGS AND BEATINGS

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. On June 15 the minister told the House that he would have the Hansen report on the Millhaven gassings and beatings ready for tabling before July 1. In view of the fact that it is now July 6, would the minister let us know if he is now in a position to table this report or when the next promised date will be?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I believe the report is ready for tabling and could be tabled before the end of this week.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REASON FOR DELAY IN CHANGING DAIRY POLICY

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister tell the House when he will be announcing changes in the federal dairy policy to provide some relief for farmers who are seriously affected by it, and can he confirm that members of his staff told Ontario government officials that the cause of the delay in making an announcement is the result of the fact that the President of the Treasury Board vetoed such changes and the Minister of Agriculture is now appealing that decision to the full cabinet?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member got his information, but I made an announcement after the NFU appeared last week and made new submissions to me as the Minister of Agriculture. These submissions would take some time to be considered. We are discussing them. This is a very important decision, and I have always said that if the provinces want me to run the whole dairy policy, they should vest in me that authority, and I will run it for them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whelan: If they were to accept their responsibility and shoulder the responsibility for the terrible and inadequate way the quotas are being run within the provinces, we would not have the problem we have.

Mr. Beatty: When the minister is successful in getting these changes accepted by the cabinet, will he give the assurance that any changes to be announced will be announced in the House of Commons and not delayed until after the House is in recess, which appears to be the present policy?

Mr. Whelan: I can no more give the hon. member that assurance than he can tell me when the vote on capital punishment will be taken.

House of Commons

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MINISTER OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS OF CAMEROONS

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of Mrs. Tsanga, Minister of Social Affairs of Cameroons, on official duty in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On June 30, the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi said that I had been making statements about a statement which he is supposed to have made about my being guilty of paying the farmers too much money for milk, and that this was the problem I was facing. I refer to *Hansard* of April 14, page 12807—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the information the minister has for the House would be most interesting and would provoke a great exchange between the two hon. members; but, while all are anxious to hear it, it does not constitute the substance of a point of order. This would have to be done during debate on some other occasion or in some other way.

Mr. Whelan: Then I rise on a question of privilege, because what the hon. member stated, whether he intended it or not, has damaged in some manner or form—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has received no notice of any intention to raise a question of privilege. Any matter between the two hon. members is a subject of disagreement which all, I am sure, hope will surface at a very early date.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the debate between 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock this morning there was a lengthy exchange between the Solicitor General and the hon. member for York-Simcoe with respect to the amendment dealing with the question of piracy and air piracy. At that time the minister was referring to a legal opinion he received from the Department of Justice. It is obvious that there is some question on this matter, and I wonder whether the minister would be prepared to file or to table that opinion, because he indicated it was not completely clear in his mind in the event that the matter had not been tried. I wonder if he might consider doing that.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the opinion which I received was received by telephone and not in writing.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which has to do with the return filed in answer to a written question which appears in yesterday's *Hansard*. The question is number—

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Simcoe North also has a point of order related to questions. Perhaps the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar could wait until questions are called later in the day.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING RECENT STRIKE OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table, in both official languages, copies of a letter to Mr. Demers, of l'Association des Gens de l'air du Québec, from myself, and a letter received under today's date addressed to me from the three commissioners appointed recently to investigate the air traffic control matter.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TABLING OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, in both official languages, the text of the framework agreement for commercial and economic co-operation between Canada and the European Economic Community, signed July 6, 1976.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,614, 5,116, 5,200, 5,201, 5,304, 5,479, 5,493, 5,560, 5,639, 5,692, 5,699, 5,700 to 5,707 inclusive, 5,714, 5,733, 5,771 and 5,802.

[*Text*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE—LEOPARD MARK II TANK

Question No. 4,614—**Mr. Whiteway:**

1. What is the (a) estimated purchase cost for a Leopard Mark II Tank (b) cost to retro-fit the present Centurion Tanks?

2. What is the average time taken to change an engine in a (a) Leopard Mark II Tank (b) Centurion Mark II Tank in the (i) shop (ii) field?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) The cost of the Leopard II Tank is not known as it is still in the prototype stage. (b) The estimated costs of retrofitting the Centurion Tank can not be disclosed until negotiations with the German Government and the Kraus-Maffei Company in Germany for the purchase of new tanks have been concluded.

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

2. (a) (i) and (ii). The Leopard Mark II is still in the prototype stage and therefore no operating specifications are known. (b) (i) 45 man hours; (ii) 62 man hours.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—PERSONNEL

Question No. 5,116—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. How many (a) Officers (b) Privates (c) NCOs (d) WOs are there in each rank in the Canadian Armed Forces?

2. Is any move being made to stop the automatic promotion from (a) private to corporal (b) 2nd Lieutenant to 1st Lieutenant (c) Lieutenant to Captain?

3. How many civilians in the Department of National Defence are paid (a) Colonel's wages or better (b) more than a Lieutenant's wages, but less than a Colonel's?

4. How many graduates from the service colleges entered the regular service in the Armed Forces in each year 1960 to 1975?

5. Of the service college graduates who entered the regular service in 1960, how many were still in the Armed Forces, by entry year, in 1965, and each subsequent year to date?

6. (a) How many officers were commissioned from the ranks in 1960 and each subsequent year to 1975 (b) how many remained in the regular service until they had (i) 30 years of service or more (ii) reached their compulsory release age?

7. (a) How many civilians entered the regular Armed Forces as officers directly in 1960 and each subsequent year (b) how many were still in, by entry year, in 1965 and each subsequent year?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. As of March 31, 1976: (a) 14,890; (b) Ptes—17,506, Cpl*—18,254, Total—35,760; (c) Sgt—9,703, MCpl—10,823, Total—20,526; (d) CWO—797, MWO—2,160, WO—4,261, Total—7,218.

---

*Since 1966 promotion to the rank of corporal has reflected competence in a trade and length of service. This rank does not carry command or supervisory responsibilities.

2. (a) No. (b) No. (c) Yes. Effective January 1, 1979 promotion to the rank of captain in all general service officer classifications will become competitive. A similar policy for specialist officers is under study.

3. (a) 158; (b) 4,783.

4.

Year	Number of Regular Officer Graduates
1960	146
1961	129
1962	138
1963	138
1964	182
1965	191
1966	170
1967	172
1968	198
1969	163
1970	172
1971	175
1972	143
1973	183
1974	234
1975	234

5. Accurate figures prior to 1965 are not available. The figures from 1965 to the present are listed below:

Graduation Year	Number of Graduates	Still Serving
1965	191	88
1966	170	78
1967	172	87
1968	198	111
1969	163	102
1970	172	124
1971	175	159
1972	143	135
1973	183	179
1974	234	226
1975	234	232

6. (a)

Year	Number Commissioned
1960	144
1961	206
1962	254
1963	238
1964	180
1965	302
1966	403
1967	382
1968	115
1969	268
1970	213
1971	168
1972	139
1973	148
1974	186
1975	182

(b) These figures are not readily available and would entail searching manually the records of each officer commissioned from the ranks since 1960, approximately 3,500 files. The cost of this research is beyond the approved resources of the Department.

7. Due to changes in record systems during the forces integration phase, and the many changes affected by unification, enlistment data prior to 1968 is not available without extensive research. The table below gives the data on officers still serving who entered the forces directly from a civilian status since 1968 and the number of direct entry officers since 1968.

Entry		Still Serving as of							
Year	Total	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
1968	164	154	123	112	105	102	92	83	77
1969	302		252	177	157	146	133	122	108
1970	193			171	126	113	104	85	79
1971	281				246	206	174	159	143
1972	286					253	201	167	155
1973	342						301	232	182
1974	414							346	265
1975	336								276

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 5,200—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Have postal clerks in approximately five post offices in Montreal recently refused to speak English on certain occasions to English-speaking customers and, if so (a) has or will the Post Office Department conduct an investigation of any of the incidents and will the results be made public (b) what are the designations and addresses of the post offices involved (c) have there been incidents where specific clerks speak English one day and claim the next day to have no knowledge of the language?

2. What specific action has or will the government take to enforce the Official Languages Act so that English-speaking persons in Montreal will be served by all post offices in their own language?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. The Department is aware that English speaking customers have occasionally been denied service in English at a number of Post Offices in the area of Metropolitan Montreal. (a) The department has conducted, and will conduct, investigations whenever a complaint is received concerning inadequate public service. Results of such investigations are made known to the complainant and, as appropriate, to agencies such as the Commissioner of Official Languages. (b) Complaints have been received concerning inadequate service in English at the following Montreal Post Offices: Postal Station B, 1250 University; Postal Station H, 1970 St. Catherine West; Place d'Armes, 155 St. James West; St. Laurent, 1495 De l'Eglise, St. Laurent; Victoria, 4895 Sherbrooke Street West. (c) Members of the public have stated that the same employee(s) have spoken English on occasion and have not on others.

2. The Department ensures that employees who will serve the public are trained prior to assuming wicket duties. Part of this training emphasizes the employees' duties and responsibilities vis-a-vis the official languages. Where appropriate, language training is given. The great majority of postal clerks understand and honour their obligations for providing service to the public. When infractions occur, personal letters are sent to the individual(s) concerned reminding them of their responsibilities. If further infractions occur after an employee has received such a letter, the Department would consider taking all administrative measures necessary to ensure the application of the Official Languages Act.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Question No. 5,201—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the government aware of a statement attributed to Mr. Marcel Perreault, President of the Montreal Local of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, that Montreal postal workers are determined to support the principle that French be the working language of Quebec's post offices?

2. What immediate steps has or will the government take to guarantee the rights of Quebec English-speaking persons to be served in their own language at all post offices designated bilingual within the Province?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. Yes, the Department is aware of a statement attributed to Mr. Marcel Perreault that postal workers are determined to support the principle that

French be the working language of Quebec's Post Offices. As a matter of fact, French has always been, and remains, the working language within most Post Offices in Quebec. Bilingual skills are required primarily for positions where public contact may occur in accordance with Section 4(A) of the Parliamentary Resolutions of June 29, 1973.

2. A Post Office is not designated bilingual. Some, or all, of the public contact positions within a Post Office may be designated bilingual depending upon the clientele served as determined empirically. The duties and responsibilities of employees who are bilingual to serve the public either in English or in French are made clear prior to assuming wicket duties. See also reply to Question 5,200, Part 2.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SERVICEMEN'S TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE

Question No. 5,304—**Mr. McKinnon:**

What was the cost (a) per annum (b) per serviceman of pre-release counselling and preparation for the serviceman's transition to civilian life in (i) 1973 (ii) 1974 (iii) 1975?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) (i) $78,032; (ii) 75,357; (iii) 59,767. (b) (i) $34.27; (ii) 37.14; (iii) 36.78.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SHIP PLANNING AND PROCUREMENT SECTION

Question No. 5,479—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Has the Department of National Defence set up a planning section or any other type of unit, section or project office to carry out planning and procurement of the 20 new ships, announced by the Minister and, if so, how many (a) servicemen (b) civilians are so employed?

2. What is the amount of money allocated for this purpose for the fiscal year 1976-77?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. No. Although no specific announcement about procurement of 20 new ships has been made planning studies for ship replacement continue to be carried out by Department staff as part of their regular duties. (a) and (b) Not applicable.

2. Nil.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—CONTRACT WORK

Question No. 5,493—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Does the government have any plans to further contract out work to private firms at the government dockyard in Halifax and, if so, what specific plans does it have in this regard for the fiscal years 1976-77 and 1977-78?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): The dockyard in Halifax, has had occasion to contract some work to private firms. It is expected that the need for such outside assistance will continue but there are no plans to increase the proportion of work to be contracted out in 1976/77 and 1977/78.

[Mr. McRae.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE—PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT

Question No. 5,560—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Have all positions and employees of the Communications Security Establishment of the Department of National Defence been excluded from the operation of all the provisions of the Public Service Employment Act effective April 1, 1975 and, if so, for what reason?

2. How many persons are affected?

3. How many persons have been so exempted each year since 1968?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes. To enable the employees to maintain the same terms and conditions of employment which they had prior to the transfer of the Establishment, to the Department of National Defence on 1 April, 1975.

2. Six hundred.

3. 1968—585; 1969—589; 1970—567; 1971—562; 1972—580; 1973—589; 1974—579; 1975—602.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—CANADIAN AIRBORNE REGIMENT

Question No. 5,639—**Mr. Howie:**

1. What was the total strength of the Canadian Airborn Regiment as of (a) January 1, 1975 (b) January 1, 1976?

2. In what location is the Regiment stationed, and what plans, if any, have been formulated for its future strength and location?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) 976; (b) 909.

2. The regiment is stationed at Griesbach Barracks, Edmonton, Alberta. There is a sub unit of the regiment stationed in Baden, West Germany. No final plans have been formulated, but as part of the Defence Structure Review currently in progress, several options are being considered for the deployment of the land forces. Some of these options could involve changes to the Canadian Airborne Regiment.

CENSUS—"HEAD OF HOUSE"

Question No. 5,692—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. What is the purpose of requiring one person in each household to be designated "head of house" for the 1976 Census?

2. What criteria were used in determining who was to be designated as the "head of house" in a household?

3. Does Statistics Canada intend to abolish this procedure on the grounds that it is archaic and unnecessary?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: 1. The purpose of requiring one person in each household to be designated as "head of household" in the 1976 Census, is to provide a statistical reference point to enable compilation of information on families and their constituents. Without such a reference point the production of census statistics on the composition of Canadian families would be impossible.

2. Following an analysis of the 1971 census information, Statistics Canada changed the head of household concept from a male head only to a male or female head of household. Who is to be designated head in 1976 is a matter of choice to be decided by the members of each household.

3. Statistics Canada does not consider the term head of household to be archaic and unnecessary. In accordance

with the usual practices of the bureau, the results of the current census will be analysed before determining the format of questions in future censuses.

POST OFFICE—PINE FALLS, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,699—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in Pine Falls, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the Pine Falls Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 573; (b) (i) 537; (ii) 3; (iii) 33; (c) (i) 15; (ii) 6; (iii) 8; (d) (i) 25; (ii) 2.

2. (a) 157; (b) 4.

3. (a) Two months; (b) One month.

POST OFFICE—STE. ANNE, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,700—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in Ste. Anne, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the Ste. Anne Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 459; (b) (i) 324; (ii) 7; (iii) 35; (c) (i) 27; (ii) 5; (iii) 4; (d) (i) Nil; (ii) Nil.

2. (a) 64; (b) 4.

3. (a) Nil; (b) Nil.

POST OFFICE—STEINBACH, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,701—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in Steinbach, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the Steinbach Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 2,029; (b) (i) 1,871; (ii) 12; (iii) 146; (c) (i) 242; (ii) 33; (iii) 16; (d) (i) 242; (ii) 5.

2. (a) 136; (b) 5.

3. (a) Two years; (b) One year.

Order Paper Questions

POST OFFICE—BEAUSEJOUR, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,702—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in Beausejour, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the Beausejour Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 1,209; (b) (i) 996; (ii) 11; (iii) 109; (c) (i) 67; (ii) 11; (iii) 2; (d) (i) Nil; (ii) Nil.

2. (a) 88; (b) 3.

3. (a) Nil; (b) Nil.

POST OFFICE—ST. MALO, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,703—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in St. Malo, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the St. Malo Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 182; (b) (i) 156; (ii) Nil; (iii) 26; (c) (i) 27; (ii) 3; (iii) 3; (d) (i) 38; (ii) 4.

2. (a) 68; (b) 2.

3. (a) Two years; (b) One year.

POST OFFICE—ST. PIERRE, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,704—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in St. Pierre, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the St. Pierre Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 412; (b)(i) 320; (ii) 7; (iii) 54; (c) (i) 29; (ii) Nil; (iii) 2; (d) (i) Nil; (ii) Nil.

2. (a) 24; (b) 2.

3. (a) Nil; (b) Nil.

POST OFFICE—DUGALD, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,705—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in Dugald, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the Dugald Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 108; (b) (i) 93; (ii) 2; (iii) 10; (c) (i) 4; (ii) Nil; (iii) Nil; (d) (i) Nil; (ii) 2.

2. (a) 64; (b) 5.

3. (a) Nil; (b) Nil.

POST OFFICE—OAKBANK, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,706—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in Oakbank, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the Oakbank Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. There are no mail boxes at the Oakbank Post Office.

2. (a) 186; (b) 14.

3. Not applicable.

POST OFFICE—LAC DU BONNET, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,707—**Mr. Epp:**

1. How many mail boxes at the Post Office in Lac du Bonnet, Manitoba (a) are presently in place (b) are held by (i) private individuals (ii) government (iii) businesses (c) are used by (i) 2 families (ii) 3 families (iii) 4 or more families (d) have been requested by (i) individuals (ii) businesses?

2. How many (a) individuals (b) businesses now receive their mail over the counter, referred to as general delivery?

3. What is the present waiting period for (a) individuals (b) businesses to receive a post office box at the Lac du Bonnet Post Office?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. (a) 851; (b) (i) 674; (ii) 11; (iii) 133; (c) (i) 120; (ii) 25; (iii) 2; (d) (i) Nil; (ii) Nil.

2. (a) 96; (b) 6.

3. (a) Nil; (b) Nil.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—COMMISSIONING OF WAR ARTISTS

Question No. 5,714—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. Has the Department of National Defence commissioned any war artists to do any portraits or landscapes of the Royal Canadian Regiment or the Royal 22nd Regiment, while on duty in Cyprus and, if so (a) who was hired (b) what was the cost?

2. Is the Department planning to do the same for the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry presently in Cyprus?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. No, the Department of National Defence provides assistance to Canadian artists to paint or draw the activities of the Canadian Armed Forces in their peacetime roles both in Canada and abroad under a program called the Canadian Armed Forces Civilian Artists Program (CAFCAP). Under this program the artist is provided with transport, and rations and quarters at Canadian Forces establishments in exchange for four or more works chosen from those created during their assignment. (a) and (b). From 1968 to 1975 four artists have participated in this program in Cyprus.

2. For fiscal year 1976/77 no artists have requested an assignment to Cyprus.

NORTH BAY AIRPORT

Question No. 5,733—**Mr. Blais:**

For the years (a) 1973 (b) 1974 (c) 1975, by quarter, what were the total number of take-offs and landings for (i) scheduled aircraft (ii) non-scheduled aircraft at North Bay Airport?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The following table contains statistics on scheduled, non-scheduled, and other commercial aircraft movements at North Bay Airport. These data are presented on a quarterly basis for the years 1973, 1974, and 1975. The tabulated data represents the numbers of take-offs plus landings. On a quarterly basis, there is a negligible difference between the number of take-offs and landings. Therefore, the numbers presented can be divided by two to obtain either take-offs or landings. Please note that non-scheduled refers to charter operations by aircraft having a gross take-off weight of 18,000 pounds or more. Charter operations by aircraft having a gross take-off weight less than 18,000 pounds are in the other commercial category.

NORTH BAY AIRPORT
Itinerant Aircraft Movements
Quarterly Take-Offs and Landings by
Scheduled and Non-Scheduled Air Carriers

1973	Scheduled	Non-Scheduled	Other Commercial
1st quarter	781	4	2,335
2nd quarter	912	4	1,623
3rd quarter	988	11	1,692
4th quarter	1,231	8	1,249
Total	3,912	27	6,899
1974			
1st quarter	967	—	793
2nd quarter	971	34	1,298
3rd quarter	1,374	17	1,271
4th quarter	934	17	971
Total	4,246	68	4,333
1975			
1st quarter	917	6	1,859
2nd quarter	1,119	3	2,488
3rd quarter	1,379	67	2,421
4th quarter	1,547	17	3,122
Total	4,962	93	9,890

NOTE: Totals may differ slightly from published annual numbers due to adjustments in monthly figures for the annual publications.

[*Text*]

IMMIGRATION

Question No. 5,771—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. What was the number of immigrants from (a) Poland (b) Hungary (c) Czechoslovakia (d) Ukraine (e) East Germany (f) West Germany in the year (i) 1974 (ii) 1975?

2. What was the number of applications rejected from each country in the year (a) 1974 (b) 1975?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1.

	1974	1975
(a)	945	809
(b)	383	301
(c)	77	107

(d) Statistics are maintained by countries of last permanent residence. Since the Ukraine is a part of the U.S.S.R., no separate statistics are available for immigration from the Ukraine.

(e)	17	12
(f)	3,619	3,469

2.	1974	1975
(a)	169	360
(b)	62	113
(c)	17	33

(d) Statistics are maintained by countries of last permanent residence. Since the Ukraine is a part of the U.S.S.R., no separate statistics are available for immigration from the Ukraine.

(e)	3	3
(f)	1927	2,003

WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Question No. 5,802—**Mr. Marshall:**

How many World War I veterans who are still living were prisoners of war?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Records of this type of information are not kept.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered.

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,709 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

CANADIAN COAST GUARD

Question No. 5,709—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. In what locations are the stations for the Canadian Coast Guard specialized fleet?

2. What is the size of the ship's complement for the following Coast Guard vessels, the (a) ten offshore cutters (b) 33 foot hovercraft (c) six 40 foot shore-based launches (d) nine 15 foot inflatable inshore rescue boats (e) fourteen 44 foot shore-based lifeboats?

3. In what locations are the thirty-three helicopters, which respond to marine emergency calls, based?

4. What is the type and capability of each of the sixty-five vessels which perform a secondary search and rescue role and in what locations are they based?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is not the appropriate time to raise this point of order, but I want to refer to the reply given by the Solicitor General to questions of mine, Nos. 4,255 to 4,355 inclusive. The answer given by the Solicitor General is that apparently he does not have sufficient staff and it would take considerable time to answer the questions I raised. I think this is a castigation of the way his department is operating. If they do not have the information I requested, which is not complicated—it dealt with mutilations, attempted escapes and attempted suicides, matters which the Department of the Solicitor General and the Penitentiary Service ought to have readily available—I suggest to Your Honour that the questions should remain on the order paper as at least a testament of the incompetence of the Solicitor General.

Mr. Allmand: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, in answering that question yesterday, at page 15013 of *Hansard* I pointed out that while that information may be available, it is not in our computer system. To get the information for the hon. member we would have to look through 30,000 files, some active and some dormant. This would take several months' work by a large group of officers. We felt that in this instance we do not have the staff or the funds available to provide answers to such questions.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring your attention to a question I asked at page 3625 of *Hansard* for February 25, 1975, when Your Honour replied regarding the answering of starred questions in a given length of time. Your Honour indicated that the question could be left unanswered *ad infinitum*, at the discretion of the minister.

The purpose of starred questions, as I understand it and as the system has developed by custom over the years, is to inhibit lengthy questions with a preamble, to put them on the order paper and star them. Another purpose is to give the minister time to prepare a more complete answer than he could on the spur of the moment and, hopefully, improve the answer. This was my understanding and my reason, over the months that have elapsed since February 25, 1975, for writing to the President of the Privy Council and speaking to him on three occasions. I also felt it would give protection to the Speaker since he stated, quite cor-

rectly, that he has no authority over starred questions as to when, if ever, they should be answered.

I also want to add that when I was ruled out of order on an oral question in a previous parliament, a former Speaker told me that my question was too long, that he was trying to contain the length of questions and answers so as to get to as many members as possible, and therefore my question should be starred and put on the order paper and it would be answered within a few days. This is, and has been, my understanding of the status of starred questions.

In the mother of parliaments a starred question is answered within two full days. In Canada it appears we are a bit unorthodox. Originally, as I understand it, only written questions were admissible by the Standing Orders and had to appear on the order paper. Then the asking of oral questions became customary on the basis of extreme urgency, and this has now become firmly established. As a matter of fact, Sir Herbert Williams probably asked about 4,000 questions during his parliamentary career, and described questions asked in the House as perhaps one of the most powerful instruments of democracy.

Nothing could more weaken the control of parliament over the executive than the abolition or curtailment of the right of a member of parliament to ask a question in the House of Commons. It is my contention that starred questions, by custom, should be given their useful place between oral questions and written questions.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the indulgence in listening to my plea to retain a useful tool in the armament of democracy and to strengthen the hand of every member of parliament by placing starred questions in the place in which custom has already placed them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reinforce what has been said so well by my colleague, the hon. member for Simcoe North. In the past it has been recognized and accepted by all sides that starred questions had a high degree of urgency. I notice that some on the order paper are simple ones that have been there since April. They are not particularly embarrassing. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Fundy-Royal has one which asks what the regulations are concerning spouses accompanying officers to functions in an officers' mess. This question was asked early in May, and it is still outstanding.

I do not think any question that goes on the order paper with a star should take more than a week or ten days to answer. Certainly, with today's communications, there is no excuse for delay. Any question with a star, which has a privileged position and asks that the parliamentary secretary or the minister concerned should read the answer aloud, should be, by courtesy, answered within a working week. If it appears on Monday, it should be read aloud by the following Monday.

I would hope the Chair would assist the House in seeing that the regulation is enforced, not by order, but there is not inconsiderable moral suasion available to the Chair—a matter about which I know something.

[Mr. Rynard.]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, questions are starred simply in order to obtain an oral reply. There is no indication in the star itself that the matter ought to be answered with any greater urgency than any other question on the order paper. Your Honour has always held, as have your predecessors, that questions ought to be placed on the order paper if they are not of such an urgent nature as to be asked during the oral question period at the beginning of each day's sitting.

If my hon. friends have some precedents that they want to communicate to me, I would be glad to hear them. I listened with interest to the intervention of the hon. member for Edmonton West. I am not aware of any precedent of Your Honour or your predecessors to the effect that starred questions ought to be answered with more celerity than questions on the order paper that are not starred. I am ready, as my hon. friend has indicated, to be instructed by members with more experience, and I would welcome any assistance he can offer. Of course, I did not hear that assistance in his intervention before Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: The matter raised by the hon. member for Simcoe North has been raised before, as he indicated, and he had the conversations alluded to in his remarks today with the hon. President of the Privy Council concerning this matter. I think it is clear that in the past there has certainly been that impression among some hon. members, even if it was never enshrined, and it certainly has never been enshrined in the customs of the House, which are equally as important as our Standing Orders. If that has not been the custom or practice of the House, it certainly has been the impression in the minds of a good many members that it was so.

A cursory examination of the precedents verifies there is no regulatory force behind the notion that there should be a time limit with respect to answering starred questions. However, since we have the oral question period in which we attempt to accommodate questions which are sufficiently urgent to warrant exposure during that time, since ordinary questions on the order paper can be answered within a greater period of time, and since we have starred questions which demand an oral answer, there is support for the idea that the urgency of the starred question which must be answered orally lies between that of oral questions and questions on the order paper. But there is no indication in the precedents or practices of this House that that has ever been formalized.

● (1520)

It is hoped that some understanding can be reached with respect to starred questions. It might be urged that the procedure committee should examine this question in the course of its re-examination of the procedures of the House. Members who have participated in such discussions on previous occasions are distinguished members of that committee. It would be helpful if the committee could examine this matter specifically to see whether some recommendation could be made to allow a clearer understanding to be reached about the degree of urgency which might be attached to starred questions.

I have asked a study to be undertaken in my office to determine with greater clarity the exact experience of the House in the recent past. When the study is complete,

perhaps I can supply copies of it to members of the procedure committee and others who are interested, to see whether it might form the basis of suggestions to be made by that committee.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think what has been said effectively closes the matter. I suggest to the President of the Privy Council that it would be helpful if he would consider the position of the government with respect to starred questions before the committee deals with the matter. Perhaps on an experimental basis we could institute a temporary, voluntary system with respect to how starred questions are to be dealt with in future.

I was rising on another point of order to do with a practice which has developed concerning the recognition by members of this House, other than yourself, of distinguished visitors to Canada who may be in one of the galleries of the House. I am not suggesting that distinguished visitors to our country who are in our galleries ought not to be recognized, but I say to you, sir, that we do those visitors a great disservice and discourtesy if, as was the case with the group from the European parliament today, they are recognized by someone other than yourself during a controversial portion of the question period. Perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs thought it would be appropriate to recognize our distinguished visitors during the question period.

To the extent that this occurred during the parliamentary struggle known as the question period when some matters hit close to the bone, I am prepared to accept it, but I suggest it was bad manners. It is bad manners for parliament and improper on the part of all of us to allow this situation to continue. Sir, if official visitors to this House are to be recognized, you, and only you, as the first commoner of this House, ought to call the attention of members and to the public generally, through the press, to the presence in the gallery of distinguished visitors to our country.

I think it is extremely important that recognition on such occasions should not be regarded as legitimate government recognition, or legitimate opposition recognition, but as parliamentary recognition. If the visitors are so distinguished that they ought to be recognized, then you, and only you, sir, ought to do the recognizing. That course, I suggest, would be more conducive to order and decorum in this House and to the proper operation of the question period. I repeat, if the visitors are so distinguished, if the delegation is so prestigious as to warrant recognition by this House, you, sir, as the first commoner, ought to recognize our visitors on behalf of all members of the House of Commons. I ask Your Honour to take that matter into consideration.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into the discussion as to who should be the appropriate member of this House to recognize distinguished visitors. I ought to point out that my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, introduced our distinguished visitors from the European economic mission and council today as he did, because for some reason the minister and Sir Christopher Soames were placed in the diplomatic gallery and he was unable to recognize them from that place. Only after they went to the gallery facing him was he able to introduce them. I know it is not like him to want to introduce distinguished visitors on a note of controversy, but he did it in what seemed to him the only time available.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Thank you. The minister has reinforced my point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There are several dimensions to the problem raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. In fairness, I ought to say that I have attempted to follow a rigid guideline with respect to people recognized by the Chair. There have been requests on what seem to become more frequent occasions for recognition by counterparts of ministers. Some visitors have counterparts in our cabinet and for that reason there seems to be a temptation for their counterparts in the Canadian ministry to recognize them.

This raises two problems alluded to by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton: first, that some visitors are recognized by members of the House other than the Chair; second, that a minister's recognition of someone in the gallery could be interpreted as recognition conferred by the government, as opposed to recognition conferred by parliament.

I would appreciate the collaboration of House leaders in order to clarify this matter. I would be prepared to take it upon myself to do whatever recognizing is to be done, if it is understood, within flexible limits, how that matter should be handled. Perhaps that could well be left for future discussion. The point was most interesting and well taken.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I listened with great interest to the exchange which just took place, and I felt the explanation you gave the House was most worthy. What concerns me is that your call just now for the cooperation of House leaders apparently went unnoticed by the government House leader, who was busily occupied discussing another matter with another member during the entire time Your Honour was speaking. I suggest that the government House leader should read today's *Hansard* tomorrow.

An hon. Member: Sick!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Orders of the day.

● (1530)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported

(with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, just before the lunch recess, I was presenting arguments explaining why I support the motion of my colleague the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

Before, if I may do so, I would like to thank the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras) for supporting the motion which I presented at the opening of this sitting and I would also like to thank all hon. members of the House who supported it unanimously, in order to clarify once for all the days of sitting of Parliament when it comes to St. John the Baptist Day or Dominion Day. I thank you all very much.

Mr. Speaker, as amendment No. 10 deals with clause 3 of Bill C-84 and as it concerns piracy, I have been a little bit surprised when I heard the Solicitor General who, apparently, wants to have us understand that, in the spirit of the bill, the word "piracy" applies especially to air piracy. However, it is not referred to at all as the bill simply says "piracy". As my colleague from Lotbinière explained very clearly yesterday when he took part in the debate, there are other acts of piracy just as criminal as air piracy and which, to my mind, should have the same consequences for those who commit them.

When we read the history of our country or the history of the world, we remember those novels about piracy on the seas, when people would join the crew of a ship to seize it, to sail it away from its destination and to take hold of its cargo to make a fortune. Nowadays, there is a new form of piracy. During these last few years, we have experienced many aircraft hijackings which claimed many victims. All nations in the world concerned about the protection of air passengers were shocked by hostage takings and sometimes by killings of innocent victims. Mr. Speaker, I remember and I think all hon. members also remember this kind of piracy which was the subject of international conference discussions on air piracy to find ways to stem this epidemic of crimes.

Everyone will recall that parliamentarians of various countries advocated very severe penalties for criminals who hijacked planes away from their destination and kept a number of passengers as hostages to gain personal benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of hijacking is still going on. Although we in Canada never had the misfortune of being in such a situation, it does not mean that in the coming months or years such a situation will not occur. Therefore, if we really want to cooperate with the other countries of the world to prevent this kind of hijacking, severe penalties must be provided to prevent criminals from hijacking airplanes and committing such reprehensible acts as we witnessed in the past, either through newspapers, television or radio, where many victims were held during hours and even days under the threat of armed criminals who thought they could really come out of it with a sentence of only a few years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to retain in the statutes this section 75(a) of the Criminal Code, in order that criminals contemplating such acts be prevented or at least deterred from going ahead for fear of the death penalty.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call upon all hon. members to express themselves freely on this amendment. We hear about a free vote. I happen to believe in free votes, Mr. Speaker, because ever since I came to this House I have been voting freely, and I would like all hon. members to do so. However, I am a little surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the fact that the ministers are not free as well to vote as they choose. Yet, if I understand well the constitution of Canada and our parliamentary procedures, I believe—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired. He cannot carry on without unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I thank you and all my colleagues as well. I will just complete my thought on this matter. Before being a minister, a member of this House is above all a member of parliament, and it is as such that we are called upon to vote for or against a bill.

That is why I am surprised that cabinet members seem to be obliged to vote specifically for the bill and in proof of this, I shall quote from an article in *La Presse* dated February 12, 1976. And if the thinking reported here is not that of the Solicitor General, I would like him to clarify the matter so that the public will not be under the impression that a free vote in the House implies some hypocrisy but something quite concrete. This was reported in *La Presse:*

> According to the principle of cabinet solidarity, cabinet members are bound to support the government bill designed to do away with capital punishment at the time of the free vote on the matter.
>
> In answer to questions put to him outside the House, the Solicitor General of Canada, Mr. Allmand, explained that because the bill he will table in the House on February 24 is a government bill, the ministers will not be free to vote for or against its passage.
>
> If they are against, Mr. Allmand went on to say, they will have to leave the cabinet . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am quite willing to cooperate with the hon. member who has requested the unanimous consent of the House to conclude his speech, but I must point out to him that we are now on motions Nos. 10 and 11 which deal specifically with clause 3 of the bill before us and concern piracy more particularly. I realize that the hon. member deal with the subject in general terms and that his remarks might apply to the amendment as well as to the bill itself. I trust that he will at least refer once in a while to the amendment before the House so as not to misuse the time unanimously allotted to him by other members.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, your very kind remarks on a point of order lead me to think this: I have a feeling I was not going far enough in trying to explain my thoughts. I believe I am respecting the spirit of the Standing Orders of the House because clause 3 of the bill is precisely designed to amend a section of the Criminal Code which stipulates in fact that whoever is guilty of piracy must be condemned to death. As we are discussing the

death penalty and as in addition we have been told we would vote freely, I am wondering why hon. members of the House are not allowed the privilege of expressing themselves freely. To my mind, whether one is Solicitor General, Prime Minister or minister, one is first of all an hon. member. I would like this point to be explained to me because, if we do not proceed in that fashion, the rules of the game are changed, and the tenth amendment to Bill C-84, as moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), specifically concerns the death penalty. Since the vote is to be free on the death penalty, I would like that vote to be free for all hon. members. Otherwise, I shall never believe again in "a free vote in the House of Commons".

● (1540)

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my intervention at this time will not be as lengthy as some in the past. I find in clause 3 an amending section dealing with the subject of piracy and a distinction is drawn in section 75(2) of the Criminal Code. Not only does that section speak of committing an act of piracy within or without Canada, but it goes further and provides that if an individual or individuals, while committing piracy or attempting to commit piracy, murders or attempts to murder or does any act likely to endanger the life of another person, then the wrongdoer shall be sentenced to death. In the present bill provision is only made for a person who commits piracy while in or without Canada; there is nothing about attempted piracy.

I suppose the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) might answer, "Oh well, we would lay a charge, in the ordinary course of events, either of murder or attempted murder". But what are we to do in this day and age about the modern version of an act of piracy of the kind we saw last week and two announced even this morning? I suppose Canadians will say that these things happen in other lands. One might almost expect those high moralists who talk of the abolition of capital punishment to say that such acts are committed in barbaric or less civilized lands. I say nonsense, Mr. Speaker. It is just as conceivable to have an aircraft hijacked in Greece, Israel, France or Germany. The United States had a rash of hijackings and we have had a couple, and I think we may yet see further attempts at hijacking or actual hijacking of aircraft into or out of Canada take place.

When hijackings occur, people do get murdered. These people are not only security agents but passengers. I would want a much more valid explanation than the one I have been able to cull from these amendments in Bill C-84 or from the testimony of the Solicitor General's officials before the justice and legal affairs committee. Simply to say that piracy will merit a life sentence does not satisfy me. Clause 5 of the bill repeals section 218 of the Criminal Code and substitutes the following:

(2) For the purposes of Part XX, the sentence of imprisonment for life prescribed by this section is a minimum punishment.

I gather from the popular impression that this minimum punishment is 25 years. It is hard to determine whether there will be an application for parole permitted at the end of 25 years or whether it will be at the end of 18 years; I rather suspect it will be the latter. I think, as I said last night, that in this modern day it is far crueller to consign a man or woman to the Bastille, as they were in the eighteenth century in France, to be put away, forgotten, pigeonholed as just another file that the Solicitor General's department will occasionally examine in a raw of other files.

One has to undergo incarceration or restriction of liberty to know what it is like. I hate to be subjective about this, because somehow I feel that subjectivity may not be the best attitude to take in arriving at a judgment in such matters as these. However, one is conditioned by one's circumstances, and I can assure hon. members that nearly three years of very severe restriction of my freedom during World War II, knowing of those who had to suffer solitary confinement for real or imagined wrongs against the captive power, did much to the morale of prisoners of war.

● (1550)

If there is no hope, and release from prison is 25 years down the road, then, notwithstanding the relative comforts of the modern-day prison compared to the Bastille, this is an invitation by society to the individual to remove or do away with himself. Certainly, there will be no hope of rehabilitation because that person will in the normal course of events reach middle or old age, if he should survive the sentence of 25 years at all. As I say, why not park them all in a mausoleum right away because they will become as the living dead.

There are a few people who are sentenced now to terms of 25 years hard labour, although very rarely, who have the propect, if they behave, of being up for parole at the end of one-third of their sentence. A man of 25 years of age sentenced to 25 years may expect, if he meets the other conditions—and they are stringent—to get out on parole in eight or nine years. What a difference between eight or nine years and what is proposed! This provides a goal to work toward, which is not inherent in 25-year or perhaps an 18-year sentence. These people will become, if this should be Canada's law, the living dead. I do not know whether society is any further ahead when it says to a man or woman in the courts that he or she is sentenced to a living death, or is sentenced to suffer death by hanging. One is quicker and very sure, whereas the other takes much longer but is equally sure.

For these reasons, I do not see what improvement there is in the amendment contained in Bill C-84. My colleague, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), has moved that clause 3 be deleted and, in effect, that section 75(2) of the Criminal Code be maintained. I am in full support of his amendment and I commend it to the House.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few moments in support of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). We are dealing with a situation much more serious than perhaps the minister and his colleagues realize. After listening to the exchange that took place this morning between the minister and the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), it would seem there is an element of doubt as to whether this legislation deals with hijackers or if they are adequately dealt with in sections 76

(1), (2) and (3) of the Criminal Code. I am sure you are very much aware, Mr. Speaker, as I am, that in a great many cases guilty people are not subjected to the laws of the land because of technicalities. I can certainly envisage circumstances in which a smart lawyer could get a guilty person off on a technicality such as would exist in the criminal law if this legislation were passed.

The minister stated today that he did not have written advice that hijacking was included in piracy but that this was advice he had received through a phone call. It seems to me we should not be dealing with legislation by conversation and we should not be acting on conversation. This is far too important a matter for us to be dealing with it just by guesswork. The minister is not playing fair with the Canadian people by subjecting them to this type of legislation. It seems that we will end up with nothing short of a bird's nest and the only people who will get any comfort from that nest will be the criminals. Canada will become a haven for criminal activity. The day has long passed when we could say it cannot happen here, because it can. We are only separated by a few hours, by aircraft, from the most distant parts of the world.

The minister says that piracy does not relate to hijacking. He is differentiating between water and air travel. I suggest it is very difficult to differentiate between them. It would behoove the minister to clarify the Criminal Code in this area so everyone will know what can be expected. All the members of this House and, I am sure, the Canadian public are concerned about this matter. That is why there has been a great deal of interest shown in the legislation. The minister would do a great service to Canadians by holding back third reading of this bill.

An hon. Member: So the public can react.

Mr. Towers: Yes, in order that the public can react. Perhaps it could be dealt with during a certain period of time in the fall. I am sure my colleagues would agree to a three, four or five-day debate in the fall, allowing the Canadian people the summer in which to have some input into this important matter.

If hijacking is related to piracy, this means that every time a person gets on an aircraft he is up for ransom. Let me bring to the attention of the House a point made last night by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan). I read from page 15043 of *Hansard* for July 5:

> I would ask you why those guerrillas hijacked the plane and held those innocent people captive? It was for the purpose of freeing other people who had committed political crimes, crimes of terrorism and crimes of air piracy, yet because they had not paid the penalty for these heinous crimes they were still alive in jail providing sufficient motivation to these people to commit this terrible act. They played with those people's lives so they could spring from prison their associates and accomplices in international crime.

● (1600)

Mr. Speaker, this should not go unnoticed. As I mentioned a moment ago, whenever Canadians board a plane their lives are at stake if someone should decide to hijack the plane and take hostages. We cannot any longer say this cannot happen in Canada. If this bill should pass, persons who are prepared to perpetrate this kind of crime will be protected in this land; there will be an inducement for them to come here. We must think about that before we decide to pass this legislation.

Another point I wish to make is that it is very difficult to differentiate between piracy by sea, hijacking, piracy by air, or activities during war. I am sure there are few Canadians who would not agree that as a nation we have the right to protect our freedoms and our way of life in time of war. It is difficult for me to understand why people who agree that they should have the right to go to war to protect their rights and privileges would not have in place a form of capital punishment for acts that are closely associated thereto.

These are points which I think the minister would be well advised to take into consideration and give further thought to so that Canada will be able to have the best law possible for the protection of its people, a law that will meet with approval by the majority of Canadians. This is a fundamental principle and one we cannot pass over lightly. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to present my thoughts on this matter at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to comment on an issue about which I had several opportunities to rise in the House since 1962. I am also pleased to speak to the amendment moved by my colleague from Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) concerning the amendments brought to the bill. We hope that the minister will finally understand the merits of our allegations and our remarks which are not based on feelings but on the views of those who have already studied the matter on several occasions during the past years and especially when piracy acts were committed in Canada and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I have here the magazine *Science criminelle et droit pénal comparé*, volume No. 28 of 1973 where the various countries of world are asked to legislate more clearly and adequately on air piracy. On page 306, it is recorded that:

> The world strike of air line pilots was launched on June 19, 1972 by the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations (IFALPA) to protest against inadequate measures taken to prevent and curb offences against aviation. IFALPA President Olof Fosberg met United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim on June 15, 1972 to ask him to submit to the Security Council for approval adequate measures to prevent air piracy.
>
> The struggle for safety in the air is one of the crucial problems of modern penal law, its efficiency, its social function in today's world.

Experts in the field of aviation seek protection for the millions of dollars invested in aircraft by various people, for the human lives which they are responsible for as well as for pilots.

Today the minister wants to give wider scope to the statutes by saying that pirates may be penalized, not must be penalized.

By changing just a few words, we are opening the door wide to pirates, the gangsters of our country and those of other lands who can come here on various occasions and do what they will in Canada, as they already have in many countries of the world in the last 25 years. Later on, I shall give figures which constitute the balance-sheet of international piracy in the last 25 years.

The president of the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations had this to say about the matter:

First of all, plane hijacking has now become an international problem because the course of flights is being altered beyond state boundaries. International flights are often involved and frequently domestic flights are forced to fly out of their countries thus changing abruptly their original itineraries. That is why hijacking has become an international problem

—and national.

Now, this is what we hear when the notion of piracy is being defined: What is piracy? According to the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations, piracy is this:

1. The behaviour of individuals who disturb air traffic is currently known as "air piracy". The comparison with sea piracy at sea is easy to make. For centuries, pirates disrupted the peaceful navigation on the high seas, whose routes knew neither masters nor obstacles. The seas were and remain free of any state jurisdiction and ships flying the flags of all nations meet there freely. All civilized nations respected those free stateless waterways. Pirates who disrupted peaceful traffic on the high seas were considered as *hostes generis humani*. Arrested, they were immediately executed (hung from the yards) by those who had caught them. The state which got hold of them did justice. It is even asserted that the international penal code began with the struggle against piracy.

● (1610)

Section 15 of the Geneva Convention states:

The acts hereinafter enumerated constitute piracy:

(1) any illegitimate act of violence, detention, or any depredation committed for personal purposes by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or private aircraft and directed: (a) on the high seas, against another ship or aircraft, or against persons or goods aboard, (b) against a ship or aircraft, persons or goods in a place not under the jurisdiction of any state.

Mr. Speaker, I could still go on for a long time quoting international texts on conferences in the field of international piracy.

It is strange to see that in Canada we seem to be very compassionate towards those who commit criminal actions, as evidenced in one of the trials described in the book entitled *Air Pirates* by Mr. James A. Arey which can be found in the Parliament library, and where we are told about the deeds of one of the most wanted criminals in Italy, by the name of Raffaele, who

committed the longest and most terrifying aircraft hijacking ever known, kidnapped a policeman; when he was arrested, he declared with innocence: Why do you arrest me, my friend?

In November 1970, he was tried in Rome under eight charges for kidnapping twice—first the crew of the aircraft then the Italian policeman; for having used coercion twice, by threatening with a gun first the crew, then the policeman; the three other charges dealt with the import, the keeping and the illegal possession of military weapons.

Minichiello was sentenced to seven years and six months imprisonment and to a $580 fine. While the most responsible editorialists in the United States wrote: "Hijackers are not heros!", in Italy, the public prosecutor . . . described Minichiello as a "good boy" . . .

—a little like we apparently wish to define them in Canada as a result of this bill—

. . . a "good boy, a timid boy" who just wanted to go back to his native land to see his father again and find peace there.

The counsel for the defence said, and I quote: "You have in front of you a rustic Don Quixote, without any education, deprived of Sancho Panza and of Dulcinea who, instead of mounting Rossinante flew in the skies to follow his dream and to achieve his purpose." Upsetting, isn't it? How is it possible not to be moved, particularly if we hear that, in addition, Minichiello is a pathetic and romantic young man who simply wants "to escape the injustices of vast America."

—And we were among those, among "the injustices of vast America".

"He is a romantic person: his anguish, his hopes, his nostalgia launched him in that incredible adventure, like an ancient crusader".

This is more or less the description Italians were making of the greatest hijacker Italy ever knew. And that is why in Canada we seem to be about to open our doors and soften our legislation to encourage these honourable individuals.

Minichiello . . . was . . . really crazy about the sky, endlessly cleaning his weapon while the old aircraft was crossing the ocean with its load of nice hostages . . . who, on several occasions, almost came to their death at the hand of a sympathetic gangster.

On November 10, 1969, young David L. Booth, aged 14, threatened with a butcher's knife a young lady he had taken hostage. He wanted to hijack a Delta Air Lines DC-9 from Cincinnati to Sweden or any other destination. David was finally persuaded to give up his plan and was held under guard until the plane had left the ground. This may have nothing to do with Minichiello's brilliant achievement but the child's mother, Mrs. Anne Booth, suggested herself that her son may have been influenced by a young marine's spectacular flight to Rome on the previous week. "He eagerly followed all news pertaining to the hijack in the newspapers and on television", she said.

When hijacking is reported in the media hijackers are depicted as heroes, and thus air piracy is encouraged over morality, much against our children's interests. During the few minutes which are left, Mr. Speaker, using reports on hijacking in various countries which were published in this book following interesting research in this matter, I would like to list the hijackings which occurred from 1930 to 1974.

If we read this chronological list, we see that in at least 80 per cent of the cases hijacking was carried out by revolutionaries of the entire world who, for the sake of piracy, try to alleviate our laws in order to do what they want with our planes.

It would be too long to give the whole list. I quote:

This list was made from data provided by the US Department of Transport; the US Federal Administration of Aeronautics; the American Air Transport Association; the International Air Transport Association; the International Civil Aviation Organization; and also from thousands of newspaper articles and the author's personal archives.

I only want to indicate that on November 1, 1958, five Cuban revolutionaries boarded Viscount and headed for Miami-Varadero and then crashed on the ground, causing the death of 17 passengers. There were only three survivors.

On July 5, 1960, two Cuban revolutionaries boarded the Madrid-Havana air line and landed at Miami. On July 18, 1960, a Cuban revolutionary on board Viscount going from Havana to Miami landed in Jamaica. On July 28, 1960, three Cuban revolutionaries on a domestic Cuban flight landed at Miami. On October 29, 1960, 9 Cuban revolutionaries on board a DC-3 Havana-Isle of Pines landed in Key West. It is funny, Mr. Speaker, to see how revolutionaries use air piracy to go to Cuba, their country where they wish so much to go, and a few years later, we see those same revolutionaries, having tried this socialist regime, using the same air piracy—of which we have the records—to get out of those countries and fly toward other skies.

On October 29, 1960, 9 Cuban revolutionaries on board a DC-3 Havana-Isle of Pines—I just mentioned that. On July 3, 1961, 14 Cuban revolutionaries, flying Havana-Veradero, landed in Miami. On July 9, 1961, a group of Havana businessmen took a DC-3: there were three dead and six wounded. On March 27, 1966, three revolutionaries named Angel, Bétancourt and Cueto were on board an IL-18 Santiago-Havana Flight: there were two dead after the pilot used trickery to land in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me a list of approximately 560 air piracies where it is seen that revolutionaries of the world are those who did the greater number of hijacking to date.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we want to relax our laws by saying that a pirate may be liable to death we are automatically encouraging revolutionaries across the world to commit a larger number of criminal acts than has been witnessed in history. As my hon. colleagues, and those tho preceeded me, I would like the passage of this bill to be postponed so we can have the reaction of the public and I would also like to keep the old bill as it was drafted so we can use it for a longer period than what is being proposed at this time to allow Canada to live at least the next six months because with the events that we witnessed all across the world during various Olympic Games, with the tensions that exist between certain states that will be coming to Canada I am concerned that we should want to relax our statutes so as to bring about at home events that we would not like to have particularly in our province and in this country.

I do not understand the eagerness of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) to open the doors, facilitate air or other kinds of piracy, and nearly give medals to those who are unfortunately preparing to commit acts in Canada as were witnessed elsewhere in other parts of the world. I dare hope that the minister will be able to consider not only the advice of those officials but particularly the people and what they want, because they are asking for protection. The public elected members to this House to give protection to non-criminals and punish criminals. I do not understand that the cabinet, and the Solicitor General in particular, should want to have understanding, latitude, to open doors, nearly give medals, and not give any protection to those who live not outside the law but within the law, abiding by the law. We are in this House to make laws and ask the law-abiding population to respect the laws we pass in this House. On the other hand, we now see the policemen of Canada, even prison guards who are really concerned to see the spirit the Solicitor General wants to give to our laws by offering protection to those who have always lived outside the law.

In concluding, I would like very much the Solicitor General to postpone at least for a few months the passage of this bill to allow reflection and allow the people of this country to make their opinions known on a bill which is extremely important to the future of this country and also to maintain good relations with other countries which will be called upon within the next few days to send representatives to this country to participate in the 1976 Olympic Games. We must ensure maximum protection to the citizens of this country and those who have faith in Canada because this country has always had a good reputation across the world and because we had stringent laws, discipline, because we were showing leadership and we were able up until this day to punish the guilty and have those who respect our law respected.

● (1620)

[*English*]

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that there might be some hon. members who at first glance at this amendment to delete clause 3 might think it has some validity because you can talk about piracy in connection with a navy if you have a navy, but if your navy is non-existent, you can no longer talk about that form of piracy. The bill would become redundant in that sense. Considering the condition of our navy, it may be that the bill would be redundant in that regard. Therefore, I cannot understand why this morning the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) argued that the bill would have an effect only in the matter of piracy on the high seas. When we look at the two or three ships which are left in our navy, I do not know why any pirate would want to take any of them. The object of piracy is to get to port, and if a pirate were to seize one of our ships on the high seas the question is whether he would be caught long before he got to port.

At first glance, there might be some hon. members who think there is some validity in the government's bill and that we should eliminate the death penalty for piracy. However, it has always been contended that piracy should be deemed an invasion of the country whose flag a ship is flying, and throughout history an act of piracy has been considered an invasion of the integrity of the country to which the ship in question belonged. In addition to that, there is the vulnerable position of the people on board ship who are not in easy contact with their government and are isolated from the help of their compatriots and their government's constabulary forces. Piracy has been considered throughout history as the ultimate act of vandalism and a fraudulent affront to the integrity of governments.

Whenever we board an Air Canada jet, we walk past our country's coat of arms emblazoned on the fuselage of the aircraft. To me, that is a pretty clear indication that our government is fundamentally involved in the airlines of our country. That is our indication that unlawful intrusion of that aircraft is piracy.

In any act of war, the most heinous by-product is the anguish suffered by innocent bystanders. We can look back at the record of the suffering and anguish, especially on the part of women and children, in the Second World War during the Battle of Britain, the air raids over Germany and the bombing of Hiroshima. It is the suffering by innocent bystanders that is the most heinous aspect of war. How much worse is it when there is nowhere to hide? There have been cases in wartime when mass evacuation has taken place. We remember well that during the Battle of Britain thousands of women and children were taken out of London to the countryside, and many of them were brought to Canada.

However, what do innocent bystanders do if they are in mid-air on an aircraft flying at 35,000 feet? They are locked into the cabin of that aircraft. When a government authorizes or licenses a ship or a plane to carry the general public,

it owes the public the protection it deserves. In its present form, this bill proposes to make pirates or skyjackers nothing more than we would consider prisoners of war to be. They can declare war on this country and all we will do is imprison them; and in its present form imprisonment in this country is fairly comfortable. As the present prison system operates, that would be about as effective as "Stalag 13" where the prisoners go in and out at will. I am not implying that the administrators of our penitentiaries are the counterparts of Colonel Klink, but I am saying that the kind of support being provided by the Solicitor General makes it appear that way.

I must refer again to what the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) alluded to a few minutes ago. One of the reasons there is a rash of skyjacking in the world is that there are other terrorists in prisons and they become the reward for skyjackers. They are always the reason another skyjacking takes place. Just a few minutes ago the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) referred to the perverted sense of morality of skyjackers which involves the matter of identity and simple self-expression. It is suggested that all these people are trying to do is express themselves. There is some truth in that. In their perverted morality, these people have borrowed from the philosophy of Karl Marx, Sartre and Camus and said they are trying to express their authentic selves, and anyone trying to prevent their doing so is committing another act of immorality. They claim they are entitled to express themselves. There is no such thing, in this kind of perverted morality, as an absolute right or wrong; therefore the skyjacking of a plane is no different to these people than helping the poor.

● (1630)

In this country we are faced with the eventuality of having pirates or skyjackers in our prisons. The time will come when one of our planes will be skyjacked and the people in our prisons will be the reason for that skyjacking. Under the system that operates presently in this country, the next skyjackers will be rewarded for their terrorism. These people are ideologically committed to violence and have total disregard for human life. When we encourage skyjacking and air piracy by maintaining a terrorist population in our prison system, we are doing violence to the peace and security of the people of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this amendment that would alter the direction of the bill, in the interests of peace and security, if that is what the government is after. For innocent bystanders and innocent passengers on aircraft we must pass this amendment and take away the reward for skyjacking in Canada. I therefore urge hon. members to rethink and to re-evaluate their position on this bill, and to realize once and for all that we cannot afford to reward people who have this kind of twisted mentality and morality.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) aimed at eliminating clause 3 from this bill. At first I thought I would be speaking about piracy in terms of air piracy. However, that matter was so well covered this morning by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) that I feel he has given the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) cause to reconsider the definition of piracy. I share the view of piracy in this context and particularly the manner in which it is described in the Criminal Code which in section 75.1 reads:

> Every one commits piracy who does any act that, by the law of nations, is piracy.

It is true, as the Solicitor General said, that the last conviction for piracy in this country was in 1867. During the past century there have been many developments in technology and in attitudes toward the law. I am satisfied in my own mind that should an incident of piracy affecting an aircraft take place, a judge could easily interpret this as meaning aircraft.

I have had other thoughts on this particular section, however, and I should like to draw to the attention of the House some anomalous situations which have developed as a result of the government's decision to include clause 3 in Bill C-84. I am convinced that as they were drawing up the bill and overflowing with this notion that they were going to eliminate the death penalty from Canadian law, they put their staff to work to find those sections of the Criminal Code where the death penalty occurred. In section 75.2 there is the possibility of someone being sentenced to death for having committed, or attempted to commit piracy although, as the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) pointed out earlier, any reference to a murder being committed in the course of committing that piracy was left out. No one will ever know why this occurred. In my opinion, it is another instance of extremely bad drafting.

Does piracy refer only to piracy on the high seas? I find it difficult to understand that the theft of a Canadian ship is the only act which can be considered a piratical act, when there are so few Canadian ships—unless we are talking about our neighbour's canoe up at the lake, or his sloop. Is that a Canadian ship? Is it piracy, or is it theft, to take charge of our neighbour's ship during the summertime? I think we have to be careful here.

In the course of eliminating the death penalty there is a most outrageous anomaly that has come to light in my study of the various related legislation on the statute books and that which is being proposed. Paragraph 76 defines piratical acts. I draw special attention to subsection (c), as follows:

> 76. Every one who, while in or out of Canada . . .
>
> (c) does or attempts to do a mutinous act on a Canadian ship . . .
>
> is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for 14 years.

So a mutinous act is one of those acts which under the Criminal Code provides for imprisonment for life. In section 53 of the Criminal Code, inciting mutiny is dealt with. That is another act which, if committed, would make a person liable to imprisonment for 14 years. But mutiny itself is another matter and is referred to in sections 69 and 70 of the National Defence Act. This is where the government is carrying out a great con game. It has presented this bill as measure to eliminate capital punishment in Canada. Either it is deliberately conning the Canadian public, or its staff's work has been faulty. Section 69 of the National Defence Act reads:

> Every person—

This deals with every person, not a military person.

—who joins in a mutiny that is accompanied by violence is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to suffer death or less punishment.

Section 70 reads:

Every person who joins in a mutiny—

It explains that he suffers something unless he is the ringleader of the mutiny, and then he shall suffer death. My purpose is to warn the abolitionists in this House that if they think by voting for this bill, including the retention of this particular amendment, they are going to see the elimination of the death penalty in Canada, they have been had—completely and utterly had. I warn them: the death penalty remains on the statute books of this country. If they go away believing that by voting for this bill they will see the end of it, they delude themselves. The government either acquiesces in perpetrating this delusion or has been extremely inept in allowing it to happen. That is all I want to say. I shall leave it to the judgment of parliament.

● (1640)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—National Gallery—Acquisition of room painted with murals at Karsdale, Nova Scotia—Request that it remain in Nova Scotia; the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard)—Immigration—Medical checks on visitors from the tropics; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Veterans Affairs—Possibility of increase in allowable earnings of recipients of war veterans' allowance.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code regarding piracy. I will speak particularly about air piracy and kidnapping and murder associated with such acts.

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

Although I have no formal notes to which I may refer, I feel strongly on the subject and think I have some capacity for speaking on it. I refer to a letter sent by the Reverend Sorley, of Stouffville, Ontario. In it he raises six points. His sixth point reads in part as follows:

Let us extend the death penalty.

We should include all those who are guilty of kidnapping, terrorism, hijacking, bombing and treason. If we do, it will have a discouraging effect on any lawbreakers and bring about a reduction in every form of crime. We have, in practice, abolished the death penalty for the last thirteen years and we have an increase in crime such as never has been known in the history of Canada.

What the clergyman said in his letter cannot but make one reflect on the enormous costs which have been inflicted on Canadian taxpayers and those of other nations for implementing methods which help to prevent acts of terrorism in the air. Canadians employed in security duties at airports and near aircraft could be better and more constructively employed elsewhere, at considerably less expense to the travelling public. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), in his wisdom, has developed the "user pay" concept and applied it to Canadian airports. The "user pay" policy applies not only to those operating light aircraft; it applies as well to commercial airlines, the travelling public and the long-suffering Canadian taxpayer.

I wonder what life in Canada or in any western country would be like without the embarrassment and harassment of airport security. I am thinking of what happens when an impatient air traveller is confronted by an equally impatient security officer. But it seems that most Canadians accept this new way of life, this new way of travelling, this new type of harassment, this further infringement upon civil liberties, as necessary. They look on security measures as measures to protect life and limb.

Perhaps members of parliament are more equipped than others to comment on the air piracy aspects of the bill. Many of us return frequently to our ridings at the Canadian taxpayers' expense. It takes me five or six hours of flying time to return to my western Canadian constituency. During my travels I have the opportunity to visit and observe Canadians of all walks of life. In the aircraft I see mothers with babies, aged parents and grandparents travelling to weddings, perhaps to funerals, or on holiday and I think about what can happen in the air if an act of terrorism takes place. I shudder at the consequences of air piracy.

Consider what happened recently in Uganda. All the free world lauded and applauded the actions of the Israelis in rescuring the victims of terrorism. What a frightening experience that must have been. Surely it has burned itself into the minds of all those hostages. They were held, I might add, with the apparently tacit approval of Uganda. I recall reading the reported remarks of one hostage who said, "When we heard the guns firing and the explosions, we thought it was all over for us, that our time had come."

In modern-day flying there are no second chances in the air when acts of piracy occur. Because of the ignorance, the madness of those who are involved in such acts, it takes only one mishap, one wrong move to send an aircraft plummeting to the ground. I recall an aircraft which was blown up some years ago over northern British Columbia. The identity of the perpetrator of the act was suspected; he could not be name for lack of proof. Mr. Speaker, there was

an explosion in the air; the people in the tail section were blown out of the aircraft. Actually, the entire tail section separated from the fuselage, and in a dramatic effort to save the lives of his passengers, the pilot, with enormous skill given to him by God, flew the aircraft in a flat spin right down to the ground. When the wreckage was examined, it was found that the seats had dented the floor of the aircraft only by a quarter of an inch. That shows the lightness of the impact. The pilot brought the aircraft down without the tail, without any rudders to control it, using the throttles to operate the engines on the port and starboard side. He was able to bring the aircraft relatively safely to the ground. Unfortunately, on impact the gasoline tanks exploded and all on board were incinerated.

This sort of thing has happened in Canada and is going on in the world. We hear these things almost daily. It is the new trend. Terrorists kidnap and hijack for political or financial reasons. Without doubt, such acts are premeditated. No one boards an aircraft with the idea of flying from Ottawa to Vancouver and, on arrival at Calgary, thinks it might be a good idea to hijack the aircraft. These people know what they are doing. I say that those who are prepared to inflict their criminality, their murderous intent upon Canadians deserve only one penalty, that is, the supreme penalty. This is why I support the amendment.

● (1650)

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some comments on this motion, one which would in effect delete clause 3 from the bill and retain the death penalty as a deterrent to acts of piracy. In today's world we do not often hear about piracy on the high seas. We hear a lot about piracy of trucks and aircraft. Piracy on the high seas has pretty well come to an end, at least on a large scale; but piracy of aircraft is something else again.

I had an experience several years ago when I was travelling on business from Madrid to London. It was a BEA flight. We were on board, and shortly before the aircraft was ready to leave the terminal, airport officials boarded high government officials from Spanish Morocco. I was sitting in the first-class section and I was shuffled out into the economy section. Incidentally, I never did get back the difference in fare, but that is beside the point. The aircraft began to taxi out to the main runway for take-off. But just before we got to the main strip, the aircraft was halted, the engines were shut down and all the passengers were taken off. The aircraft was surrounded by security people.

Airport officials brought up a vehicle, which we found out later to be a bomb disposal vehicle. All luggage was unloaded and all passengers were required to identify their luggage from behind a steel plate, after which their luggage was examined and placed in another location. When this process had been completed there were three pieces of luggage left, and we found later that those three pieces of luggage contained explosives. It was evidently the intention of somebody to blow up the aircraft. We could only surmise that it was due to the presence of the Spanish Moroccan government officials who were on board. It certainly was not because I was on board, because I was only a lowly Canadian businessman travelling abroad, trying to sell something and make a few dollars.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it was a frightening experience. We did not realize what was happening until it was all over. The aircraft was taken back to the terminal and checked again, after which those of us who wished to go on to London were allowed to board. I had some urgent appointments and consequently decided to proceed. Halfway into the flight all of us were suffering from a case of jitters, wondering whether they had really got all the explosives out. This illustrates the type of risk which travellers increasingly face today and which prompt one to ask whether we ought not to retain the supreme penalty for such crimes.

In the United States, acts of piracy on board aircraft with the object of securing money seem to have diminished sharply in number. It is true that some small aircraft are hijacked, but commercial aircraft have not been endangered recently in this way. In the last few years, though, we have seen a new threat: aircraft are being hijacked not for money but for political reasons. One group of individuals differs from another on political or religious grounds and is prepared to seize an aircraft and threaten people on board, most of whom they do not know, placing their lives in jeopardy in addition to the lives of the crew, not to mention an extremely expensive piece of machinery.

I notice that our airport surveillance arrangements are manned more extensively. At the Toronto international airport there are as many as five people who take passengers through the security gates. I do not know how much this costs Canada, but I estimate it amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars a year, all paid for by the travelling public. The cost worldwide must be in the billions of dollars and all we seem to be doing is putting our trust in an electronic device.

Only a few cases involving air piracy have been tried in Canada. There was one here in Ontario, I believe, and two in British Columbia. The person who tried to hijack an Air Canada plane in Ontario was given a relatively short prison sentence, one of those tried on the west coast was given a suspended sentence, and the other was fined $100. I do not believe we can continue to accept the taking of hostages, placing in jeopardy the lives of innocent people, without specifying that this is a crime which warrants the most serious penalty which can be prescribed. I certainly do not believe that 25 years in prison, with provision for review of sentence after 15 years, is adequate.

For these reasons I shall support the motion when it comes to a vote, which I understand will be on Thursday at 9.30 p.m. or thereabouts, in the hope that the House will make it clear that piracy on aircraft in flight is a most serious matter and we must take the most severe action we can to deter it. I recall some years ago checking with Lloyds of London respecting losses in connection with aircraft they had insured throughout the world. This loss came to hundreds of millions of dollars. Insurance rates for aircraft have increased, adding to the operating cost of airlines. Of course this cost is ultimately passed on to the user of that mode of transportation.

● (1700)

I ask members to contemplate this motion very carefully, not just carelessly to wave it aside, saying that it is proposing the retention of capital punishment in some

form for certain crimes and they cannot support it. It would be a good thing if those members who oppose the motion were able to talk to some of the hostages in the recent incident in Uganda, to listen to their experiences and discover their feelings. I suggest they would realize that we should not lightly pass this matter off but should retain the most severe penalty that we have for the act of piracy of an aircraft.

That is about the extent of the remarks I wish to make. I will be speaking to other amendments that come forward but I thought it worth while to put on record the personal experience I had on an aircraft that was going to be blown up in the air. It was an experience I should not like to have again and which I would not wish on anybody else. I urge hon. members when considering this motion to think it out carefully and to support the deletion of clause 3 from Bill C-84.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I too should like to go on record as urging all hon. members to consider favourably the motion now before the House to delete clause 3 of the bill. Clause 3 clearly states that everyone who commits piracy is liable to imprisonment for life. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) made a very good speech on this subject before lunch, and I was slightly amazed during the question period to hear the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) say that the legal opinion that he had received was over the telephone. Not being a lawyer but as one who has been around here for a while, I thought legal opinions were written documents that clearly spelt out in every detail the arguments for or against a given position. Yet the minister suggests that piracy applies only to ships, I assume because somebody in the justice department advised him over the telephone that that was his interpretation of section 75(1) of the Criminal Code.

Section 75(1) clearly states that everyone commits piracy who does any act that by the law of nations constitutes piracy. The Geneva conference stated that air piracy exists and is considered as such. What we are dealing with in this bill is piracy, whether it be of ships or aircraft. Piracy is the taking of a vehicle, vessel or aircraft, and endangering the lives of the people thereon.

I think there is hardly anyone in Canada, except for the scattered few in the cabinet who are obeying the dictates of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who does not believe that we should retain the death penalty for hijackers. This is what the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) is seeking. A hijacking took place some years ago in Calgary by a person who is now serving a jail sentence. He has clearly stated that had he known that the death penalty would be invoked if someone had come to harm, he believes it would have deterred him from hijacking an aircraft, having it flown to Montana and back again to Canada. However, in that case no one lost their life and all were very fortunate.

The very essence of hijacking is that it endangers lives. Section 75(2) of the Criminal Code provides that anyone who commits or attempts to commit piracy, and who murders or attempts to murder in the course thereof, shall be sentenced to death. That is the section that Bill C-84 seeks to delete from the Criminal Code and in its place substitute life imprisonment for the death penalty.

Someone pointed out earlier today that imprisonment for life does not mean that. A person can get out of jail on guarded leave, which only means that he has to report in every so many hours while out on a week end pass. That really is not good enough. A hijacking could take place even in that short space of time. I urge all hon. members to take their obligations as members of parliament and representatives of their constituencies very seriously. This is not a complicated matter but one that is simple and straightforward. The question is: should one who causes bodily injury to another while committing an act of piracy face the supreme sentence of death?

I believe we have to make a concerted effort to cut down aircraft hijackings. The recent incident in Uganda which resulted in the freeing of 100 passengers by an amazingly successful raid by Israel will have a tendency to deter any further attempts at hijacking aircraft or any attempts at blackmailing Israel to release prisoners serving jail sentences in that country. From now on these terrorists will know that their own lives will be threatened, not that of any hostages they may take.

If this country now attempts to create a situation where we have the least severe penalty of most western nations for hijackings, then the very opposite will be true. Rather than flying aircraft to Uganda, hijackers will have them flown to Canada, particularly if their country does not have an extradition agreement with Canada. The worst penalty they can get in Canada will be life imprisonment. Their lives will not be in jeopardy. We are taking what must be considered in the eyes of the world a very backward step in attempting to control the hijacking of aircraft. This is a modern problem that has only come into being in the last five or six years. We should wrestle with it, and we should enforce the law as it now stands. We should not try to amend it as the Solicitor General is attempting to do through this bill.

● (1710)

I wholeheartedly support the two amendments moved by hon. members, the one before me being the amendment by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta. It demands the attention of the House, and now has the attention of the whole country. The entire country is in complete support of the amendment put forward today. Members of parliament on all sides of the House would be doing the country a service in voting for the amendment whenever it comes to a vote, on Thursday night or at some other time.

It would not detract very much from the beliefs of abolitionists to vote in favour of retaining the death sentence for those who are convicted of the crime of hijacking where bodily harm occurs during the commission thereof. Surely that would not be asking too much of those who believe in abolition. This is an horrendous crime which is very difficult to stop. Many innocent people's lives are endangered through no fault of their own. Surely the minister, if he had the good of the country at heart, would accept this motion moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta.

There is one other thing that comes to my mind when dealing with this subject matter. This bill left the House and went to committee where the committee refused to hear any witnesses except the minister. Had we been able

to call witnesses of the CP or Air Canada Airlines to give evidence before the committee, and perhaps officials of some U.S. airlines who have experienced hijacking a number of times, we might have heard evidence from those people who are responsible for the operation of aircraft, and for that matter ships, who firmly believe that the death penalty should be retained in respect of any such act of piracy.

The government in haste, or in an attempt to cover the facts and keep the public ignorant of the true state, rammed this bill through committee in a shameful fashion. The subject matter of this measure has been around Canada for a very long time. The government should have been prepared to have its legislation stand the scrutiny a good committee would have given it, and I know that committee would have given it that scrutiny had it been able to call witnesses and hear evidence. This is one of those things I will never be able to understand.

The minister knows he is moving against the will of the people. One might have thought that by having witnesses appear before the committee the minister in essence might have educated the people into believing that he is actually ahead of rather than behind them. However, in this way I think he is taking a retrograde step. I urge hon. members on all sides of the House to support the amendment which would retain the death penalty for the crime of piracy involving bodily harm.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Before putting the question, it is my understanding that motions Nos. 10 and 11 were to be grouped for the purpose of debate but that the question should only be put on motion No. 10 as this would also dispose of motion No. 11. Is that right?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on motion No. 10 in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to order made Tuesday, June 29, 1976, the recorded division on the proposed motions stands deferred.

The House will now move to the consideration of motions Nos. 12 and 13. It is my understanding they are to be grouped for the purpose of debate, but voted on separately. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lawrence moved:

Motion No. 12.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in Clause 4 by adding immediately after line 27 at page 4 the following new subsection:

"(6) Murder is first degree murder in respect of a person when the death is caused by that person and that person has been previously convicted of either first degree murder or second degree murder."

and by renumbering the present subsection (6) as subsection (7).

Mr. Reynolds moved:

Motion No. 13.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): I shall not take too much of the time of the House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to outline, if I may, the sense of the first amendment. First of all may I say that the new Section 214 deals with that type of homocide which we now have in the Criminal Code as murder. Basically murder, under the amendment submitted by the minister, will be broken down into two new classifications, first degree murder, and second degree murder. Right off the bat, in the reclassification of this type of homocide, anything that is not first degree murder will be classified as second degree murder.

In the new amendments there are a total, if my arithmetic serves me right, of seven broad, general classifications of homicide that can be classified as first degree murder. First, homicide is first degree murder when it is planned and deliberate. Second, homicide is first degree murder when the murder takes place by hiring an assassin, and that cuts through the verbiage of subsection (3). Third, homicide is first degree murder when the victim is a police officer or constable acting in the course of his duties. When a warden, prison guard or some custodial officer of that type is murdered during the course of his duties, that is the fourth broad classification of first degree murder. The fifth classification relates to a killing which takes place during an offence which we call the hijacking of an aircraft. In other words where there is a hijacking of an aircraft and murder or attempted murder takes place, then that is also first degree murder. The sixth classification is where a murder or attempted murder takes place during the offence of kidnapping or forcible confinement. Finally, classification number seven under the amendments submitted by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is where a murder takes place during the commission of a sexual offence such as rape.

● (1720)

Those are the seven classifications of first degree murder under the new reclassification submitted to the House by the Solicitor General, for which I congratulate him. The sense, the meaning, or the object of my amendment is to add an eighth classification for first degree murder. The eighth classification is in respect of any person who commits murder who previously has been convicted of either first or second degree murder.

I must admit that I have been doing a fair amount of pressuring and lobbying during the last few days about this. I feel that if an honest and fair vote takes place on this amendment, which hon. members will note does not deal with capital punishment but deals solely and strictly with a murderer who commits murder a second time, there are enough members who have indicated to me, regardless of how they voted on second reading that they will vote for this amendment. I suggest to hon. members that this is one instance in which we should not get emotional. It has nothing to do with the capital punishment issue.

I must admit that when I originally submitted the amendment my purpose was to make sure that all first degree murderers would be liable to the penalty of capital punishment. However, the Chair ruled that amendment out of order. But we still have this classification number eight for first degree murder. I submit it for the attention of members of the House because I think it certainly is worthy of consideration. The purpose is to make sure that the person who has been convicted of murder and who murders a second time is subject to the full punishment relating to first degree murder.

One might say that this is a pretty petty thing, and ask how often it happens. One might ask how many murderers are there who have been convicted a second time. I agree there are not too many, but there are enough. So far as I have been able to ascertain there are at least six convicted murderers in Canada now, and there is at least one person charged with an offence who has not come to trial, who have been convicted of murder a second time in the period between 1961 and 1974.

One thing I appeal to members of this House to consider, no matter what their philosophy and belief in respect of capital punishment, is the present law of the jungle that exists in our federal institutions. I merely point out that of the six people who have been convicted of murder a second time four have been convicted of murdering a second time in prison. I suggest to members of the House in general that this is something to think about. Under our present law a person in prison who has had a reduced charge of murder, which under the new classification would be second degree murder, does not have too much to worry about if he murders or attempts to murder a guard in the prison, or even a policeman on duty during an escape attempt.

I suggest to hon. members that my amendment could very well prevent the killing of other prisoners or the killing of a prison guard. It has nothing to do with capital punishment. It has everything to do with the deterrent effect in prison on some of those hard-core prisoners who simply are unrehabilitatable at the present time. I suggest that this is a sensible, fair and equitable amendment. At the present time there simply is no deterrent in the new

amendments brought forward by the Solicitor General that would deter anyone from killing a second time. Under this amendment at least there would be a deterrent if the person has previously been convicted of second degree murder, because it means in effect that instead of having a 15-year sentence he will have added to that at least a further 25 year sentence.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have given serious consideration to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence). It is my opinion that we should accept the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: After examining it in detail I think the member makes a good point when he says that more properly this is the type of crime which fits in with first degree murder. I must say I have had other representations supporting his amendment. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) and the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan) have supported this type of amendment.

I have met with the leaders of the Solicitor General's component of the PSAC, that is, the guards' union, and they feel that the penalty for a second murder should be a tougher penalty. They would have preferred capital punishment, but they would support something that goes in that direction.

● (1730)

So far as I am concerned this is a free vote situation and I am ready to recommend that we support this amendment to make second murders, whether they be first or second degree murders, considered as first degree murders and subject to tougher penalties under these provisions. I urge that we accept this amendment. I do not know whether we can accept it right now or not, but if we can I would be willing to do so.

Mr. Reynolds: On a point of order, I just want to make sure that we are only talking about motion No. 12, not motion No. 13.

Mr. Allmand: I was simply talking about motion No. 12 dealing with second murders. Even though motion No. 12 is joined with motion No. 13, I am not proposing we accept motion No. 13, because it would delete clause 4 altogether. I am prepared to accept the amendment but not the deletion.

Mr. Blais: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) intends to debate motion No. 13, because in effect he would be seeking to defeat the amendment which the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) finds acceptable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my understanding that motions Nos. 12 and 13 are grouped for debate but will be voted on separately, and everyone is agreed on that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I was trying to point out is that if motion No. 13

seeks to delete clause 4, by deleting clause 4 in effect we are defeating the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) and thus we are at cross-purposes. We see two members of the same party at cross-purposes.

Mr. Reynolds: This is a free vote in the House, and there are also members on the other side who are at cross-purposes in this debate. The vote on motion No. 12 would come before the vote on motion No. 13. If the Solicitor General wants to approve motion No. 12, that is fine with me, but I would still go ahead with motion No. 13. My point of order was only to ask whether we would dispose of the vote on motion No. 12 right now because we have agreement. If the Solicitor General is willing, we would not put up speakers and we could pass it right now by unanimous consent and proceed to motion No. 13.

Mr. Lawrence: I wonder if I could speak on the same point of order and indicate to the House why I desire a vote to be held in spite of what the Solicitor General says on motion No. 12. We are dealing with a free vote, or what is supposed to be a free vote. I suggest that in any event we have a vote on my motion. Simply because the Solicitor General accepts it does not mean that it would be accepted by all members of the House. We have indicated that the votes would take place at another time and therefore I, and I hope other members, intend to stand when the question is put. May I suggest, Sir, to assist the debate, that you put the question on motion No. 12 now, which would help in cutting down the debating time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On the same point of order may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you put the question now and that you call for the yeas and nays. If there are any nays then a vote would seem to be in order, but if it is unanimous, perhaps the hon. member would not press for an additional vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to the order made on Tuesday, June 29, 1976, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You cannot vote against your own amendment.

Mr. O'Sullivan: The Solicitor General cannot speak for the whole party.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I can and I will.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, although we were supposed to debate these two motions together, to see the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) agree to the amendment of my colleague, and I suggest that we only asked for a recorded vote because it is a free vote in the House and we want to ensure that every member's name is on the record. As the parliamentary secretary said, it may seem that we are at cross-purposes in debating the deletion of clause 4 at this point, but I do not think we are in fact. My colleague's amendment is somewhat of a victory in that if we had not put up a fight in the House over the bill, this amendment would not have been possible. We would have done what the government wanted from the start. We would have rushed the votes through the House and the bill would have gone through not in its best form.

My reason for putting forward this amendment to delete clause 4 is that I feel the whole clause should be deleted. Although my colleague would vote for his motion at the start, he will vote for mine when it comes up to delete the whole clause because we think it would be better than the first motion to which the Solicitor General agreed.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I might change my mind like you did.

Mr. Reynolds: As a retentionist I do not see how he can do otherwise but support the amendment I am proposing because it deletes clause 4. As it stands, section 214 of the Code reads as follows:

(1) murder is punishable by death or is punishable by imprisonment for life.

(2) murder is punishable by death in respect of any person, where such person by his own act caused or assisted in causing the death of

(a) a police officer, police constable, constable, sheriff, deputy sheriff, sheriff's officer or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace, acting in the course of his duties, or

(b) a warden, deputy warden, instructor, keeper, goaler, guard or other officer or permanent employee of a prison, acting in the course of his duties,

or counselled or procured another person to do any act causing or assisting in causing the death.

(3) All murder other than murder punishable by death is punishable by imprisonment for life.

I suggest to any of the retentionists on the other side that clause 4 in the new bill totally eliminates this protection for police officers or prison guards. Although I stress that I am in favour of retention of capital punishment for all people guilty of first degree murder, I agree with the proposal that people guilty of second murders be considered guilty of first degree murder.

We have to deal with this bill part by part because it is a free vote in the House and each member has to vote according to his conscience. There may be some members of the House who do not want capital punishment for all first degree murders, but I know that there are some abolitionists who are prepared to support this amendment because they agree we should have capital punishment for

anybody who kills prison guards or policemen while in the course of their duties. I hope I will receive the support of the abolitionists who do not believe we should have total abolition.

The Solicitor General has had numerous letters and briefs from various groups across the country, from police forces and from penitentiary officials who are concerned that their lives will be in greater danger if this bill is passed. I have had letters from people who ask why we have capital punishment only for murderers of policemen and prison guards. I agree it should be for everybody convicted of first degree murder. This is a law which has not been carried out and, as a result, we have put some policemen and prison guards in great danger.

● (1740)

The government chose to ignore the statistics put out by the Department of the Solicitor General covering the period between 1961 and 1974, which is a period in which we have virtually had abolition, although the government has twice passed bills which called for capital punishment for the murderers of policemen and prison guards. I think anyone involved in crime knows that this has been an abolitionist country for a long time, and that is one of the reasons we have such a serious crime problem today.

Between 1961 and 1974 the statistics show that there were six convicted murderers charged with murder after their first conviction. All six were initially convicted of non capital murder and sentenced to life imprisonment. In four of these cases the offenders were charged with a second murder which was committed in prison. That in itself points out one of the problems we will have if we end up with people spending 25 years in jail. Granted, they would have a chance of getting out after 15 years, but many of them will not because of the types of crimes they will have committed.

I cannot see the gentlemen who killed the policemen in Moncton, the two gentlemen who viciously murdered the RCMP officer in Surrey, British Columbia, the man who killed the policeman in Delta in my riding—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): And in St. Boniface.

Mr. Reynolds: —or, as the whip for the Liberal party says, the man in St. Boniface, getting an opportunity of getting out after 15 years. There are many vicious types of murder, and the amendment put forward by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) was a good one. I supported it, members of my party and members of the Liberal party supported it. That amendment proposed that after 15 years serious offenders should go before a judge and jury, rather than just the Parole Board, to decide when they can get out. I find it hard to believe that a jury would allow these people out of jail. Juries would make sure that most of these people stay there. That means a real problem for the people who have to work in the penitentiaries because these offenders will have to be controlled.

If hon. members have been to a penitentiary like the B.C. penitentiary and talked to people like Bruce and Lucas, or even watched what they do—I do not think one needs to meet them to know what kind of people they are—they will realize the problem we will have in this country if we abolish capital punishment and do not protect our prison guards especially. I think they should be protected even more than policemen because they are stuck inside institutions with people who will have no other recourse but, if they get a chance to escape, to take it, and when they get outside the institutions, they will take hostages, and we will have situations like the one in Calgary. In that case an escapee took his own life, and I do not feel very sorry about that at all. He had a choice to make. He knew he could either kill some people there and probably still not get away with it because he was surrounded, or he could take his own life. He asked for drugs and took his own life so he would not have to go back to jail. That is the type of situation we will have, but not everyone will have the conscience of the fellow in Calgary who took his own life. Some of them may take a few people with them, and if this clause of the bill were deleted we would be much better off.

I do not like to read things in this debate, but there have been a number of briefs sent to the Solicitor General by various police associations across the country. I think some of them were better prepared than others, but I would like to put on the record the brief sent in by the Calgary Police Association because the Calgary police have had some direct experience with some of these people. This brief is a good cross section of all the briefs which were sent in by other police associations. The Calgary Police Association brief starts by saying:

> We appreciate the complexity of dealing with the problem of increased violent crime, and we sincerely empathize with the government's attempts to come to grips with satisfactory solutions. We would, nevertheless, like to raise several questions with the proposed legislative changes as contained in the bill. Our view of the issue "capital punishment", as we are certain it is of the government spokesmen and people in general, is couched with concern for providing community security, while at the same time, doing so without posing serious or unjust punishment on those who behave criminally irresponsible.

Their next heading is "Is the Death Penalty a Deterrent?" The brief goes on:

> The death penalty, say its opponents, is no deterrent.
>
> How can this be?
>
> It is not being used. In Canada, since December 11, 1962, there has been no death sentence carried out, and yet there have been hundreds of innocent lives taken by the hands of violent criminals. Each murder was followed by a fair and open trial and due consideration for the rights of the accused person. If the Salk vaccine were given the same kind of test, there surely would be no cure for the dread scourge of polio today. One thing for certain—the death penalty is a deterrent to the criminal who is executed. He will not murder again and since in excess of 70 percent of serious crimes are committed by repeaters, a second offender may possibly have been deterred.

Then they discuss the public debate on capital punishment as follows:

> Once again the matter of the death penalty is a matter of national concern. There are many different opinions and views being bandied about on this important subject. The question confronting people everywhere is this—Is it ever morally right for the government to take the life of a human being for his flagrant disobedience to the law, ie.—for a crime involving him in a capital offense?
>
> Let it be said at once that the reason that we have so many varied and diverse opinions, such an endless number of opposing views, so many arguments for and against capital punishment, so many pros and cons of debate—the reason, we say is there is little or no leadership being shown over the past twenty years in the punishment and treatment of the violent criminal.
>
> In both Canada and the United States there are several forms of perverted thinking. One of these is in regard to sex and another is in

regard to the punishment and treatment of criminal offenders. There seems to be a mass mania to be lenient and loose in both these directions. Laws and judges and juries take sides with the criminal and continually disregard the criminal's victim.

In preparing this submission, we came upon the most illuminating paragraph from the American Bar Association, an association of lawyers speaking on behalf of all American judges at a meeting some fifty years ago. Here is that echo from former and better days: "When, for the gratification of their appetites, or the promotion of their interests, lawyers, bankers, politicians, social leaders, both men and women, disobey and scoff at all law, they are siding with the cause of anarchy and promoting mob violence, robbery and murder; they are sowing dragon's teeth; and they need not be surprised when they find no judicial or police authority can save our country or humanity from reaping the harvest."

Contrast this quotation from the American Bar Association with the amazing statements made by the former Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, U.S.A., when appearing before Congress in July, 1968—Mr. Clark urged Congress to repeal the death sentence for federal crimes. Mr. Clark assured Congress that crime would go away or greatly reduce when all men learned to love one another. Mr. Clark mentioned "love" several times during his discourse, but could not predict when this happy state would arrive, however, one step toward hastening it would be to abolish capital punishment he suggested.

But to eliminate capital punishment, strict, just, effective and quick punishment for those humans who show they want no part of love and understanding—is to lay helpless, the meek, the kind, the decent and the law abiding, to the brutal twisted acts of the criminal.

Let us for a moment, travel to the promised land, California, U.S.A., and the eve of the defeat of Governor Edmund "Pat" Brown at the hands of Ronald Reagan, December, 1966. Governor Brown carried out his last major act—he commuted the death sentence of 9 men to "life without parole". Their records would fill these pages.

Later, in the same day, he again changed their new status to "life with possibility of parole".

Should this proposed bill pass and become law, the same thing will happen in Canada in 1976 through virtue of Section 25(1) (2) (3) (4). Page 12 and 13 of Bill C-84.

There are presently a number of people who are awaiting the outcome of this discussion to know what their future holds. They were all tried in an open court with all of their rights protected and have been found guilty of murder punishable by death.

What then is their fate? Will cabinet again flaunt the spirit and intent of a law of Parliament, or will they engineer one large "coup" and make all elected members part of their conspiracy?

The Association then asks, "what kind of homicide should be punishable by death?" and goes on:

What then is the kind of homicide that should be punished by death? Someone has put it this way; murder is the direct result of the unlawful plan leading to the death of another innocent person; or when another person dies as the result of another attempting to fulfill his desires, such as stealing, rape and other sex crimes.

Under the heading "Capital Punishment as a Deterrent" the brief continues:

Let no one confuse or use a pile of unreliable statistics or insufficient figures and factors when attempts are made to prove that the punishment of crime has no deterring effect. Chief Justice Taft, former President of the United States, said:

"I think the abolition of capital punishment is a mistake. It is a deterrent for crimes of bloody violence. I have on hand more testimonials from criminals who said—I would not risk the rope".

The next heading is "How Do we View the Proposed Bill?" and the brief states:

(*a*) We are opposed to the abolition of capital punishment.

(*b*) The taking of any innocent life should be punishable by death.

(*c*) We endorse the description of first or second degree murder as outlined in Section 214(1) (2) (3) (4) (5), Pages 3 and 4 of the proposed bill.

(*d*) We endorse the intention of improved staff training and increased safeguards for maximum security institutions.

(*e*) We believe the proposed bill will place prison guards and other prisoners in danger, by allowing the offender to remain alive.

● (1750)

The brief concludes:

In searching for a suitable method of concluding this submission what better authority could be found than the Honourable Ernest C. Manning, former Premier of Alberta and now a member of the Senate:

"In this respect it is evident in society today, a strange and indefensible inconsistency. Many of those who are the most vocal in demanding the abolition of the death penalty because they hold it is morally wrong to put a murderer to death, are frequently the same people who are the champions of abortion on demand. In other words, they argue that it is morally right to destroy the life of an unborn innocent child, but it is morally wrong to exact the death penalty in the case of a murderer who has deliberately taken the life of another human being".

Let's put the blame where it belongs—on the lawbreaker.

Respectfully submitted,
Calgary Police Association

I must still comment about the fact that we did not hear witnesses at committee. This type of brief, which is one of hundreds that members of parliament have received comes from people who should have been before the committee to put their views forward so that the media and the people of the country would be aware of them. Briefs like this never reach the pages of the newspapers to show what the feelings of the people are who are in the front line.

Sometimes I think that the bureaucracy, the people who get involved in making the laws, do not know what is happening in the field. I do not think the Solicitor General has gone out and listened to the people under his control. Certainly the RCMP, people in the penitentiaries, and people in the security field, have a totally opposite view to his on this issue.

I should like to repeat a quotation I used in the debate on second reading. In a book he wrote the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated:

I found it unacceptable that others should claim to know better than I what was good for me.

If he thought that at one time in his life, now that a majority of the country is totally opposed to what he is trying to do, can he expect the country to believe in him? Now he is asking the Canadian people to accept what he thinks is right for the country and I do not think they will.

The tremendous amount of mail which has arrived in the last few days shows that people are disgusted that parliament would pass a bill to which the majority of Canadians are totally opposed. The government can take a stand on an issue where the country is split down the middle, but in a situation like this the government is opposing the views of the majority who want some form of capital punishment.

I am prepared to compromise, Mr. Speaker. In the last two or three votes taken in this House on this issue we brought in compromise law. People knew there was no way an abolition bill would pass the House so they compromised. I wonder why, when there is close to two years left in the life of the present law, the government saw fit to bring in this bill. Why did it not carry out the law it voted for which ensured the protection of prison guards and

policemen? That law has been in effect ever since the Prime Minister has been leader of this country and certainly since the Solicitor General has held that post, yet they have not upheld the law. A number of executions have been stayed for a long time. Instead of trying to rush this bill through the House now why not delay third reading of the bill until the fall and stay those executions to the end of the year? It bothers me that the government wants to rush this through. The fact that it accepted the amendment of my colleague today is an indication that it should not be rushed through the House.

Those of us who decided we would stay here and fight some of the clauses of this bill to try to bring members of the House closer to the ideas and feelings of the people of this nation, were right. The people of Canada are going to remember, even if we should lose, that some changes have been made to improve the bill a little bit. Perhaps we are optimistic in thinking we might get some other clauses of the bill changed and that there would be some form of capital punishment for crimes committed in this country.

The Solicitor General circulated a letter from the family of a policeman who had been killed which said that they did not believe in capital punishment. Some of the letters of this type that we received are pretty strongly worded. I have a letter here from a Barbara Irwin whose husband was murdered in 1972 in metropolitan Toronto. It is worth putting this letter on the record so that people who read *Hansard* will see it. Not too many people have an opportunity of seeing what the wives and families of policemen who were killed have to say about the situation. The letter, addressed to the Solicitor General of Canada, reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Allmand:

I would like to voice my opinion on capital punishment, being the widow of the late Detective Michael Irwin who was with Metro Toronto police department. My husband was slain in the line of duty with Detective Doug Sinclair on February 27, 1972.

I have discussed this subject with my family and can speak on behalf of myself and my family. We all feel capital punishment should be brought back—not only for policemen.

I would like to refresh people's memories on our traumatic experience. When my husband was slain, the man who took his life was also slain, so I feel our opinion as a family is not revengeful.

My late husband and myself raised our children to respect humanity and what belongs to them. If they do harm to someone or something then they should expect to be harmed in the same way.

I am sure if your wife or children were raped or murdered you would not question bringing back capital punishment.

The cost to the taxpayer to keep this man in jail is far more than they pay the murdered victim's family.

We have one of the finest police forces, but I feel we won't have this reputation if capital punishment is abolished.

Why should these men put their lives on the line, to have their family's taxes keep the murderers in jail for 15 or 25 years?

I do not understand how parliament can say it is not a deterrent.

I have raised my children to be good citizens and respect the law by setting a good example.

The government should set a good example by showing they have some gumption, by making the murderers pay the price with their lives. One rotten apple is destroyed before it destroys the whole bushel. It should be the same in society.

I trust my opinion will be as valued as Pauline Maitland's. I am also a widow of a slain policeman and my family and I reside in Canada.

Sincerely,
Barbara Irwin

It is signed also by three of her children.

Mr. Speaker, I am not quite finished so may I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I had used most of my allotted time before the supper break. I wish to say one or two more things in support of my reasons for wanting to delete clause 4 of the bill. Before supper I quoted a letter written by Mrs. Barbara Irwin whose husband was killed in Toronto in 1972. May I at this time put on record a letter which Kathy Flannery, daughter of the late detective Michael Irwin, sent to Syd Brown, president of the Metro Police Association. She said:

Dear Mr. Brown:

I for one am very much in favour of capital punishment. Being the mother of a new baby, I feel I have more worries now than ever. I would like a little reassurance that when my child grows up, she will not have to put up with such a permissive society.

My daughter will be raised to the best of my ability to honour and respect the law and if she should do anything to break the law, she will have to pay severely for it.

I would not like to think that by the time my child is old enough to go out alone, that people such as Kevin Willden are back on the streets.

Perhaps if Mr. Warren Allmand or Mr. Pierre Trudeau saw the decomposed body of little Lisa Kowalski and put themselves in the shoes of her family, they would change their minds. Why take the risk that this could happen again?

I think that letter reflects the feelings of many in Canada. The feelings of such letter writers, of people whose relatives or friends are actively involved in the police force or work as prison guards, might be somewhat stronger than those of average Canadians, although I doubt it. Judging from the mail which members of parliament get, and the result of the Gallup poll—a poll which some people like to ignore in election times but which always comes within a few percentage points of showing the actual feelings of Canadians—the majority of Canadians want some form of capital punishment retained in this country. I think the majority feel that prison guards especially, and policemen, deserve special treatment.

Surveys I have conducted in my riding show that most people are in favour of capital punishment. The great preponderance of people want capital punishment retained at least for the offence known in this bill as first degree murder. I hope some abolitionists in this House will agree with us, show their support by the way they vote on this motion and thereby retain capital punishment for the murderers of policemen and prison guards. I should like to see the penalty retained for all who commit first degree murder but am prepared to accept a compromise if the majority of the members of this House feel it is necessary.

I shall close by quoting what a United States judge said some years ago about deterrence:

The death penalty is a warning, just like a lighthouse throwing its beams out to sea. We hear about shipwrecks, but we do not hear about the ships that the lighthouse guides safely on their way. We do not have proof of the number of ships it saves, but we do not tear the lighthouse down.

Those words are appropriate to this bill. I hope we shall not tear our system down by abolishing capital punishment for the offences mentioned.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of amendment No. 13 to Bill C-84. This amendment modifies Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code, by eliminating clause 4, and I believe it is one of the most important amendments to be discussed today. Four amendments have already been passed by the House. We are now discussing the fifth of 29. This is encouraging, and in my opinion the House will be able to adjourn in a month.

I believe that motion No. 13 is the most important of the amendments since it concerns the safety of policemen and prison guards. I have already talked about this during the other debates that we have had on capital punishment, but today I have realized, Mr. Speaker, that there is a considerable difference between section 4 in its present form and what the minister wants us to adopt.

The amendment reads as follows:

214. (1) Murder is punishable by death or is punishable by imprisonment for life.

(2) Murder is punishable by death, in respect of any person, where such person by his own act caused or assisted in causing the death of

(a) a police officer, police constable, constable, sheriff, deputy sheriff, sheriff's officer or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace, acting in the course of his duties, or

(b) a warden, deputy warden, instructor, keeper, gaoler, guard or other officer or permanent employee of a prison, acting in the course of his duties,

or counselled or procured another person to do any act causing or assisting in causing the death.

(3) All murder other than murder punishable by death is punishable by imprisonment for life.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the amendment which had been suggested during the last discussion had been accepted by the then minister who was the present Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). I wonder why, since Parliament had agreed to this amendment, today, without consulting anyone, since the government has refused completely to have witnesses appear before the standing committee of the House, we are presented with a new bill that I consider completely ridiculous.

● (2010)

First, they start by categorizing murders. So we would now have first and second degree murders, probably ending up with third, fourth and fifth degree murders. So murders are going to be classified.

I now read the proposal before us:

214. (1) Murder is first degree murder or second degree murder.

(2) Murder is first degree murder when it is planned and deliberate.

(3) Without limiting the generality of subsection (2), murder is planned and deliberate when it is committed pursuant to an arrangement under which money or anything of value passes or is intended to pass from one person to another, or is promised by one person to another, as consideration for that other's causing or assisting in causing the death of anyone or counselling or procuring another person to do any act causing or assisting in causing that death.

And further down, under subclause 4, the existing statute is somewhat altered as follows:

(4) Irrespective of whether a murder is planned and deliberate on the part of any person, murder is first degree murder when the victim is

(*a*) a police officer, police constable, constable, sheriff, deputy sheriff, sheriff's officer or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace, acting in the course of his duties;

(*b*) a warden, deputy warden, instructor, keeper, gaoler, guard or other officer or a permanent employee of a prison, acting in the course of his duties; or

(*c*) a person working in a prison with the permission of the prison authorities and acting in the course of his work therein.

And finally, in subclause 5, the minister deals with the matter of aircraft hijacking that should have been included of course in the first amendments to the statute, that is amendments introduced this afternoon concerning piracy. However, this subclause deals with hijacking, kidnapping and sexual offences. Mr. Speaker, I would like to limit myself this evening to the matter of subclause 4 dealing with the murder of peace officers, sheriffs and prison guards.

As always the minister was very careful to put aside any conclusion contained in the previous act, that is to say that he ends up with life imprisonment as punishment.

This afternoon, while we were discussing motion No. 12, we heard a speaker introduce the motion, which would add a clause saying that if a prisoner who committed murder escapes or commits another murder, he can be given more severe punishment. The Solicitor General jumped to his feet, of course, to support that proposal. I wonder what more severe punishment he has in mind, when he says in his bill that first degree murderers will be sentenced to life imprisonment. It seems to me that the punishment that is more severe than life imprisonment is the death penalty. But he does not go beyond that. Yet, this afternoon, he said to us: we will give him a more severe sentence; but what punishment is that? What does he mean by more severe? Now, the amendment is ridiculous, stark ridiculous! When someone has really been condemned, I take the words to the letter, when they say after all that the maximum penalty will be life imprisonment and he tries to have us believe that there will be a penalty more severe than that, but what kind of a penalty is it? Another life imprisonment? And if the criminal commits a third murder, it will probably be a third life imprisonment? It gets so funny Mr. Speaker, that it is ridiculous.

I simply declare that the whole population cannot admit such a bill in the present circumstances. I think the minister, as all the others, has certainly received reports from police officers and prison guards. He received letters of opposition as we have received reports in which we are given the same percentage of the number of police officers who are opposed to Bill C-84.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand at all how the minister can interpret his bill. He declares he is here to adopt laws which will protect the public and he is going to let the murderers absolutely free after a few years, and as I said this morning, I do not believe in these 25-year and 10-year sentences, as I did not believe him when he assured the House, during the last few years, that he was going to execute those who would kill police officers or prison

guards. Dozens of police officers or prison guards have been killed, but what about the executions? How many executions during the last 10 years? Is this minister sincere? And we do keep this minister. He promised that he would submit his resignation if the bill was defeated and I heartily hope that the bill will be defeated so that he can disappear forever.

● (2020)

[*English*]

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Solicitor General is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Allmand: I do not want to intervene prematurely but I should like to ask Your Honour to enforce the rule of relevancy. We are now discussing motion No. 13, which is a motion to strike clause 4. Clause 4 deals merely with the classification of murder. This afternoon we disposed of motion No. 12, the amendment respecting first and second degree murder.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to differ with the opinion of the Solicitor General but he has just come into the House. I have been listening to the hon. member's contribution, and 99 per cent of his remarks up until now have been directly related to the clause the motion seeks to delete. Perhaps he did go off the subject for a second or two, but he should be given enough time to return to the subject matter of the bill which he has treated so well up until now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I always thought that you had a sense of justice and I am satisfied that you realized, as we did, that the minister does not know much about order, he brings disorder, how can he know whether he is consistent with the Standing Orders or if another member acts similarly?

Now, I come back to my subject. I was earlier speaking about clause 4, which deals with police officers and prison guards. If he has not read all the reports, I am going to read to him a few paragraphs of the report of the Police Chiefs Association of Canada. This will probably refresh his memory or he might learn something if he has not read this report.

I have the feeling he does not read any of those. He is one-track minded and goes straight in the direction in which he looks and I even wonder if he looks where he goes. So I quote:

The Police Chiefs Association of Canada studies with great interest the debate concerning capital punishment and we want to assure everyone that we have the same respect for the views of both abolitionists and retentionists . . .

Do you realize their impartiality? There is no racism in all this.

In the briefs we already presented on that subject, we have clearly stated our position in favour of capital punishment . . .

Hear, hear!

. . . and at this time a discussion of the pros and cons would only bore you.

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

However, we wish to mention that so far one speech mentions our recommendation to create a committee of people representing the executive, the legislative and the judiciary to study in depth the permanent banishing of an offender and some alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, when we refer to permanent banishment, I am not sure if the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) knows that it means. Permanent banishment means capital punishment, to use the right words.

The current alternative advocated in Bill C-84 is not the result of considerable thought and is nothing but a deceptive palliative aimed at making us accept the abolition of capital punishment. This statement is mostly based on the comments made by the hon. Warrent Allmand . . .

—this has to be the Solicitor General—

. . . in an April 8 address before the John Howard Society when that question was put to him. He said that a 25-year imprisonment sentence was too harsh but that we should first eliminate capital punishment and then direct our efforts toward reducing that imprisonment term.

It has been his idea, his obsession for ten years. It is not something new, this has been his target for ten years ever since I have known him in the House.

Such a philosophy greatly worries us because even if the full period of imprisonment in Bill C-84 did apply, it implies a much more serious threat for our society and particularly for the guards of our institutions. In view of this philosophy . . .

Some people call this a "whim".

. . . we submit that the minimum sentence of 25 years as proposed in Bill C-84 is a blatant misrepresentation, considering that for all practical purposes an individual would have the right to make an application for a reduction once he has served the first 15 years.

An hon. Member: Fifteen years should be enough.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Yes, it should be enough. He is going to serve only five years and sometimes only three.

We also think that a minimum sentence of 10 years in some cases where life is taken is much too severe comparatively to the odious individual who only thinks of killing for money.

This is what we call hired assassins. It is for them and not for those who kill by accident that the law applies, of course. I wonder whether the minister is not now protecting these hired assassins.

Even if we retain capital punishment, the traditional commutation would have the same effect.

Considering that as spokesmen for the police forces in Canada, we have a knowledge of criminals which is available to very few people outside our profession, we regard it as our duty to express our deepest concern to you, our M.P.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that you are about to interrupt me. I believe my 20 minutes have come to an end but all the same I shall finish reading my letter another time. I shall have other opportunities to talk about those problems, for I have indeed five or six major issues to put forward to the House. During the forthcoming days which will be very enlightening for the people, I want the public to know what is going on, what the Solicitor General thinks of capital punishment and what he is trying to force down on them.

[*English*]

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak very briefly in this debate on behalf of policemen and prison guards in the context of this bill. I believe they deserve special consideration because of the special kind of work that they perform.

• (2030)

If capital punishment does not exist for the killing of a policeman or prison guard, the prisoner serving a life sentence who attempts to escape has no deterrent to restrain him from killing a policeman or a guard in the course of that escape. He knows the only penalty he will receive is a continuation of that life sentence. This is obviously no penalty at all. I believe the penalty for killing a policeman or a prison guard should be capital punishment because that is the only deterrent to committing murder during an attempted escape from prison. Therefore I intend to support this amendment.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I spoke on previous amendments, once yesterday and once today, and I make no secret of the fact that I am really not prepared to speak on this amendment in the way I would like, though I must take issue with the government's position in this bill as it affects the security of police officers, prison guards, and people who are in danger of falling victim to contract killing.

Just over a year ago, 13 months, there were 15 people held hostage in the penitentiary at New Westminster. I know that at least one of those hostages was a constituent of mine. He was held as a hostage, together with others, for several days by men who have no convictions and no compunction in respect of human life. Last February there was another hostage taken at this same penitentiary by two of the same prisoners. Another constituent of mine was held at knife point by the same people. I met that constituent just a few weeks ago and found he was still not working after having been released on sick leave since February.

It seems to me we owe something to the men and women across Canada who are willing to place their lives in jeopardy for the security of others. We owe them at least protection from those who have no sense of value for human life.

Not too far from where I live there was a contract killing a few years ago. The price of that contract was $200. That is the price some of these people place on human life. If that is the kind of society we are willing to protect through this legislation, we have become bankrupt. We must re-evaluate our position on this matter.

The people in this House who are protecting those who have absolutely no sense of value for human life will be guilty when prison guards and police officers become the victims of future murderers. I am in complete agreement with those officers who are sending letters to those who voted for the abolition of the death penalty. I am in complete agreement with their position, that those people who voted for the abolition of the death penalty for the killing of police officers and prison guards should be held responsible for the deaths of future policemen and prison guards who are murdered.

An hon. Member: You tell them, Benno.

Mr. Friesen: I am, if you will only listen. If you will not listen to me, please listen to your constituents.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Friesen: Some 80 per cent of the people in Canada agree with what I am saying today.

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Friesen: That hon. member will hide behind the cloak of self-righteousness and say he is voting on the basis of his conscience. I would ask that hon. member whether the 80 per cent of the voters in his constituency do not have consciences. He chooses to ignore that 80 per cent. I suggest it is nothing short of a dictatorship when a minority rules the majority. That hon. member will have to account to his constituents the next time they get a chance to make a decision in respect of their representation in this House.

An hon. Member: That's a joke.

Mr. Friesen: That is no joke, and anybody who can be flippant on this subject deserves to be re-examined by his constituents. We need some sober second thought about this clause. I intend to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), and I would hope that other members, as we just heard from the previous speaker, will also re-evaluate their positions and realize what they are doing to the peace officers of this country. I hope they will vote in support of this amendment in order to protect those police officers and prison guards who are working to protect us.

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on the amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). Let me bring to the attention of the government some of the problems it will have to face if this amendment is not accepted.

Prison guards and policemen in this country are very disappointed over what parliament did a few days ago. They are now reviewing their positions in terms of the kind of work they are doing. Contrary to the Anti-Inflation Board policies, there will be only one way in which these people will remain in their jobs, and that is if the government is to come up with enough money to keep them. Certainly money is not everything, but some of these people may remain at their jobs if they are sufficiently well paid. Perhaps even then some police departments across the country will be able to recruit new staff. If I were a young man graduating from school at this time in 1976 the last job I would want to look at, no matter what it paid, would be the job of a policeman or prison guard.

The law as it existed before the vote did in fact provide a deterrent. Notwithstanding that the government did not live up to its own law, many of those who might have committed murder thought they might be hanged. They thought "the government did not hang the last fellow but they might hang me."

If I were convicted of first degree murder and sentenced to prison for 25 years with little hope of parole, and if I happened to be somewhere around 20 years of age that would mean I would be 45 or 50 when I got out, the uppermost thing in my mind would be how to get away for six or seven days of freedom. Circumstances might arise during my incarceration in which I would only have to deal viciously with one or two prison guards. Perhaps I

could overcome them and obtain seven or eight days' freedom before I was caught again and returned to prison to continue serving the 25 years, or another 25 years for having committed another murder. That would only worsen the situation, because the minute I went back to that prison I would start thinking again of how to get out for another eight or ten days.

Let me say in all seriousness that I think it is terrible and disgraceful that the minister, who is so adamant and so vehement in his position that hanging must be abolished for all kinds of crime in this country, is not in this House to listen to some of the speakers on this side who have very serious and legitimate concerns. If we are really responsible parliamentarians I think it is our job to do all we can to ensure that the government at least sees a little sense in what it is doing.

● (2040)

We have the question, with regard to law in Canada, of whether or not we should be going as far as we are. Should we be as lenient as we are in terms of what is happening all around the world? I remember the day when the use of the lash was abolished. What is wrong with the lash in the view of any citizen who lives in accordance with the law? All I am saying is that we should use it for sexual offenders, for people who continually commit crimes against society. It is a deterrent as much as hanging is a deterrent in respect of the commission of a crime against a policeman or prison guard. I say in all seriousness the government once again should take a look at this before this matter comes to a vote.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate on capital punishment I have felt constrained to make a contribution on each motion, not for the sake of getting my name in *Hansard*—any member can do that at any time—but with a very deep seated concern over the direction of this country and the direction or the path our government is taking in the face of overwhelming public opinion. My concerns are no less, indeed perhaps no greater, for the safety of police, prison guards, and all those associated with that particular group that helps maintain law and order in our society. I have no wish to give them a special category, but the criminal element has elected to give the police and prison guards a special category.

I recall recently after the result of the vote on second reading the response of two murderers in Oakalla prison in New Westminster who said, "Great stuff, a guard a day". That, Sir, is the attitude of the hardened criminal. That is the attitude of those individuals who have no hope for redemption, absolutely none; who have absolutely no concern for law and order and who place no value on human life except their own.

We had the example some 18 months ago on the lower mainland of those two murderers who said that their kick that night, their pleasure, distorted as it may be, was to go out and get a cop. Mr. Speaker, let it be on the record, for the continuing respect of the RCMP and the control they demonstrated at the time of the capture of these two murderers within a matter of an hour or two, that they did not shoot them on the spot having witnessed the murder of a brother officer. What fear have these men; what fear do these murderers have? Are they concerned about a sentence of 25 years in prison? Many of them have spent almost that much time in prison on a variety of other charges involving crimes against society.

The public cries out in frustration over the attitude of the government on the subject of abolition. I can readily accept the concerns of those who voted for abolition and the manner in which they have had to agonize over this issue, as well as the pressures to which they have been subjected by their constituents. I recognize and respect these concerns, but I cannot respect anyone in this House who would vote for abolition for the sake of appeasing the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brisco: I shall not point the finger, but if there be a member in this House—

An hon. Member: Who told you that?

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, the honourable noise from the opposite side will have his opportunity to contribute to the debate when he has something sensible to say. Let me continue.

Some hon. Members: Order, order!

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, would you like to interject and quieten down the rabble on the government side of the House so that I can continue to contribute something sensible to this debate? I wish it clearly understood that I am not about to point the finger at any one member. I say hopefully that over there sitting in this House tonight there is not a member who, because he had his eye on the post of a parliamentary secretary or a cabinet ministership, changed his vote.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brisco: I know of the agonies that have existed in the minds of the abolitionists who have made a substantial contribution in this House in so many other ways and yet whose constituents feel they have been let down. I believe that is unfortunate. I can think at the moment of one of my goods friends, a member of this House of many years standing. I must say with respect that I have forgotten the name of the member's riding. It is a Halifax riding. This member has contributed for more than a decade to the decision-making process in Parliament. I believe it is decidely unfair that a member such as this should be vilified by his constituents, be they one, a dozen or 100. Nevertheless I would hope that members of this particular persuasion would consider the impact of this particular amendment, and of one or two other amendments that have been presented in respect of Bill C-84 concerning capital punishment. I hope they will consider the impact this will have on the Canadian community. They should at least realize, or a least give credence to the fact that when we declare open season on the police and prison guards it is a sad day for Canada.

● (2050)

Let the Canadian people know, let my constituents know from the record that I heartily support the proposed

amendment that clause 4 be withdrawn and that capital punishment apply to those who have set out to murder the very men who protect our lives in this House and on the streets.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on these amendments—

An hon. Member: Then don't, sit down.

Mr. MacFarlane: —the main reason being that I had done the anguishing that the hon. member mentioned at the time of voting on the bill in principle and I did not think that any amendments would do anything else but cause me the same anguish and cause me to come up with the same conclusion. Now on this particular amendment I find it necessary to say something because of my personal experiences and also because of the references of at least six members of the opposition concerning the situation.

I thought I had indicated in my earlier speeches my absolute respect for people holding the retentionist view and my honest presumption that they hold the retentionist view because they think it would improve the situation. I hold the abolitionist view for the same reason, and I would normally expect the same kind of respect. I will not indulge in any remarks that I feel offended sometimes—and this is only a human foible—when innuendoes are made, but I will get down to the point and let those hon. members who wish make the innuendoes do so. Let me get down to the point at hand.

Since this was part of the previous law, I had to deal with the fact that unexpectedly I would have to take a plane to Moncton and attend the funeral of the two policemen whom I knew so well. The two gentlemen had worked so hard with youth and were so well known in minor football circles that the police force itself each year purchased for them a ticket to the $100 a plate dinner where all the funds were raised for amateur sports in that area. I happened to have been the guest speaker at each one of those dinners and so was vitally involved in this work in the city of Moncton. I stood in the cathedral and heard the archbishop say to us "God help us not to do what it would be normal for us to want to do, but help us to do what you would have us do, and so save our souls". It was not easy when you knew the young boy who had been kidnapped. It was not easy when you knew his father, his mother, and the children of the policemen. It was not unusual for someone to send you the photograph of the little boy crying over the coffin and accuse you of not caring.

So this was a calculated decision. At the risk of not ever holding another seat in this House in my life I decided that those whom I consider my brothers—and being a Presbyterian I think I might see them again—would understand me. This is my reason for voting in this fashion.

It may be old fashioned to be religious, but being a bachelor who does not have the comforts that some of you have in your homes—

Some hon. Members: What comforts?

Mr. MacFarlane: I still pray to my mother and father who are dead and are in heaven. Believe it or not, but you might as well hear the truth now. There are others who have other reasons, and I respect them. There are others with great legal minds who can make decisions that I could not attempt to make. There are others who know the law backward and forward and can argue it. I am just a simple soul who comes from an ordinary world who says: I must stand now and be counted.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacFarlane: When I received a letter from a constituent who was particularly peturbed by the murder of those two policemen—and at that time we had not seen the bill on abolition—I replied to him in all honesty in writing that indeed if these two are convicted and if the law at that time is that they should be put to death, I will support that law.

Mr. Woolliams: Why did you not do it then?

Mr. MacFarlane: Because it did not occur in that order. I then had the opportunity to think on it, just as many juries do. Do not think for a second that a person like myself who has administered corporal punishment in the schools when it was considered important did not do it with a will, but sometimes when you reflect and think back, you discover that in the first year of your teaching when you used the strap in school 42 times when it was encouraged, and discovered what a poor teacher and disciplinarian you were, you never used it again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacFarlane: You discovered that respect came from the students not because you were good at anything in particular but because you respected them as individuals.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacFarlane: When I came to parliament, I did not think I would be in this situation. I am not ashamed to say that there was a moment when I saw those policemen when I wondered whether capital punishment should be invoked. That is not an embarrassment, that is the truth. If I saw a child being molested, do you not think I would kill the other person on the spot? Do you not think I would feel that way? But six months later, sitting in a court room and thinking carefully about whether the taking of another life would serve any useful purpose, I had to think differently. That is what I am doing here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacFarlane: By the same token, it is not fair to make the division between the abolitionists, the retentionists, the parties or anything else. In one situation when a reporter telephoned me and discussed this, he made a very good story out of it which was attractive enough because six other members mentioned it. The man who wrote the story, and who thought up the tremendous idea that there might be a contradiction, was an abolitionist. First of all he was a press man, the story was important. Imagine if by any chance I was really waffling and moving back in the other direction, he would really have a great story. We do face that. Some people make as much as they can out of a situation in their own interest rather than recognizing that

we are making a value decision here in parliament just like a jury.

Beyond reasonable doubt you must vote in the way you believe would be the best for all concerned, and it is not necessarily a conscience vote. My vote is the best for all concerned, not just for my conscience. I really believe I vote for my constituency. I feel that if this is successful and abolition is indeed accepted, I will be able to attack more strongly any of the weaknesses which I see exist in the law which might make it more dangerous or less safe for my constituents, for the people on the streets. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is well aware of the fact there is no one side in the government on that because I will be at him like thunder that I want that kind of protection, just like thunder, and no kidding about it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacFarlane: That is the reason I felt I should put myself on record on this matter.

I have not gone into other member's constituencies, as some people have, in order to badger them.

● (2100)

I have not gone on open lines and used their names at any time, although they have used mine. In my speech I did not refer to them or to one article or editorial I have read about them, as they have done about me—and I do not condemn them for that; they can do anything they want—but remember that I and many of my colleagues, who are retentionists or abolitionists, are here at this moment not just supporting the government but in a free vote saying, "This we believe we must do, and now."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to follow the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), but I want to congratulate the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) for moving the hon. member to speak.

It has been obvious that hon. members on the government side have not been very interested in this particular stage in the legislative process.

An hon. Member: Where is Joe?

Mr. Sharp: Where are all your members?

An hon. Member: Where is the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)?

An hon. Member: Joe who?

Mr. Schumacher: I think the record will show that the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain is the first member on the other side of the House to participate at this stage of the bill. I understand that one hon. member from the New Democratic Party was more or less goaded into participating yesterday.

Mr. Gilbert: Persuaded.

Mr. Schumacher: Or persuaded. I know there are some retentionists on the Liberal side, and they are to be congratulated for their political fortitude because I sincerely believe they have been under a great deal of pressure. I think it is a commentary on this so-called free vote, which I think is a snare and a delusion, that there has been so little participation by Liberal members at the report stage.

This amendment brings the bill into focus with the existing law because capital punishment for the murder of police officers and prison guards is the only form of capital punishment we have at the moment. This amendment deals with that matter.

I think it is worth while to remind hon. members at this stage that the study in committee of this legislation was really not very worth while or illuminating to hon. members who participated in that committee. I spent some time one evening in that committee, and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) said that he really did not know what would happen in our penal institutions if Bill C-84 passed. There was some talk of building new and special facilities to deal with criminals of the incorrigible type who are dangerous, but he could not satisfy the committee or hon. members of this House that the approach of the government is the right one.

The minister just said we would have to wait and see. Of course he believes that his approach is the right one, but this is too serious a matter to be running a laboratory type of experiment, and it distresses me greatly that the government, which less than three years ago said that it wanted another five year period of experimentation with a limited type of capital punishment, now feels that it is very important that all stages of this major piece of legislation must be dealt with before we adjourn for the summer. In my view that in itself is an interference with the free deliberation and conclusion to be arrived at by this Chamber on this legislation.

There happens to be a penal institution in my constituency at Drumheller which has been referred to on many occasions as Eldon's house, but it has also been referred to as the crown jewel of the penitentiary system of this country. I think the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) should be congratulated for forcing the government to build that institution against all the expert advice the government was receiving as to why it would not work. With this piece of legislation the government is acting on the same type of expert advice, and we will rue the day we listened to those elitists who think they know better than the majority of Canadians.

I have heard hon. members questioning the hon. member for Kootenay West about whether 80 per cent of Canadians want the retention of capital punishment. I suppose there is no absolute way of determining the matter, but several of us have conducted surveys over the last number of years, and the figures vary from in excess of 70 per cent to in excess of 80 per cent. I believe the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion has shown that the figure is well in excess of 70 per cent. But I do not think anyone can seriously argue that the overwhelming view of Canadians is that there should be some type of capital punishment.

We hear the Burke philosophy expressed, and abolitionists can agonize all they want and bleed all over the Chamber because they are using their judgment rather than that of their constituents. I do not accept that particular philosophy of Edmund Burke. I am sympathetic to a

great deal of his thinking, but that sympathy applies to other areas. I think the people who send us here to do several things on their behalf, and when we are discussing matters such as freight rates, banking legislation or economic questions, things ordinary citizens do not have the chance to become acquainted with, they will look to us for leadership and for our judgment. After all, members of parliament have more resources at their command to help them to come to the right conclusion. However, the question of capital punishment is in no way similar to those types of questions.

When I made my speech at second reading I said that surely this is the type of question which is most suitable for a referendum. The government says there will not be a referendum because it knows its view would be rejected by Canadians at large. That is the only reason the government will not hold a referendum. It knows it would not have its way, but it is so elitist in its approach and so convinced that it knows best that it will use all the tricks at its command to make sure its will prevails in this matter.

Mr. Sharp: We have the support of your leader.

Mr. Schumacher: That doesn't make it right at all.

Mr. Sharp: Does it make him wrong?

• (2110)

Mr. Schumacher: It certainly does not make him wrong. That does not mean that the people of Canada are wrong, just because the leaders of all the parties except the Social Credit party, happen to be in cahoots in this.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Schumacher: Look what happens on the procedural questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I would suggest that the hon. member get back to the subject of the motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: He was only answering the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane).

Mr. Schumacher: No, I was answering the hon. House leader who dragged in that red herring. That is another little trick he is using. He is just full of tricks.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is Joe Clark a red herring?

Mr. Schumacher: The only thing red about Joe Clark is his hair.

Mr. Gilbert: Joe is a red Tory.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: And you have a red face.

Mr. Schumacher: I would not know about that. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), sitting where he does, may have a better perspective of where people fit into the political spectrum than I do. I guess we could not be much more apart, and he has a better view.

Mr. Gilbert: But we are still friends.

Mr. Schumacher: Certainly. As I was saying the Drumheller institution is in my constituency. It has operated very well in its ten year history, but the staff of the institution is very upset. The Solicitor General has not reassured them about what the situation will be in those institutions when this bill is passed.

On the subject of policemen, Mr. Speaker, I would just repeat what I said on second reading—we should be careful that we do not find ourselves in a situation in this country where the police feel compelled to shoot first and ask questions later. That is the road I am afraid we are heading if we go along with Bill C-84. That is why I support the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) in his amendments, so that those in whom we place the most confidence to protect us and our families and all those dependent upon us in society, may feel safe. I would ask hon. members to give their support and ensure that this amendment passes.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the motion moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) designed to delete clause 4 of Bill C-84 is, in my opinion, extremely important.

Section 214 of the Criminal Code which was in effect in Canada since the last review of the Criminal Code provided for different kinds of murders, and at the time the House of Commons abolished the death penalty for the murder of any citizen but clearly retained it for the murder of prison guards, policemen, sheriffs or sheriff's officers.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, Parliament then suggested it was essential to support the police forces in Canada at the legal and governmental levels through a legislation stipulating that the murder of a prison guard or a policeman would be punishable by death. That is from section 214(1), (2) and (3) of the Criminal Code went.

The Solicitor General now proposes to abolish capital punishment altogether and just sets two categories of murders: premeditated murder and unpremeditated murder. In any case, the penalty remains the same—life imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favour of a police society. I do not believe either in a society where some kind of parallel power is given either to the armed forces or the police or the military. I believe in democratic power but I dream of a society where the rights of everyone will be respected and everyone will recognize his obligations. We know as professors, family heads, mayors or members of a provincial or a federal legislature that we can pass all the statutes we want but there will always be people who either will

not know them or not understand them or who will voluntarily defy them. That is why any organized society sets for itself means, limits, structures within which it must develop. That is how a system was invented for street and road traffic—traffic lights. You stop on red, you go on green, you use caution and stop on yellow. That is an essential law. It is stupid in itself but essential to the security of the public driving down the many roads of Canada and across the world. Laws of this kind for an organized society are found everywhere. As I said, Mr. Speaker, we had Criminal Code provisions calling for the death penalty for the murder of people paid with our taxes to enforce those laws whose only purpose is the protection of society. Under the old Criminal Code which imposed the death penalty to those convicted of the murder of a policeman or a prison guard, 11 persons were convicted pursuant to section 214 of the Criminal Code, and therefore, liable to the death penalty, because they deliberately attacked and killed police officers or policemen or prison guards.

These people thus deliberately broke the law, and I am not the one to say so, but the courts, the judiciary which says that they broke a law passed by Parliament. We all know that these 11 persons were shown mercy by the federal cabinet under the influence, I suppose, of the Solicitor General, this man who is so soft with criminals. And that is how, Mr. Speaker, these 11 persons are now sent to prison for life, but with the possibility of parole. I would like to say outright that what colours this debate on capital punishment is the existence of the Parole Board.

● (2120)

We pass a law, then the court states that a convicted person will serve for a given time, but inevitably the National Parole Board intervenes in favour of the criminal concerned and releases him, and thus the law of Parliament is twisted and so is the will of the court.

Mr. Speaker, during the second reading debate, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) argued about clause 4 of the bill. In turn I would like to do just that. He said that those who will vote for retention of capital punishment should think twice since they would have on their conscience the death of eleven people. I cannot do that. This is not a literal quotation but roughly the portent of what the Prime Minister said.

Mr. Béchard: You should quote literally.

Mr. Fortin: If the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Béchard) is so well informed, he should have the courage to speak like a man, to stand up, rather than remain seated; otherwise, he should be so kind as to listen to me.

Mr. Béchard: When one refers to someone, the reference should be made properly.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said then that those who would vote for the retention of capital punishment would have the death of these 11 criminals on their conscience.

Mr. Béchard: He did not say that. Quote him properly.

An hon. Member: But this is what he meant.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I should like very much the Prime Minister to tell me who has the death of at least 11 victims, the victims of these criminals, on his conscience.

Mr. Béchard: Those who killed.

Mr. Fortin: It is funny, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about criminals here but we forget the innocents who are the victims of these criminals. Who is going to compensate these families? Who is going to protect these families, Mr. Speaker? It is not important. They do not talk about it but say that the lives of criminals must be protected, and the Prime Minister said: "I wash my hands of it, I cannot do this action, I cannot act as a hangman, let those who want to act as hangmen do this."

Mr. Speaker, since when can a government pass the buck to Parliament, when a legislation providing for the application of capital punishment for the murder of policemen, prison guards or law enforcement officers had been passed with a majority of votes? Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation. We pay for the maintenance of police forces with our tax money at the municipal, provincial and federal levels.

Let us suppose that tomorrow morning somebody commits armed robbery in some shop and that the police are called. Their first duty, that for which they are paid, is to go to the scene of the crime as rapidly as possible, armed, because our money is used to provide weapons for policemen to protect either the lives or the public and private property of individuals. That is the reason for the existence of police forces. It is so true that the federal government is now investing over $100 million in the Olympic Games to ensure security in case of danger or threats. On the one hand, enormous amounts of money are spent, the army is called, all the sophisticated techniques available are used, and on the other hand, when the supposed criminals are caught, they are simply released or told: You are liable to life imprisonment, which means a 25-year imprisonment with possibility of parole after 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, why would a policemen, if we adopt clause 4 as proposed by the minister, why would he go out and risk his own life to defend property which is not his own, a life that is not his and buildings which do not belong to him? Why should the law enforcement agencies intervene in a violent demonstration when the statutes of our country do not defend or support police action in Canada? Why should we, as Canadians, finance municipal, provincial or federal law enforcement agencies to protect our lives and our property if our own laws do not support them? This is why I say that the motion of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) is valuable in the sense that it aims at ensuring that the most important democratic institution of our country, Parliament, which is supposed to reflect Canadian opinion, can protect the police.

We do not want a police society, we do not want a violent society, we do not want a society where people take an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. We want a society where the rules of the game are known, a society where we try to educate people as much as possible about their rights and their duties, but where we respect the laws that we pass. We have come to a point in our country where the legislation of the labour world is defied, where injunctions are

defied, where the police forces are defied; we are facing a situation of virtual anarchy.

People are worried. I have asked the following questions in my constituency: Do you approve the fact that the cabinet is changing the death sentence to life imprisonment when the Canadian judicial system has condemned the criminal to the death penalty as provided by Criminal Code section 214? This is what my own constituents, those who have shown confidence in me and who have elected me to the House, have replied: yes, 409; no, 1,885; undecided, 9; no answer, 138. This is significant. These 1,885 citizens of Lotbinière are not violent people, they are not people who demand violence for violence. They are people who are worried about their safety. They are people who want to live in peace in their own country. They are people who want the policemen that they pay with their taxes to be able to do their work with the respect and support of the governments.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked my fellow citizens: In the case of premeditated first degree murder, would you approve the death penalty? Here is the answer: yes, 2,058; no, 274; undecided, 14; no answer, 95. I would like to note that more than 37 per cent of my fellow citizens who have received this questionnaire have answered it when a 10 per cent reaction is generally considered excellent. I have therefore received more than 39 per cent of answers, which shows how the Canadian people are worried about this situation. What we deplore is the fact that the cabinet does not respect the legislation passed by Parliament.

When we adopted Criminal Code section 214, the minister—and I remember that debate, I was sitting in the gallery—said that we would apply the death penalty in the case of murders of police officers or prison guards. Let us go back to that context. The death penalty was never applied. The cabinet found a way to bypass the wishes of the members as expressed in the House.

The minister says today that those guilty of first degree murder will be sentenced to 25 years imprisonment, which he calls "life imprisonment," and that after a 15-year period they will be eligible for parole. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe him. I claim that the criminals will be set free before the end of the 15-year period. Why? For good behaviour. I have no reason to believe the word or the good will of the Solicitor General because, Mr. Speaker if I rely on past experience, I have been deluded. I cannot believe him. If somebody could assure me that the laws voted by Parliament and dealing with the application of justice in Canada would be respected, my judgement on the application of the death penalty would probably be different. But I have no choice. This is my sole resource as a member of Parliament as I showed you by expressing the opinion of my constituents. This is my sole resource to try, with others, to ensure a minimum of security in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, no one can laugh at people forever, no one can exploit their good faith and their ignorance forever. The Olympic Games will cost more than one billion and a few million dollars of our taxes. For the Olympic Games, we are going to invest in excess of $100 million of our taxes to ensure the protection of personalities, politicians and athletes. Why do we spend $100 million to ensure the protection if, in any case, whatever crime might be committed on these premises, either piracy, high treason or deliberate murder, we will not move to condemn the criminals? Mr. Speaker, there is a limit, if we really want order in society. The government uses the police forces and the armed forces of our country to escort athletes along the Trans-Canada Highway. In Quebec for example, they are being installed in Granby and a number of other places around Bromont. This excites people and creates an illusion that this government truly wants to ensure protection. But in fact, what are we going to do with criminals we catch, if there are any, which is not to be hoped.

An hon. Member: Give them an olympic medal!

Mr. Fortin: They probably will get an olympic medal, if the logic of the Solicitor General is to be followed. That is totally ridiculous. Our police forces need encouragement and if clause 4 of the bill is not amended, I fear that if this government refuses to implement it, police forces will do so in the field. That probably is what will happen. Police officers called on the scene of a hold-up or violent crime will implement capital punishment to save their own lives, knowing full well that this government does not take its responsibilities. Police forces will take their own responsibilities.

Somebody told me recently that police force regulations provide that one shot shall be fired in the air as a warning before a shot can be fired at the criminal. From now on, after the Solicitor General's bill has passed, it will be one shot at the criminal and then one shot in the air, to warn him he has been fired at. That is utterly ridiculous. Either we want an organized society or we don't.

It is time we come back to earth and face facts. Mr. Speaker, the other night before the House I was talking about the taking of hostages in a Montreal schoolbus. There were then some gun shots, you will remember, and at that time, Mr. Speaker, the police stepped in. What could we read in the newspapers following that? Some public servants castigated the police for stepping in too quickly.

Mr. Speaker, that shows us how far anarchy has progressed in this country. And I repeat what I was saying earlier: I do not want to live in a police society, but I just want to live in a society where people respect one another, but in a society which punishes, governs or arrests those who do not want to obey traffic regulations. Mr. Speaker, when driving down the streets we stop on red lights and go ahead on green ones—

● (2130)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I shall not abuse the kindness of my colleagues who give me a few minutes more. Mr. Speaker, there is a limit. Some minimum standards have to be respected in a society and as I said before I was interrupted, for a long time I have been wishing to run a red light and stop on green. But society

demands that we stop on a red light and go on a green light. I have always considered that it was faster with greens but however—

Mr. Speaker, that is the highway code in our society. Then, what do we do when an hon. member, a minister, a citizen fails to comply with the rule of the road? What happens? We say that everyone is equal before the law and we levy a penalty against him. Let us look at the case of the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal) who recently was allegedly treated in an offhand manner by the Ontario Provincial Police for a mere summons for a parking offence. Mr. Speaker, is it not a ridiculous situation? We are extremely strict with a representative of the people for a mere parking ticket when in the case of criminals, who kill the father or the mother of young children, we just put them in jail.

Recently in Granby we had the case of someone who was convicted of murder and sentenced, if I am correct, to six months imprisonment considering his social status, the fact that it was a first offence and so on. What example do we give to society? I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that we should be strict but I say that we should be fair.

If, as citizens and MPs, we can accept that an hon. member be treated offhandedly by a police force for a petty offence, should we not, Mr. Speaker, insist upon adequate measures, corresponding to the seriousness of the crime, in the case of murders where innocents loses their lives? Mr. Speaker, only then will our society be really treated equitably. That is important and I want to close on that, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe in the law of retaliation, nor do I believe in an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth, but I would like to see a society in which there are minimum standards to respect, in which everyone knows the rules of the game.

We have reached the point where we want to control the use of firearms by innocent people through Bill C-83, but this bill does not control that of the criminals covered by Bill C-84. In other words, we attack honest people to give freedom to criminals. There is a limit to laughing at people! If we are serious about investing so much of the taxpayers money in the Olympic Games or about protecting public safety against the FLQ during the October crisis, let us now apply penal sanctions against those who break the law; otherwise, we are wasting our time.

[*English*]

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, it has been and continues to be my position that crimes of premeditated murder and certain other acts of premeditated terrorism in some instances merit the death penalty. The amendment before us, though it does not go as far as some of us would like, does restore the status quo as it existed before this issue was brought back to the House of Commons. Why was it brought back? It was brought back because the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and the government did not see fit to honour the existing law which was passed in this Chamber by a free vote. Had that law been honestly applied it would probably have made it unnecessary to raise this touchy issue at the present time.

As I say, this particular amendment would restore the former situation by deleting clause 4 and restoring section 214 of the Criminal Code. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward-Hastings has stated, prison guards and others in a like position do deserve special consideration. When one looks at the situation which prevails across the country today, the violence in our prisons and the crime which is being committed outside those prisons, it becomes obvious that society has not reached the stage at which the death sentence can be abolished no matter how much one might wish it had. For one thing, we still do not have in this country an adequate system of rehabilitation or a workable system of parole.

● (2140)

One particular situation that troubles me very much concerns a person who, for example, commits murder, is sent to prison and murders again. This time it is a guard whose life is taken. What does society do with this sort of individual? Does one put this person in chains or allow that individual, who may be a psychopath or just a plain, vicious killer, to remain in an institution menacing the lives of guards and other inmates? What do you do with a person who has demonstrated the capacity to kill repeatedly? That is the question to which we should address ourselves this evening.

One thing that has been lost sight of in this debate is that under the present law very few people who commit murder even face the possibility of being executed. The vast majority of the people who take the life of another do so in some extenuating circumstances. However, for the person who deliberately commits some kind of crime which most people regard as particularly abhorrent or unspeakable, there is no adequate way to deal with him at the present time until a way is devised to provide proper rehabilitation or other remedial assistance.

Anyone who heard the speech made by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) this evening would do nothing less than applaud his sincerity. Unlike many speeches made with a great deal of emotion, the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain did not get carried away with exaggeration, make unfair comments, or cast reflections upon anybody else, and he deserves a great deal of credit for his excellent speech.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacKay: In putting the case forward for myself as well as perhaps for others who feel with a great deal of sincerity that there are cases where the death penalty is merited, in doing away with the kind of violence, admittedly abhorrent, that is administered by the state, with the consent of the citizenry and under the sanction of the law, we may be trading one system for another which will bring about a vigilante type of violence, even a type of violence that is administered by police and prison guards for self-protection. It seems to me that at least an equal amount of violence will replace that which the minister and the government are trying to prevent. Until our system of justice, including rehabilitation and parole, becomes more refined and realistic, I cannot justify in my mind the total abolition of capital punishment.

It is fair to say, without being unduly sarcastic, that the Solicitor General in the administration of his portfolio, and the government in the administration of the country's affairs, have not demonstrated that they have matters

under the kind of control that would justify the vast majority of the people of Canada having confidence that their rights will be preserved and their protection improved by removing the death penalty. On the contrary, I think a vast number of people in this country feel a sense of betrayal on the part of the government in failing to provide protection for them in general, and for policemen and prison guards in particular.

I agree with all those who say that members of parliament must reflect their own consciences. Nevertheless I think it is incumbent on the government to recognize that perhaps as high a percentage of Canadians as 80 per cent feel very uneasy about the removal of the death penalty. In taking this extraordinary step surely the government should be able to point to some sort of improvement in prison conditions and in the administration of justice that will replace the security that many people feel the death penalty represents. Otherwise this would not be such an issue and you would not have eight out of 10 Canadians writing in to protest the death penalty being taken away.

If hon. members support this motion they will surely be coming to grips with the basic proposition that, in allowing police and prison guards to risk their lives to protect the rights and properties of Canadians, police and prison guards ought to have, as I maintain all Canadians ought to have, some sort of specialized protection. Otherwise, as a previous speaker this evening pointed out, it will become increasingly difficult to find people of sufficient calibre and initiative to make a career out of a very important and demanding occupation.

I hope the Solicitor General and the government will take into account the fact that up to this point in time they have not been able to improve or refine the administration of justice, parole services, facilities to reform criminals, or indeed do anything except to put in place of the death penalty a system which in many ways is more repressive and which makes the cause of prisoners more hopeless than it is today. Not only is the government giving people who are prone to violence and have nothing to lose an opportunity to vent their frustration by committing further murders, but many people convicted of murder will be sent to prison for a long time in situations where, if they were judged under the present law, they would be provided with some hope of rehabilitating themselves and re-entering society. Altogether, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is a very good amendment that will basically improve a very bad piece of legislation.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to say a few words on these amendments at report stage, and I rise to support this amendment. During the committee hearings we asked the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) about the changes being made by Bill C-84. The bill divides murder into first degree murder and second degree murder, and the penalty for murder in the first degree is 25 years' imprisonment. The bill refers to planned and premeditated murder, the killing of peace officers, police constables, correctional officers, wardens, deputy wardens, instructors and so on, and uses the term "without prejudice to the foregoing generalities".

The point has been made that guards, wardens, and correctional officers are responsible for guarding convicted murderers for 15 or 25 years. During the committee stage we asked the Solicitor General whether these people will be permitted to be released into society under any circumstances. The Solicitor General replied that on humanitarian grounds even these prisoners will be released, but with an escort. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if any person, regardless of his age, who has been found guilty of first degree murder under the terms and conditions of this bill and has been given 25 years' imprisonment is released on humanitarian grounds or for some reason or other with an escort, what value is he going to place on the life of that escort? That is why this amendment is so important, particularly if these people are to be released with escorts on humanitarian grounds.

● (2150)

Let me give you a little history, and I am not digressing. It was only a few years ago that humanitarian grounds under Section 26 of the Penitentiaries Act meant very special grounds. For a number of years it was necessary to get an order of a judge of the high court, and the attorney general's consent in the province where a person was incarcerated, before that person could be released on humanitarian grounds to attend the funeral of a member of his family, for example. Now this decision is made by an administrator, perhaps an individual without any knowledge of jurisprudence or of the law. Perhaps he interprets Section 26 of the Penitentiaries Act to mean any kind of grounds, because certainly people are being released now for any reason. Apparently many things are humanitarian. Some of the grounds are, of course, very unusual.

Let me review with you for a few minutes that intamous Geoffroy case. This was a person who was found guilty of the planned, premeditated murder of his wife. After he had killed her he burned the bed in the bedroom.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: Some hon. members may think this is funny, but this is what happened, and this is what we are talking about tonight. I am not in any sense attempting to be humorous. This person was found guilty by the court, then by the court of appeal of the province of Quebec, and then by the Supreme Court of Canada by the due process of law. Then how do we find humanitarian grounds being interpreted by the present Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), who was then the Solicitor General? This is so tragic that if it were written up it would almost be a comedy.

The reason the accused wanted out was that the children had no mother. Who had got rid of the mother? It was this man himself. The then solicitor general, who is now the Minister of Supply and Services, said he should be released. The accused took part in a ceremony of marriage with his mistress who was involved in the crime. The accused had had a long time liaison with her, whatever that means.

An hon. Member: And that is the fact.

Mr. Woolliams: And that is the fact, and I raised it in the House. In any event the necessary people gathered together to hold this ceremony, with all the candles, all the trimmings and all the things that go with it, because his

children needed a new mother. When the time came for the accused, Mr. Geoffroy, who had enjoyed a long time liaison with Miss Peron, to return, they had disappeared. I asked the then solicitor general, now the Minister of Supply and Services, to make a statement about this on motions. He said they had disappeared, but it wasn't very long before they found them. Where do you think they found them?

An hon. Member: In Spain.

Mr. Woolliams: You are right. They were found in Spain on the sand at the beach. The children had been left with the parents of one side or the other. Apparently their needs were not being neglected. If that is the way humanitarian grounds are to be interpreted by the Solicitor General's administrators, then let us not leave those people who are tonight waiting on death-row under difficult circumstances. If this bill goes through, no matter what kind of heinous crime they have committed, there will be a 25-year term of imprisonment substituted for the death penalty, and they will have the right to get out of an institution on humanitarian grounds. If that is to be the *stare decisis*, or the precedent to be followed, then we have a very sticky wicket. That is the first point I wanted to make.

Just two and a half years ago the present Solicitor General and our same Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), of course with different parliamentary secretaries, stood in this House, after having been at caucus, saying that if we would abolish capital punishment except in respect of murderers of police officers, wardens and correctional officers—if we would go along with that bill they would give it a trial for five years—some trial, some promise, and some commitment to the public!

I cannot call those people who made this commitment and this promise, including the government House leader, what I am thinking. I would not dare say that those people are hypocrites because of their failure to keep this promise and this commitment, but I can say in this House that this is the very basis for the definition of hypocrisy. That commitment and that promise were not only made to the people of Canada but to those people who have a lot of courage and guts in the Liberal party who will stand and vote against this Prime Minister, this House leader, and this cabinet.

Mr. Sharp: What about Joe Clark?

Mr. Woolliams: He happens to be our leader, but he has made no commitment to any other leader. He stands by his own conscience.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: But he is your leader.

Mr. Woolliams: Let me answer that little man from the civil service who got fired by the Tories and stands here and speaks so smoothly out of both sides of his mouth, and sometimes even with the front of his lips, asking us where our leader stands. I will tell him where our leader stands.

An hon. Member: Let's hear all about it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: What about Joe? Tell us about Joe.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Woolliams: Let me say to the hon. member that at least this party has the right and freedom to—

An hon. Member: Show respect.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, it those hon. members are the essence of respect, perhaps I should call it ten o'clock, because that is symbolic of the end.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL GALLERY—ACQUISITION OF ROOM PAINTED WITH MURALS AT KARSDALE, NOVA SCOTIA—REQUEST THAT IT REMAIN IN NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, the all-inspiring reason we are gathered together in such large numbers this late at night began about 130 years ago in a place called Karsdale on the shores of the Annapolis Basin in Nova Scotia. There, as legend or modern history would have it, a British sailor deserted his fleet and sought refuge in the home of a wealthy merchant. While being given haven he passed away the winter by painting a room with murals. This room, which exists today and is the subject matter of this question tonight, is 15 feet by 12 feet by 6 feet 11 inches high. It has two doorways, a fireplace, and three windows, two of which look out on the Annapolis Basin. I am just trying to have people feel as if they were sitting there in that particular room.

The paintings have now become the subject of some controversy in the province of Nova Scotia. Miss Gretchen Pierce, who is one of the journalists employed by the Halifax *Chronicle Herald*, has described it in part as follows:

● (2200)

He covered it with a gigantic mural with many different scenes depicting life in Great Britain and the rural life of the Indians, scenes from the Croscup's own life, . . .

That is a reference to the person who owned the home.

. . . their marriage, Croscup's wife and their firstborn . . . The walls of the room portray ship launchings, a group of MicMac Indians in the woods, a hunting scene, Queen Victoria with the Royal Family, and both St. Paul's Cathedral and Somerset House in London.

It shows Trafalgar Square, but in the days before the Nelson monument was placed there. The artist whoever he was—and again it is only legend which says that it was a British sailor who deserted who apparently has not left his name on anything in that room—did his work by pencil and then applied oil paint afterward. A few years back I understand there were several such painted rooms found

in Nova Scotia and other parts of eastern Canada, but now apparently the nearest one may be that in Wilmington, Delaware, where a home contains several painted rooms.

The National Gallery has acquired this room from its present owners and proposes to restore and remove the same to Ottawa so that the nation may join in this particular heritage. I do not quarrel with or fault the intention of the National Gallery, and indeed as a Nova Scotian I have to be a little shame-faced in saying that the problem really did not become recognized until after the sale had gone through.

Now, can this be moved? I have spoken to one of the most respected artists in the province of Nova Scotia, Dr. Donald Cameron MacKay, formerly the principal of the Nova Scotia College of Art, who says yes. Technology makes it possible to take a room, even a plastered room such as that one, cut it up in segments and move it many thousands of miles so that it can be reassembled in some other place. So obviously the issue is not only of whether this rather unique artistic heritage would suffer if it were moved. Perhaps the point is that Nova Scotia would be losing something that, even late in the day when we come to this conclusion, we think we should try to keep there. I will suggest a solution in a moment, as I did the other day when I asked the hon. lady the question which brings us here this evening.

There is something called the Atlantic Conservation Institute. It is funded by the National Museums. It works in my part of the world out of Moncton. It could carry out the work of restoration. It was not asked to do so in this particular case. I understand the work is being carried out by the arts faculty of Queen's University. I wish them well in seeing that the work is restored to its original splendor. Tomorrow Mr. Jean Trudel, the curator of early Canadian art of the National Gallery of Ottawa, will be in Annapolis Royal and he will be meeting with the Friends of the Painted Room, which is the name of the society that is trying to retain this for Nova Scotia. I wish them all well in dealing with what perhaps has become a rather difficult problem.

May I finally present my own suggestion. I do not like to see a deal cancelled. It was entered into a good faith by the National Gallery of Canada and the people who own the house. The provincial government could have been involved in this early but decided not to do so for reasons of its own. So I am not asking that the deal be cancelled. Rather I would suggest to the hon. lady and the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) that the National Gallery perhaps use a little imagination and try to make the best of what I think is a pretty good bargain.

I suggest that it not move the thing too far. There is the Champlain Habitation at Annapolis Royal, a few miles away, and I am sure there is a room which could be found there in which this unique painted room could be reassembled after restoration. The Annapolis Royal Habitation which exists in the constituency of my friend, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Miss Campbell), receives up to 190,000 visitors a year. This would not be part of the Champlain tradition, but it would be part of a tradition—

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

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was correct when he stated that this Painted Room is of concern to me. I would not like to see this artifact lost, and until the National Gallery stepped in that is exactly what was happening, as had happened to other similar rooms in the province. At present the Friends of the Painted Room are attempting to find solutions to this and to see how it can be kept in Nova Scotia and, more particularly, in the locale where it was found. But anyone who has visited the room will see that there is a big job of restoration to be done.

However, let me give some of the history of this. The board of trustees of the National Museums of Canada approved the purchase of the Painted Room in December of 1975. This decision was based on the board's judgment that the preservation of the room could best be assured through its acquisition by the National Gallery and brought to Ottawa where it could be restored and kept up under the proper conditions needed to keep such an artifact.

Before its purchase the director of the National Gallery advised the Nova Scotia government of the gallery's interest. In particular, the National Gallery wished to determine that the provincial government would not regard an offer to the room's owners, and its subsequent removal, as a loss to the provincial heritage. The reply to the director of the National Gallery was that the government of Nova Scotia was of course concerned about the departure from Nova Scotia of this art as a result of the purchase. However, it was felt that unless the province supported the gallery's initiative, the art might be totally lost. They recognized that the removal of the paintings was a delicate and costly task which the province was not able to undertake.

The removal to Ottawa of the paintings has been the subject of representations to the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) from private persons and non-governmental organizations in Nova Scotia. As far as the National Museums Corporation was able to determine before the purchase by the National Gallery, no local initiatives had been taken or were contemplated at the provincial or any other level to purchase, restore, and preserve the room for the public.

It is the intention of the National Gallery to instal the paintings in a part of the gallery devoted to the arts of the Maritime provinces.

The Painted Room will contribute to the national collection, the development of which is a major responsibility of the National Gallery. This involves acquiring works of art and artifacts from the various regions of Canada and bringing them to the national capital. If this were not the case, the national collection would cease to represent the Canadian cultural heritage in its totality. Perhaps these paintings may be able to be displayed when they have been restored in the local regions. Perhaps other arrangements could be looked at, but at this time the cost of saving these paintings and restoring them has to be undertaken, and the National Gallery has become responsible for this.

In carrying out this responsibility, the National Museums are sensitive to local concerns and are doing their utmost to ensure that these concerns are given fair consideration in all such purchases.

IMMIGRATION—MEDICAL CHECKS ON VISITORS FROM THE TROPICS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak about immigration and the spread of tropical diseases. I know that a great deal has been done in these areas, but I still feel that what has been done is not adequate to deal with the problem. I have stated the necessity for more drastic action to control the problem. I have stated that it is estimated that 10,000 people or more in the city of Toronto live underground and share corners with others. They are frightened, they receive no services, and they pay no taxes.

● (2210)

Apparently the federal government does not realize that Toronto is a multicultural city. The other night I talked to a girl from the city of Montreal who is now working in Toronto representing a firm there. She told me that on the subway one night she heard five different languages spoken, and that 52 per cent of the children going into primary school cannot speak English.

The field of children's health care is also becoming more and more overloaded, and a wide range of subtropical diseases is appearing. These diseases are being brought to Canada not just by immigrants. Many of them passed the requirements of a health department months before their immigration, and I would like to ask the minister if our standard has been met or the standard of the country from which these immigrants come.

I think it is basically unfair to allow an immigrant to come to this country and months or years afterwards to find that he is suffering from a parasitic disease. That puts a stigma on him and his family which is unfair. Since he may have unknowingly spread the disease to his family or others, that has made the health care system very costly.

I hope I will be forgiven for bringing to the attention of the Department of National Health and Welfare that many of these cases are missed for months or years because the medical profession does not have the opportunity of diagnosing subtropical or tropical diseases. To illustrate my point, I had a professional patient who suffered ill health for months. He had been in the east, and finally, after going around the circle, I diagnosed his problem because one of my associate doctors picked up the same disease while in Asia.

The point I am making is that we must be as careful as possible in diagnosing any disease which may be a subtropical or tropical disease. Let me add that parasitical diseases are accepted far more as a national occurrence in some countries than we can tolerate here.

I also want to say to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras)—and I am grateful to see him here in his seat tonight to answer me—that the risk increases with the length of time a person remains in Canada. However, the minister so far has been unable to state—and I can readily understand that—how many of those immigrants there are and how many of them stay longer than the average tourist. Surely here is a case in point. The minister says a year or more. How about three months or longer, with the net result of the spread of infection mounting with the passage of time?

The minister states he has very little to do with Canadians who have stayed in those countries for a long time. Some work there for industrial firms or otherwise, or perhaps even for the governments. Is there any good reason why a thorough medical examination, particularly with regard to tropical diseases, should not be required when they return to this country?

My final inquiry has to do with foreign students from tropical or subtropical countries. Are they or are they not covered by insurance prepaid at universities? I am advised that many of them become sick and are afraid to go to the hospital or to see a doctor because they think they are not covered. Are they examined for these diseases when they come to our universities? Are they covered by health care insurance?

I want to tell the ministers involved that I have dealt only with the Toronto area, but there is also Vancouver, Montreal, and Cambridge, which has more than 10,000 Portuguese among its population. These cases present an aspect of medicine which is new to this country, and preventive medicine should be practised to stop and control these infections. The minister must now assure us that preventive measures will be taken and adequate care will be provided.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard). The other day he asked me for some statistical information, particularly relating to immigrants and Canadians returning from tropical countries. I am not trying to dodge that. I want to tell him that we do not maintain statistics on the number of visitors precisely by classification of tropical or subtropical countries. That information is available, though, and the hon. member could actually collate it himself.

International travel statistics are obtained from Statistics Canada. We certainly use this information. If the hon. member were to identify those countries that he considers to be tropical, by reference to the latest publication called "Travel Between Canada and Other Countries" he would be able to find the statistics he seeks.

The second part of the question he posed the other day and asked again tonight was regarding visitors who stay in Canada longer than on an ordinary visit. I could give him that information if he would provide me with a list of the countries in which he is particularly interested. My parliamentary secretary outlined the procedures and the change in procedures quite clearly in May this year. The information is all in *Hansard* so I shall not repeat it.

In regard to Canadians returning to this country, the Department of National Health and Welfare has primary responsibility and screens all persons subject to immigration jurisdiction who are referred to that department by us at the primary inspection area or wherever we come in contact with them. The health screening procedure includes stool testing for the detection of parasitic diseases

and it is carried out on people coming from countries where parasitic diseases are prevalent. If the hon. member wants more specific information I would refer him to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde).

I do not consider this matter lightly, Mr. Speaker. I am alerted not only from other sources of information but by the hon. member's repeated expressions of concern. I intend to dig a little more into this area than we have done so far although I think he should recognize that we have taken very specific action in the last several months, particularly with visitors who stay more than 90 days and people who may be employed in food handling, and also foreign students. We recognize the potential danger in these areas.

I will check *Hansard* for the more specific questions that the hon. member posed tonight and will get him complete answers at the earliest opportunity.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN ALLOWABLE EARNINGS OF RECIPIENTS OF WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I am rising tonight to address myself to the difficulty that veterans are having in attempting to live a decent life on the income they are receiving. While it is recognized that increases have been forthcoming under the War Veterans Allowance Act and the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, there is an immediate need to review the amount of casual earnings and to increase it beyond the $1,000 for the single veteran and the $1,500 for the married recipient.

I realize that there have been periodic increases in the amount of casual earnings allowed but I am sure the minister recognizes that there is justification for a suitable increase immediately to allow veterans to cope with rising costs.

The government has recognized and has provided quarterly indexing to veteran recipients of the allowance, and if recognition exists in this regard it should follow that there should be a coincidental increase in casual earnings. However, since the need is immediate a simple order would put the increase into effect. May I suggest to the minister through the parliamentary secretary—and I know the minister always listens to my suggestions—that the increase be in the order of 50 per cent which would increase the earnings to $1,500 for the single recipient and $2,250 for the married recipient.

If I may refer to the act itself, it was implemented to recognize pre-aging of the veteran as a result of war service, and also because of need. The veteran recipient and his wife are now in their twilight years and in most cases the children of the family have gone on their own, having been brought up under difficulty because of the veteran parent being on a fixed income. I am sure it should be recognized that the veteran in this situation, or his wife who now might want to supplement their income, should be able to enjoy a bit of extra comfort, and the amounts presently existing restrict their ability to offer themselves for employment with any permanency. They often run into the embarrassing situation where overpayments are created because they might have innocently earned a little more than the allowable amount.

● (2220)

One of the most important needs that I see with respect to increasing the casual earnings of WVA recipients is that many live in their own homes which need repairs or improvements. Because of their fixed income they cannot afford to maintain them at a reasonable level; neither can they afford a home improvement loan under the National Housing Act or the costly material required, and until we can convince the government to expand the veterans' housing program to include a home rehabilitation item for veterans, an increase in the casual earnings would help the veterans to prevent the deterioration of their homes.

I think that the minister should also give consideration to treating as casual earnings the meagre amounts that a veteran might be receiving under workmen's compensation and the Canada Pension Plan, particularly for those who cannot work.

Under the War Veterans Allowance Act a single recipient receives at present, on an unmarried basis, the amount of $221.98, while the married receipient receives $378.48. For those who can earn, this would mean that the single veteran would receive $350 and the married veteran about $550, which he could earn with pride and dignity.

I hope that the parliamentary secretary, who is most sympathetic to the veterans' cause, will pass on to the minister my remarks so that I can receive confirmation with a positive reply as to the action the minister has taken, whether or not he has made an approach to cabinet and on what date we can expect an announcement for increasing casual earnings which are so direly needed by veterans under the War Veterans Allowance Act.

Mr. S. Victor Railton (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy discussing these matters with the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) because we are both interested in seeing what we can obtain for war veterans receiving the WVA. The hon. member ought to realize that we, in our caucus, are interested in this problem and we have received recommendations similar to his from various members.

The hon. member pointed out that what was allowed to veterans receiving WVA in 1973 is now inadequate, and if we could increase from $1,000 to $1,500 the casual earnings allowable to a single veteran, and from $1,500 to $2,000 those to the married veteran, it would be a great help. On the other hand those might or might not be the correct amounts. Who knows; they might not be enough? That will need to be worked out. Such earnings are provided for under the War Veterans Allowance Act and Part XI of the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act.

I always have to remind hon. members that, from the point of view of financial assistance, we have probably the best war veterans legislation in the world. There have been major changes recently in the legislation covering veterans. These include additional allowances for children and quarterly escalation of ceilings of WVA recipients. However, as the hon. member says, we have done nothing since 1973 to increase the allowable ceiling on casual earnings. I

think the minister did say recently he was in the process of addressing himself to this question. I know this to be the case.

Studies are going on, though they are not completed, and we expect that changes in the regulations will be made in the near future. That might not be an altogether satisfactory answer, but I do not mean that an announcement will be made in a year or two; I mean in the next few months. I believe the increases will permit levels which more accurately reflect wage levels at the present time. We as a department are anxious to take action which will ensure that Canada does honour those who served us so bravely in war.

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

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 7, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

PROPOSED PENSIONS FOR HOUSEWIVES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which some of us feel should be brought urgently to the attention of the government. I therefore move, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House urges the government to bring in legislation that will establish pension rights for homemaker spouses equivalent to the rights of those employed outside the home, and that the government commit itself to the inclusion of this legislation in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the next session of this parliament.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE VOTE ON AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion dealing with an important and urgent matter.

In view of the gravity of the consequences of the conflict generated by the air controllers and pilots of Canada, except for the Gens de l'air du Québec, as the protocol of agreement signed by CALPA, CATCA and the Minister of Transport constitutes one of the worst affronts ever inflicted upon the government in the history of this country, as the decision of the Minister of Transport is stamped with chauvinism and racism which are contrary to the most elementary rights of the francophone citizens in Canada, and taking into account the fact that all the right-minded hon. members of this Parliament cannot associate themselves with so revolting an act, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That this House demand immediately that a recorded vote be taken so that all Canadians might know who, in this House, disapprove or approve of the attitude of the Minister of Transport in the conflict that opposes him to the air controllers and pilots in Canada, a positive vote leading necessarily to the resignation of the minister concerned.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

WELCOME TO ALL ATHLETES AND APPROVAL OF DECISION IN RESPECT OF TAIWAN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43, and I do so because of the nearness of the Olympic Games. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais):

That this House welcomes to Canada all athletes participating in the Olympic Games, including those from Taiwan, and that this House approve the decision to allow Taiwan athletes to compete only as representatives of Taiwan and not the Republic of China.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

SUGGESTED CONTROL OF INFLATED PRICES ASKED BY TRAVEL AGENCIES FOR TRIPS TO GAMES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move an urgent motion.

Travel agencies throughout the world are now selling package-deal trips to allow people to come to the Olympics, at terms more profitable than the best organized hold-ups. For example, a roundtrip airplane ticket between Miami and Montreal for three days, with two-night accommoda-

tion and tickets for one Olympic activity can be bought for the reasonable sum of $1400 per person. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the Secretary of State for External Affairs make representations to the Canadian embassies abroad to ask them to keep a close eye on the abusive practices of those travel agencies, which will cause enormous damage to the good commercial name Canada enjoys abroad.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

* * *

[English]

STATUS OF WOMEN

PROPOSAL TO REMOVE SEX DISCRIMINATION IN PAY PRACTICES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43 which I am sure all members will agree does not require any debate because I know they will want to accept it. I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert):

That this House calls on the government to establish on a mandatory basis the permissive clause in the anti-inflation program relating to the elimination of sex discrimination in pay practices.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[Translation]

OLYMPIC GAMES

REQUEST THAT EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER NOT INTERFERE WITH GAMES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Considering that the Olympic Games should not be used to make politics and politicking in favour or at the expense of various countries and considering that the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs which aims at forcing the People's Republic of China not to use their recognized name is a serious intrusion in the affairs of another country and a serious breach of the Olympic ethics,

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That this House immediately order the Secretary of State for External Affairs to modify his position towards the IOC for his unjustifiable intrusion in the operation of the Olympic Games which should not be subject to the disgusting blackmail from irresponsible people who take advantage of the Olympic Games to make politics.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There not being unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

* * *

[English]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

PARTICIPATION OF NATIVES IN FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON MERCURY POLLUTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a very important and urgent matter to seek the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion under Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that federal and Ontario cabinet ministers are meeting July 9 to discuss the mercury pollution problem in northwestern Ontario, but no representatives of the native people of the area who are suffering the effects of this pollution have been invited to the meeting, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House instruct the Minister of Indian Affairs to invite the chiefs of the White Dog and Grassy Narrows reserves to attend the July 9 meeting as full participants in the discussions of this crucial situation.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Oral question period.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

POSSIBILITY OF TRANSFER OF TAX POINTS TO COMPENSATE PROVINCES FOR LOST REVENUE AND RECONSIDERATION OF REVENUE GUARANTEE

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance and relates to the meetings he held yesterday with the provincial ministers of finance. In light of the substantial

loss of revenue which the provinces will suffer as a result of the government's announced intention to terminate the revenue guarantee payments, will the minister tell the House whether the government is considering the transfer of tax points to compensate the provinces for these losses, and further, given that the federal government has unilaterally changed the formula for the revenue guarantee payments owing for fiscal years already completed thus breaking an existing agreement with the provinces, will the government reconsider this decision so as to restore an atmosphere of basic trust to the current negotiations?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the hon. lady—

Some hon. Members: Hon. member.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —that the arrangements for the revenue guarantee were with regard to a five year period which would enable the provinces to adjust their own taxation systems to the changes brought about by the tax reform. The program was specifically for the purpose of making that adjustment, and the understanding at the time at which it was entered into was that the provinces should amend their tax systems accordingly. We have made it clear to the provinces that we do not intend to continue beyond 1976 the sweeping revenue guarantee that has existed in the past, and of course it was understood that the provinces over the intervening five years would have to adjust their own taxation systems to take care of the change in revenue that would be brought about.

The hon. lady refers to our claim back for the years that are now closed, 1972 and 1973. It is true that there was a federal over-payment by about $300 million in respect of those two fiscal years. We have made it clear, both in the House and to the provinces, that we are not seeking to claim back that amount for those years.

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF FEDERAL PROPOSALS AND SCHEDULE FOR FUTURE FINANCE AND FIRST MINISTERS' MEETINGS

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): The minister did not answer my question with regard to the fiscal years 1974, 1975 and 1976 in which the provinces will be losing $700 million, I should like some reply as to whether or not the government will compensate the provinces for that loss which they will suffer under an existing agreement. In view of the fact that all of these matters must be dealt with by members of the House and because we had been denied information until now, will the minister today table the federal government's proposals and documents, including the briefing books that were given to the provinces at yesterday's meeting, and will he also give the House the schedule for the future finance and first ministers' meetings and tell us when he expects these negotiations to be completed?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): With regard to the first part of the hon. lady's statement—

Some hon. Members: Hon. member's statement.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): —I should point out that in fact the obligation to pay in relation to 1974 will not arise until later this year. If the question arises as to what the provinces were expecting for the years 1974 and 1975, and indeed for the current year, presumably one should look at the estimates of revenues which they have made in their own budgetary statements to their own provincial legislatures, from which it is clear they were not expecting the much more substantial payments to which they have now laid claim.

With regard to the documents arising out of the federal-provincial conference, a copy of which I have here, I have asked my department officials to take steps to have this rather voluminous information translated, and as soon as we have it available in both official languages I will be quite happy to table it in the House.

With regard to the timetable of meetings, the next meeting will be held by the consulting committee at which officials will be meeting during the course of the summer. I anticipate that there will be at least one if not two meetings of the finance ministers between now and November, and I think the first ministers are considering the possibility of a first ministers' meeting in November for the purpose also of dealing with this among other issues.

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE PROVINCES WILL NOT LOSE UNDER PROPOSALS FOR SHARED-COST PROGRAMS

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, the question that I would like to put to the Minister of Finance has to do with assurances to the provinces, assurances which were broken under the revenue guarantee payment. Given the Prime Minister's assurance following the first ministers' meeting in June that the have-not provinces would not suffer under any new proposals for shared-cost programs, will the minister today undertake to give the same kind of assurance to the House that no province which now qualifies, and will continue to qualify, for equalization payments will receive less money under any new equalization formula than it receives at present?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): With regard to the federal government's assurance on entering into the revenue guarantee, it was to indemnify the provinces for the revenue that they would lose if in fact the new tax system did not yield as much as the old one. In fact, from the calculations made now it is quite clear that the government has been indemnifying them for that. Indeed, the federal government unilaterally went one step further and has also undertaken and has paid them indemnification for changes which occurred in the provincial tax system as a result of subsequent changes made in the taxation system in this parliament to relieve the weight of taxation upon Canadian taxpayers generally.

● (1420)

With regard to the equalization payments, I made it clear to the provinces that the examples used for the purpose of calculation of equalization on one or other of the three formulas did not indicate an intention to drop the absolute amount, that we would certainly make certain that the new formula would not reduce the absolute amount and that these calculations are for demonstrative purposes only. Of course, with respect to any particular province, it

depends on the formula adopted and the structure of that province's own taxation system. I think one can say, with regard to the transfer payment system generally to the have-not provinces, that that will not yield less to them in the future in general terms than it is paying to them now.

* * *

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF TAX REDUCTION IN VIEW OF EXCESS REVENUES

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. As federal revenues since tax reform have exceeded expectations, and as the minister has made this point quite clear in giving reasons why the provincial revenue guarantees should be terminated retroactively, does the minister propose, now that revenue guarantee payments will likely no longer take place, the reduction of federal tax rates so that the excess revenue referred to by the minister and others may lessen and so that the Canadian taxpayer will not be double taxed as a result of the federal action? Let us remember that there is only one taxpayer for all levels of government.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Exactly, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I point out to the hon. gentleman, as I pointed out to the provinces, that there was no excess revenue coming to the government of Canada, but if, as the provinces insisted, the full amount of the revenue guarantee, as calculated by the econometric formula, be paid to the provinces, then there would have to be an increase in federal taxation against federal taxpayers for the purpose of paying that greater amount. We feel that the provinces have been indemnified for what they have expected, as indicated in their own budgetary statements, and that they should not be claiming something greater than indemnity.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAXES TO PROVINCES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): As the minister advocates the transfer of tobacco and alcohol taxing power, a low growth revenue source, to the provinces to assist the provinces in the financing of such programs as medicare and hospital insurance, is the minister concerned that the provinces will be left with no option but to try to accelerate the consumption of tobacco and alcohol in order to stimulate revenue growth, which in turn might create further health problems and thus be counterproductive?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As is well known, the provinces gain the most from the sale of alcoholic beverages throughout Canada through the profits of the provincial liquor commissions and through the existing provincial sales taxes. I should correct the hon. gentleman and say that the excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco were one of the options we put before the provincial governments. We put several before them for the purpose of their choosing in this respect. I would have to say that with respect to taxation on tobacco and alcohol, this would have provided something of a rationalization of the taxing of these two commodities since so much of it is already done at the provincial level. This would have put the full responsibility for taxation on the provincial governments and therefore would have simplified the system. We are not insisting on it, however. They have other options to choose.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

EFFECT ON PROVINCIAL REVENUES OF TRANSFER OF TAX POINTS TO REPLACE COST-SHARING PROGRAMS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question with regard to the cost-sharing proposals of the federal government. By giving the provinces, as a substitute for the present 50-50 cost-sharing on health and post-secondary education, a new package which is substantially dependent on tax points, I would like to ask the minister whether he agrees that this leaves the provinces much more vulnerable in these precise areas in the sense that provincial taxes for almost all provinces are levied as a percentage of the federal tax, and therefore if the federal government changes its tax policy, the provinces could well get less revenue than they had planned for, as happened when the government introduced indexing.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should correct the hon. gentleman. The proposal is not principally on tax points. On the several options mentioned, one provides for a 66⅔ per cent payment in cash, another for 50 per cent in cash, with the balance for transmittal in terms of tax points. The basic proposition the hon. gentleman puts with respect to the impact on the provincial tax base on personal income tax is quite correct. I would remind him, however, that at least from some of the provinces—and there was evidence of this again at the meeting yesterday—there has been insistence on the transfer of tax points because they know that in the long run these taxes will return them a far greater yield than would cash payments.

Mr. Broadbent: To be perfectly clear then, the minister is conceding that by shifting away from a 50-50 cost-sharing formula in relation to health care and post-secondary education costs to a system which weighs heavily—I shall not put it more strongly than that—on the tax point system, leaves the provinces in a much more vulnerable position in terms of ability to forecast their own revenue expectations to cover the fields I have mentioned.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There is no doubt that changing the tax base under a uniform tax collection system could have the effect of reducing provincial revenues. This, presumably, was well known to those provinces which sought not only half the transfer but the whole of the transfer of tax points. So, now it looks like it depends very much on where you sit in this country. With regard to the less well-favoured provinces, the cash payment has more effect than the transfer of tax points.

AMOUNT OF REVENUE PROVINCES LOSE AS RESULT OF ABANDONMENT OF REVENUE GUARANTEE FORMULA

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I welcome the minister's candor. That, of course, is precisely why a number of provinces are opposed to what he is proposing. Would the minister confirm the estimate made by the government of Saskatchewan that the provinces would lose collectively over the next ten years $18 billion as a result of the government's unilateral decision to abandon the existing revenue guarantee formula?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I can confirm that that is not accurate. In the first place, the premise put forward by the hon. gentleman is not accurate. We have not abandoned the revenue guarantee formula. We have undertaken to pay an indemnity and we are paying it. We have also made it clear that the formula was valid for a period of five years. What the province of Saskatchewan was really saying was this: if there had been a promise to continue it beyond five years, that would have been the figure. Perhaps it would and perhaps it would not, but that is a hypothetical question which does not relate either to the existing arrangement or to the facts.

* * *

[Translation]

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED RESIGNATION OF MINISTER IN VIEW OF AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport.

In view of the sharp protests coming from everywhere following the decision by the minister about the agreement signed with CALPA and CATCA, and in view of the very serious effects resulting from that mistake he made, which is recognized by some cabinet members and even by the right hon. Prime Minister, could the minister tell the House when he intends to resign from the cabinet?

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

MEASURES TO MAKE INVESTMENT IN CANADA MORE ATTRACTIVE TO CANADIANS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. As investment by Canadian businessmen in foreign countries during the past five years has tripled—in 1975 it exceeded foreign investment in Canada by $200 million—is the minister considering plans to make investment in Canada at least as attractive as investment abroad with consequence advantages to Canadian production and employment? If that is the case, would the minister announce what these plans are at the first opportunity on motions?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I am not proposing at this point to make any statement on further fiscal changes of the kind set out by my predecessor to stimulate manufacturing and processing investment in Canada. In my view, the principal concern investors might have felt with respect to Canada was the rate of inflation in this country, together with the rate of increase in cost due to high wage settlements. As the hon. member knows, we have set ourselves, under the anti-inflation policy, the goal of reducing the rate of inflation and, as a consequence, reducing the increase in industrial costs, perhaps the most important single factor in reaching investment decisions.

● (1430)

Mr. Hees: Considering the government's obvious lack of intent to make investment in this country more attractive for Canadian businessmen, is it any wonder Canadian businessmen are forced to make large investments abroad, as they are presently doing?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would have to say to the hon. member, and to those in the business community who share his thinking, that the primary goal in Canada for all Canadians should be the overcoming of inflation in this country.

Mr. Hees: What about overcoming unemployment?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): This is always a critical factor. I point out to the hon. gentleman that if we fail to overcome inflation the rate of unemployment will be very much greater in Canada. As for those people who state they would not enter into investments for plant and equipment which would have a useful life of between 20 and 25 years because of the interim nature of the anti-inflation program, I suggest to them that they should do their thinking again. We believe that Canada is and will be a good investment area for Canadian and foreign business, and that they have as much to gain as any of us by supporting the anti-inflation program; and the attitudes of some members of the business community which negate the anti-inflation program really are negating their own interests as well.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

EFFECT OF ALLEGED CHANGE IN LOCKHEED PROPOSAL FOR LONG-RANGE PATROL AIRCRAFT

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. It has been reported that Lockheed has reduced the cost of its new proposal for the LRPA by dropping some of the more sophisticated electronic gear. Since we have been told many times that this sophisticated equipment is necessary if we are to do the job adequately with 18 aircraft, are we now to assume that less sophisticated equipment means that we shall do the job less than adequately, or will we need to acquire more aircraft?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Look who is beside you.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the co-operation between the Minister of Supply and Services and myself has always been very close; now, we are even closer.

Mr. Hees: You are a great stand-up comedian.

Mr. Paproski: Now, we know who is writing your French lines.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Richardson: I know the Minister of Supply and Services would join me in telling our hon. friend that the subject he has raised is before cabinet and, when the decision has been reached, I am certain that question and all others will be satisfactorily answered.

Mr. Hees: That was a fine, stock answer.

REASON FOR PLACING LOCKHEED PROPOSAL BEFORE CABINET RATHER THAN BOEING

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, that answer is similar to the one we heard before the last fiasco, before that "Odd Couple" were put down at the end of the treasury bench. Bearing in mind the minister said that if anyone misled anyone, it was Lockheed, can the Minister of National Defence tell us what it was about Lockheed's performance over the past year that led him to place that company's new proposal before cabinet in a position preferential to that of Boeing?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there was a contract definition phase in which the Government of Canada funded not only Lockheed but Boeing as well for several months. As a result of that long study the Lockheed company, as I am certain the hon. member will remember, was selected for a variety of reasons which were all explained at that time.

* * *

HARBOURS

EFFECT OF REMOVAL OF PORT MANAGER AT CHURCHILL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. I ask whether he has had representations made by the Hudson Bay Route Association concerning the situation created at Port Churchill through the removal of the manager and the reduction of that port from a national port to just one of the other ordinary ports. What has been his reaction thereto?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, of course there was reaction at the time of the change of the port management. I am satisfied that the new port manager will settle all concerns in that regard. The right hon. gentleman is wrong, of course, in suggesting any diminution of the voice of the port of Churchill. Indeed, I have made clear that my strong, personal feeling is that Churchill was and would continue to be recognized as a national port.

[Mr. Paproski.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I was reading from the representation made in connection with the reduction in the status of that port. There is a great deal of uncertainty and feeling in western Canada that western Canadian farmers and the people in general are being sold out again in this connection.

An hon. Member: They are being sold a port.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask the minister whether he will stand up for the western provinces in this regard and see to it that Churchill port is used to a greater extent than ever before, instead of reducing its potentiality?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I have arranged a meeting with the Hudson Bay Route Association, to keep myself fully in touch with the situation. The right hon. gentleman seems to have missed the fact that we expect a record shipment of grain through the port of Churchill this year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: I wish he would avoid his usual habit of trying to spread uncertainty by repeating a false statement and suggesting that there is any diminution of the role of the port.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Withdraw.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the minister always resorts to cheap condemnation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask him, what is the purpose for the meeting with the Hudson Bay Route Association if it is not a fact that they know he is joining in selling out the west?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I constantly have meetings with people such as the Hudson Bay Route Association. I do not ask the right hon. gentlemans permission to meet with people of all types all across this country. I simply ask him to respect some longstanding traditions of this place, if of nowhere else, and to accept what I said to him in terms of there being no diminution. That is the fact.

CHURCHILL—REPLACEMENT OF INTERIM PORT MANAGER—ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL PORT AUTHORITY

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Transport. Although this year, hopefully, is to be a record year for the port, I think the minister has done everything in his power to scuttle that record year. I ask the minister what arrangements are being made to replace the present port manager who is serving on an interim basis and who will leave on November 1? What is being done to promote a local port authority, and who will be selecting the port manager who is to serve full time from November 1?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say to the hon. member that the appointment of Mr. Lauzon to the port has been very well

received, I believe. He is a competent person. I am happy to hear no question of that. I barely detected any note of appreciation for the record year we are enjoying in Churchill. Mr. Speaker, I barely detected any appreciation of that. The management will, of course, be in permanent place in due course. The question of the port authority awaits legislation in this place, and I do not suggest that it will be in this session.

Mr. Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, the minister and also the chairman of the National Harbours Board made a statement to the effect that a local port authority would be in place by April, 1977. I understood it did not have to await legislation. Will the minister now guarantee that there will be a local port commission in Churchill and that they will be involved, along with members of the local port commission from the prairies, in the selection of a permanent port manager?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member is somewhat confused.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lang: There is a new chairman to be appointed to the current authority. The references to April were references by the chairman of the National Harbours Board to his optimism that the new legislation creating the new port authority would be available by that time and that we would have the new port authority in place under that legislation. At present we are looking for a replacement in the case of a vacancy.

* * *

AIRPORTS

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITY AT ST. LEONARD, NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the minister's previous statements in this House in answer to some of my questions regarding the construction of an airport facility in northwest New Brunswick, at St. Léonard, I wonder if the minister is now in a position to say if the ministry will go ahead with the project; if so, when; if not, why not; and if it is delayed, how long will we have to wait?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a decision has not yet been taken but discussions are going on; they include discussions with the provincial government. We are seeking the support of the province in the development of the kind of airport that would, in the opinion of the area, be the ideal and which may be beyond that which would ordinarily be there as a result of Ministry of Transport policies. We have not yet had full concurrence from the province and their willingness to share.

● (1440)

ENERGY

AMOUNT OF LOSS ON SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MANUFACTURING PLUTONIUM

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It arises out of the renegotiated agreement with Argentina regarding the sale of a CANDU reactor. In view of the fact the chairman of the AECL stated before the standing committee on national resources that on this deal Canada stood to lose at least $96 million and since press reports indicated that the price has been raised by $70.5 million, leaving a loss of at least $25.5 million, can the minister tell the House the estimated total loss on this contract, including not only the reactor but also the sales of uranium supplies, electro-magnetic parts and heavy water? Will he also tell the House why the people of Canada should not only sell the reactor to Argentina but pay over $25 million for the privilege?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I answered a question from the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands on precisely the same point. I told her at that time that the renegotiation had been virtually completed. It remains to come forward to ministers in both countries for their final approval. I have not yet submitted this renegotiated commercial contract and terms to my colleagues for their approval. Therefore, I am not in a position at the present time to discuss the precise numbers with the hon. member. I can tell him that as a result of the renegotiation there has been a very substantial saving in the cost—

An hon. Member: The loss.

Mr. Gillespie: —in the loss.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: I do not make any secret of the fact that we entered into this renegotiation because we were faced with a loss. The reason we were faced with a loss was that the contract was negotiated at a time when inflation rates in Canada and the Argentine were very much lower than they are now. If we had the benefit of the hindsight, of course we would never have entered into that agreement.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: I can say that we have been able to work out very much better terms, which should be a substantial gain for Canada.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Despite the fact the matter has not been to cabinet, surely the House has a right to know what is the estimated loss under this new renegotiated agreement. The chairman of AECL admitted at least $96 million. Some of us worked out figures closer to $160 million. The figures printed in the press upgrade the original price by $70.5 million. That still leaves a $90 million loss, not $25 million. Surely the people of Canada have a right to know. If the minister is not prepared to tell us now, is he prepared to table in the

House all the figures as to the original agreement covering not only the reactor, but the uranium, the parts and the heavy water so that this House will know what is being done with the taxpayers' money with respect to a poorly formulated deal which the government not only goofed in the beginning, but has bungled in the renegotiating?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear that when I am in a position to provide the facts to the House, I will do so. I will do that as promptly as I can. However, the hon. member and the House must recognize that until we have an agreement that meets the approval of cabinet, I am not in a position to give any figures.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, can the minister or the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs give any information in view of the fact that Argentina has not signed the non-proliferation treaty and has been building an experimental separation plant for the separation of plutonium? With regard to this renegotiated agreement, has Canada asked Argentina to sign and ratify the non-proliferation treaty, and undertaken to dismantle any separation plant it has and guaranteed that it will not purchase a separation plant?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs answered a question like that earlier this week or last week when he indicated that the bilaternal arrangements which Canada had negotiated with the Argentine were the strictest safeguards in the world and would fully comprehend the kind of point made by the hon. member.

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Regardless of whether the minister and the cabinet as a whole have considered the options for alternatives available in respect of the agreement, which I understand has already been initialed by the head of AECL, the head of AECL has supplied the minister with the estimated figures. They are on the minister's desk now. Regardless of whether cabinet has approved of them or not, will the minister kindly give the House now the estimated figures from the head of AECL?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have already given, I am not in a position to do so at this time.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

COURT DECISION GIVING BRITISH COLUMBIA JURISDICTION OVER SEABED RESOURCES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. What action, if any, does the government propose to take in response to the judicial opinion issued late last week in the British Columbia Supreme Court assigning to the province jurisdiction over the resources of the seabed and the subsoil under the waters separating the mainland from Vancouver Island and also the Queen Charlottes?

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

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we are considering the judgment of the Court of Appeal of British Columbia on that reference. No decision as to whether to appeal will be taken until that has been completed.

* * *

ENERGY

OIL AND GAS—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF AMOUNT DISCOVERED AT SABLE ISLAND—REASON FOR DELAY IN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the controversy surrounding the ownership of offshore mineral rights, especially in the 200 mile jurisdictional zone, and the statement recently by the government leader in the Senate that three discovery wells off Nova Scotia are sufficiently promising to warrant step-out drilling, can the minister inform the House whether he has any knowledge of the quantity of oil and gas discovered in the Sable Island area? If so, in view of the announced energy shortage, just when can we expect further development of these resources?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to provide any finite figures. I have received information which indicates that the prospects are promising. Indeed, I hope to go to the Nova Scotia shelf myself this weekend and talk with some of the operators in the area, discuss the conduct of the particular drilling operations undertaken by Shell Canada with the assistance of PetroCanada and to discuss with the premier of Nova Scotia some of the reserves and resources which may be off Sable Island, as well as the whole process of trying to come together quickly with an agreement between the maritime provinces and the federal government governing the administration and the sharing of the potential resources on the Scotian shelf and eastern offshore.

Mr. Crouse: Since the technique of drilling for oil and gas in offshore areas is well established in the Gulf of Mexico, the Arabian Gulf and other areas, will the minister inform the House the reasons for the delay in developing the Sable Island wells, one of which is estimated could produce something like 15,000 barrels of condensate daily, including 2,000 barrels of high quality oil?

Mr. Gillespie: These decisions, of course, have been made in the past by private sector companies for their own reasons. Undoubtedly some of them have been inhibited by the fact that agreement has not been reached between the maritime provinces and the federal government. It has been one of my priorities to urge a settlement and I hope we will be able to proceed very quickly to reach a settlement respecting the administration and sharing of resources on the east coast. That is my priority.

● (1450)

PROPOSAL BY NOVA SCOTIA CONCERNING AID IN REDUCING COST OF ELECTRICITY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who some months ago, I think, received a secret and confidential proposal from the government of the province of Nova Scotia regarding assistance for power rates. Has the government of Canada reached a decision with respect to that proposal, is the decision favourable or unfavourable, and if a decision has not been made, when will one be made?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, no decision has been made at the present time, but I can tell the hon. member that the matter is under consideration.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate to the House whether there are any discussions planned between the government of Nova Scotia or the governments of the maritime provinces and the minister's department on the minister's proposal regarding possible ways of reducing the cost of electric power in the maritime provinces? If so, when will the discussions be held?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will be familiar with the prososal I made to the maritime premiers orally. I have followed that up with a letter inviting the participation of the maritime premiers with the federal government in a study, financed if necessary 100 per cent by the federal government. I will be meeting this weekend, I expect, with at least two of the premiers of maritime Canada and I hope we will be able to advance significantly the terms of such a study.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

PROVINCIAL PROPOSAL RELATING PAYMENTS FOR HEALTH AND EDUCATION TO GROWTH OF FEDERAL REVENUES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance, and it is a follow-up of questions asked earlier this afternoon with respect to the meeting yesterday of the provincial finance ministers and the Minister of Finance. My question relates to the federal government's proposal to tie its cash payments to the provinces for health care and post-secondary education to increases in the gross national product. In view of the criticism of this proposal on the ground that it poses a threat to the maintenance of existing national standards, something that was of great importance originally to the federal government, is the federal government giving consideration to the suggestion by Ontario and other provinces that such payments relate instead to the growth rate of federal government revenues?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should say that the hon. gentleman inadvertently stated the position of a number of other governments, including Saskatchewan, which is related to the expenditure level. The basic principles that we would apply in this regard are that these are established programs, that the cost elements are now well known, and experience over the last several years has shown that on average they have stayed within the rate of growth of the gross national product.

There is this more fundamental question, that is to say whether, if federal expenditures are to be limited, as the government has stated is its intention, there should be a reduction in other expenditures so that expenditures on these particular programs should go up really irrespective of the actual cost experience. We think it is reasonable to expect that costs in this regard will be related to the gross national product, as they will be in other areas, and in that sense that is the basis of the total proposal that we have put forward.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CUSTOMS

LACK OF FACILITIES AT SAINTE-FOY AIRPORT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of National Revenue.

Could he tell the House why his department recently issued new administrative guidelines under which for all practical purposes it will henceforth be impossible to ensure the customs clearance for flights with over 100 passengers at the Sainte-Foy airport in Quebec City, and could he tell whether anyone has looked into the impact of these guidelines on the economy of the Quebec City region whose most important industry is tourism, and whether his department plans to reexamine that matter?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, because of the representations of the hon. member for Montmorency, there is now a study under way on the facilities at the Quebec City airport. Unfortunately, the dimension of the current facilities limits us to a maximum capacity of 100 persons. You will understand that it is difficult to use the airport when we have 350 passengers.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

EFFECT OF REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURES ON ISSUANCE OF TECHNICAL BULLETINS

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works in his capacity as Minister of State for Science and Technology. The public is really aware of the radical surgery that has been performed on research grants in this country. The National Research Council is now sending out technical bulletins in only one of the official languages. Is this the result of the cutbacks in research? Is this the way they are affecting the National Research Council?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of this and I will be glad to make inquiries.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGING BAN ON PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE GIVEN AT PRELIMINARY HEARINGS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. It relates to a statement he made with reference to the ban on publication of evidence given at preliminary hearings, with which I agree. If I may just refer to a comment of the minister, he said he was concerned about the way the publication ban at preliminary hearings can backfire, wounding innocent third parties. Does the minister intend to change the law in this regard, since the publication of evidence given at preliminary hearings does directly affect third parties. As one distinguished parliamentarian said, people in public life swim in the nude.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to determine what change in the law should be made in that the law is quite explicit that there should be no publication. We are examining proposals resulting from my work with the Law Reform Commission and the provincial attorneys general for some amendments regarding pretrial procedures. The rule against publication and how it should be enforced could be re-examined along with them, but as I have already said the law is quite explicit. There should be no publication and it is rather difficult to know how to express it more forcefully than it is already expressed.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice says that the law is quite clear. Will he make it quite clear whether it is his intention to tighten the law in this regard or to bring in certain penalties in cases where there is disclosure which should not be made, or is the minister going to do away with the ban altogether.

Mr. Basford: Penalties are already provided, Mr. Speaker, and there is also a prohibition against publication when so ordered by a judge. Therefore, as I say, it is rather difficult to know what further steps to take. I will be happy to review the matter in terms of clarifying either the law's intent and purpose or the penalties associated with a breach of the law. If the hon. member has any suggestions to make in this regard I would welcome them.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

INQUIRY IF VALUE TO TAXPAYER PARAMOUNT CONSIDERATION IN ADMINISTERING PROGRAM

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State; I gave his office notice last evening of the nature of the question. It arises out of a great deal of unfavourable publicity given to the administration of multicultural grants in London which for some reason the Secretary of State administers rather than the Department of Labour. An employee in the minister's department, one Carol Aziz, in referring to grant recipients who had not completed the program for which funding had been received, is quoted as saying that "people have a tendency to bite off more than they can chew" and that "their expectations are often too high". She is then reported to have said that it is not important whether taxpayers have gotten their money's worth. My question to the minister is whether it is his department's value to the taxpayer is the paramount consideration in the administration of this program and, if so, has this policy been communicated clearly to those in his department who administer the program?

[Mr. Friesen.]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to a grant under the multicultural program which was assessed by officers of the department, who recommended its approval. I think the information in the article—I believe we are referring to the same one—is erroneous. There was no time frame involved. It was an assessment in the crafts area in multicultural communities for internal purposes, in terms of the future allocations of grants in this area. It has been helpful and we have utilized the findings of the people who worked on the survey in London.

Mr. Jarvis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mrs. Aziz is also reported to have said that although she hands out public moneys, her first responsibility is not to the public but to the organizations which receive grants. I would ask the minister whether Mrs. Aziz was stating departmental policy accurately and, if not, would the minister like to take this opportunity to correct that statement if in fact it was correctly reported in the press?

● (1500)

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member may be overly critical of this particular civil servant. Of course, it is the policy that our officers and civil servants generally are responsible to the government which they serve and which, in turn, is responsible to the people. In addition to which, she is obviously supposed to respond to and monitor the dealings of the groups for which she is responsible. I do not believe it is entirely necessary to put it on the basis of first and second priorities. She can serve both purposes without contradicting one by the other.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

ALLEGED STUDY TO MAKE MONCTON OR TORONTO RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTRUMENT FLIGHTS AT DORVAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport.

Would the minister be prepared to tell the House whether he himself or one of his departmental staff has ordered a quick study on technical means to make Toronto or Monc-

ton responsible for the air communications for instrument flights now landing at Dorval?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there were some standby steps taken to consider what would happen if for a variety of reasons there was a strong feeling within Dorval that there was a need to control traffic from other points. I should like to stress that any reference to that was totally in respect of dealing with an emergency situation. There is no intention of removing the basic control position from the Montreal towers.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DRUGS

SUGGESTION SALE OF GLUE BE CONTROLLED AND ADOPTION OF INFORMATION PROGRAM OF EFFECTS OF INHALING GLUE VAPOUR

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare to whom I gave advance notice.

In view of the increasingly generalized habit among young people to inhale glue vapours as a substitute for stronger drugs, does the minister intend to launch an education campaign directed at the young to protect them against this habit which is extremely dangerous for their health, or does he intend to amend the Food and Drugs Act to ensure stricter control on the sale of glue and similar substances, particularly to teenagers?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there already exists a substantial public education campaign concerning drugs as a whole, be it alcohol, tobacco and other substances recognized as specific drugs, or even drug substitutes, such as glue vapours, gasoline fumes and the like.

Our studies seem to indicate that it would not be wise to concentrate a very substantial program on a specific substance, particularly substitutes in this case, because this problem seems to surface only occasionally in limited areas, and further there is a risk of creating an even greater interest in the substance concerned.

Finally, with regard to controls, all aspects have been studied in considerable depth, and because of the very large number of substitutes, whether it is glue, gasoline, paint or other substances, it appears to be practically impossible to impose restrictive controls on all those substances.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I had hoped to be recognized during the question period, but I understand the difficulty and I do not say that in any way except to indicate why I am rising now. This involves a question that has arisen before involving parliamentary secretaries to ministers.

Your Honour will recall that I raised a question about the propriety of the number of parliamentary secretaries being paid out of the public purse at the time of the resignation of the hon. member for Papineau as the minister of consumer and corporate affairs and his portfolio responsibilities being transferred to the Postmaster General. If the Minister of Justice will check back on the record, he will see that I dealt with the statutory provisions specifically at that time. At that time there was one parliamentary secretary too many for the ministry. Now, the hon. member for Langelier, the former minister of the environment, has resigned that portfolio and is a private member of this House. His portfolio responsibilities, in an acting way, have gone to the Minister of State (Fisheries).

Under the statute as it stands in relation to the number of parliamentary secretaries, which relates to the number of ministers and not ministries, there are now two too many parliamentary secretaries drawing upon the public purse.

An hon. Member: Twenty-six too many.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In response to the comment from beside me—someone says there are perhaps many more too many—perhaps legally speaking there are two too many. I raised the matter seriously before. At that time I was thanked by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council for bringing the matter to the attention of the ministry. It was compounded in the first case by the delay in relation to the parliamentary secretary to the now hon. member for Papineau. It has now been compounded because of the situation arising twice. Quite frankly, I do not know how these gentlemen are being paid or how they are being paid properly.

Quite frankly, I have refrained from bringing the matter to the attention of the Auditor General of Canada, but I intend to do so if there is not some undertaking from the ministry that an investigation will be made shortly, with a report to the House in respect of this matter.

I am glad the Minister of Justice is in his place, as this matter involves the interpretation of a statute. There is a difficulty here in that somehow moneys are being paid improperly, if I am right. I do not know whether there has been an investigation, but moneys will have to be paid back.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I should think the parliamentary secretaries themselves ought to be pressing the government for some answer to this conundrum in which they have been placed by the neglect of the government, in this case.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the previous occasion when this subject matter was raised I gave a preliminary indication that it was my opinion this was a legal matter as opposed to a procedural one. My opinion has not changed and, quite frankly, I do not think the opinion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has changed, either. I think he is making allusions to what we clearly understand embraces a legal problem, nonetheless an important one. I will hear briefly from the hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I recall very well having dealt with this matter at the time, but in dealing with it there

was one point I forgot to mention which I think I should bring to the attention of hon. members at this time. It is at the time when there is no minister and no acting minister that the necessity for a parliamentary secretary is felt.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: Hon. members in all parties are, I am sure, ready to agree that in fact the behaviour of parliamentary secretaries since the beginning of this particular session has been exemplary in the way they have handled questions on behalf of their ministers, which, indeed, justifies twice the salary they are presently drawing.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my point of order concerns the response by the Minister of Finance when I asked if he was prepared to table the documents that were made available at the meeting yesterday of federal-provincial ministers of finance. He did, indeed, reply that this sizeable document would in fact be tabled when it had been translated. I must express my concern—indeed, my amazement, sir—that documents as important as this in respect of a federal-provincial conference of finance ministers should have been available in only one of our two official language. I think the minister should be given a chance to explain.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Fifteenth Report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs—Mr. Robinson.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I asked for the floor on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). To a question that I put to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on July 5 regarding his intention to appoint a member from eastern Quebec to replace the Minister of Environment, he replied the following which is reported on page 15010 of *Hansard* and I quote:

> Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member knows that under an order in council there is an acting deputy minister and an acting deputy minister to the acting deputy minister. Thus, the position is not vacant now.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising on the same point of order as the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), concerning parliamentary secretaries and their usefulness. If the Prime Minister had deemed the parliamentary secretary was necessary or useful, he would have answered me differently. I think that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is valid since the Prime Minister has himself recently given more power to civil servants than to the people's elected representatives to the House, namely parliamentary secretaries. Consequently I am led to believe, like the member for Grenville-Carleton, that taxpayers' money is being squandered in view of the fact that when it comes to administering their departments deputy ministers and acting deputy ministers wield more power than the ministers themselves. This is why the Prime Minister is not replacing the former Minister of Environment.

* * *

● (1510)

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

TABLING OF ORDERS OF REFERENCE RESPECTING CERTAIN COMPANIES

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table our orders of reference to the administrator, under the Anti-Inflation Act, with regard to the firms City Motors Limited and Hickman Motors Limited of Newfoundland, Atlantic Consolidated Foods Limited, and Western Grocers Limited.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,424, 4,425, 4,434, 4,437, 5,329 and 5,710.

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

[*Text*]

LIVING UNIT OFFICERS—STE. ANNE DES PLAINES

Question No. 4,424—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of living unit-officers at Ste. Anne des Plaines?

2. Was their education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12 (c) some college (d) beyond a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

LIVING UNIT OFFICERS—ARCHAMBAULT

Question No. 4,425—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of living unit-officers at Archambault?

2. Was their education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12 (c) some college (d) beyond a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

LIVING UNIT OFFICERS—COLLINS BAY INSTITUTION

Question No. 4,434—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of living unit-officers at Collins Bay Institution?

2. Was their education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12 (c) some college (d) beyond a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

LIVING UNIT OFFICERS—SASKATCHEWAN FARM ANNEX

Question No. 4,437—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of living unit-officers at Saskatchewan Farm Annex?

2. Was their education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12 (c) some college (d) beyond a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

GRANTS TO INDUSTRIES AND LABORATORIES

Question No. 5,329—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. For each year 1970 to date, what departments or agencies have made grants to industries or laboratories whose main operation is the processing of blood to obtain derived products?

2. For each year and in each case (a) what was the amount granted (b) the name of the industry or laboratory (c) the location of the establishment?

3. What is the ultimate use of the derived products?

4. Is the basic product gathered only in Canada and, if not, from where does it come?

5. (a) Are such products sold (b) what is the relative importance of the trade in terms of nationwide numbers?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is concerned: 1. One grant.

2. (a) The amount offered was $45,546. (b) Dominion Biologicals Ltd. (c) Debert, Nova Scotia.

3. Products are used in the diagnosis and treatment of hematological diseases and in transfusion-transplantation therapy.

4. Human and animal blood is purchased through a worldwide network of raw material suppliers. Additional blood is obtained from local blood donors and rabbits.

5. (a) Yes. (b) The total market potential for diagnostic biological reagents in 1975 was estimated at $4 million. The market is expected to grow at 8½ per cent a year.

In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: 1. The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce accorded a grant in 1973 under the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act (IRDIA) to a company whose main operation can be described as the processing of blood to obtain derived products. There were no grants in other years of the period 1970 to date.

2. (a) The amount granted in 1973 was approximately $7,900; (b) and (c) under the IRDIA the name and location of the company cannot be divulged in the interest of maintaining confidentiality in respect of the firm's innovation activities.

3. The use of the derived products in question cannot be revealed but, in general, derived products produced from blood and blood fractions are used in the classification of potential blood recipients, the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of hemolytic diseases and in tissue typing in organ transplantation.

4. Blood plasma, biological dried blood and gamma globulin are imported from the United Kingdom, Austria, Belgium—Luxembourg, France, West Germany, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Columbia and the United States of America.

5. (a) Yes, the derived products are sold. (b) There is no data available publicly on export trade of these products but consumption in Canada of derived products is estimated at approximately $5 million in 1975.

BURWASH MUSEUM—YUKON TERRITORY

Question No. 5,710—**Mr. Nielsen:**

What are the total expenditures to date, whether by loan, grant or the supply of materials or services, that have been made by all departments, branches or agencies of the government and of the Government of the Yukon Territory on the Burwash Museum, Burwash, Yukon Territory?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs as follows: Total expenditures to date for the Burwash Museum Project are as follows: Government of the Yukon Territory, $52,191; Federal Government (Manpower and Immigration—Local Initiatives Program), $121,290; Total Expenditures, $173,481.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the parliamentary secretary to a question which appears on the order paper as starred question 5386 of April 29. I would appreciate it if we could have an early reply to that question.

* * *

MOTION FOR PAPERS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notice of motion for the production of papers No. 102.

Capital Punishment

[*Text*]

CORRESPONDENCE WITH PRAIRIE FARM ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO PERSONALLY OWNED VEHICLES

Motion No. 102—**Mr. Towers:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, travelling expense accounts, wage claim reports, fieldmen's work reports and mileage diaries for personally-owned vehicles between Prairies Farm Administration employees in the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the Prairie Farm Administration offices in the Financial Building at 13th and Scarth Streets, Regina, Saskatchewan, for the period May 8 to July 8, 1974.

[*English*]

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this motion is acceptable, with reservations, being that documents pertaining to charges laid against an employee will not be produced as the charges have resulted in a stay of proceedings entered by the Crown on December 2, 1975.

The activities of the Prairie Farm Administration have been phased out and all essential records were transferred to the Public Archives. Material such as expense accounts, wage claims, work reports and mileage diaries are available, but internal correspondence was destroyed in the process of closing out the office.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the bill relating to the repeal of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act is before the House, I would ask to have this transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Mr. Blais: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the other notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Tuesday, July 6, 1976, consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 13 (Mr. Reynolds).

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, at the close of our sitting last evening I was speaking on this amendment which calls for the deletion of section 214 of the Criminal Code dealing particularly with the substitution of life imprisonment for first-degree murder, which would mean a period of 25 years in the case of a person convicted of the murder of a police officer, a prison guard or a correctional officer. As I said, I support the amendment because if this clause were deleted we would go back to the law as it was.

I pointed out last evening that an undertaking was given by the government 2½ years ago. It was a promise, a commitment to the House, to parliament and to the country that if parliament would buy the government's part retention and part abolition bill, that would be the policy. Notwithstanding the commitment that was made, that commitment and promise has not been kept and here we are, 2½ years later, again arguing the same question.

Because I support this amendment I have a few statistics I should like to place on the record. The number of prison guards killed since 1961 totals six. The number of persons who were convicted and sentenced for a first murder, subsequently jailed and who committed a second murder in Canada in the last 10 or 15 years, is five. The number of policemen killed on duty since 1961 is 57. The number of custodial officers murdered since 1961 is six. Yet we have heard the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) at the committee level and in this House on occasion deny that there are any records of second murders.

What protection do the guards and the correctional officers have when, as I pointed out last night and the Solicitor General admitted at the committee level, these people, given a sentence of 25 years, may, with an escort, be released from prison at any time? What is to stop the guard and the escort being knocked off? We had a case of a person being escorted from one jail to another who asked to go to the bathroom, where he obtained a gun and then killed the police officer when he was being escorted from one institution to another. I support this amendment because I think it is very important.

The last thought I would leave is that I am shocked to think of the situation in which we are placing police officers, guards and correctional officers. I pointed out the number who have lost their lives, without adequate compensation for their families who suffer because of either the first or second murder these people commit. I ask the Solicitor General, if this bill should pass on third reading, to conduct an honest and responsible review in an effort to see that the families of the police officers, guards and correctional officers, who are victims, are compensated for the death of the provider.

● (1520)

Surely it is not too much to ask that greater attention be paid to victims rather than to the accused, contrary to what those liberals, with a small "l", wish, which is to change the law and always favour the accused rather than the victim. I have only spoken once in this debate and once on the amendments, and I leave that thought, through you, Mr. Speaker, with the Solicitor General. I am not talking about compensation amounting only to peanuts. I am talking about compensation which would really compensate the family of the victim whose life was lost violently at the hands of people released from prison who commit murder for the second time under the law as it exists now and as it may exist if this bill is given third reading and passed.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief interjection on amendment

No. 13 moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), and I might say it is a privilege to follow my illustrious colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) who is a very learned lawyer and certainly knows what he is talking about when he speaks on behalf of the great majority of English Canada.

Certainly, a great many of us are well aware of the serious position in which law officers, policemen and prison guards will find themselves if Bill C-84 becomes law, because they know that their lives will be in greater danger than at present even though there is now a form of abolition until, I believe, December, 1977.

As my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North stated most forcefully, policemen and prison guards are wondering what the Parliament of Canada will do to protect them. We have all received a great many letters, and if most of them are similar to those I have been receiving from my riding, the overwhelming majority is in favour of capital punishment, or retention of it in some form. This morning, on the "Canada A.M." television program, I saw the hangman's rope depicted and I wondered why we were not shown something to portray the other side of the coin, the victim's point of view. Let me say, forcefully, that this hanging bill, as it has been called, should be called the capital punishment bill.

An hon. Member: That would be inaccurate.

Mr. Darling: Does the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) wish to ask a question?

Mr. Caccia: Not yet.

Mr. Darling: All right. I had the privilege of speaking on an amendment last Monday regarding high treason, and I was subjected to heckling by the hon. member. If he wishes to speak, let him come forward and I will do my best to answer his questions. What I was trying to state is that instead of concentrating on the idea of hanging, the bill should concentrate on the death penalty, because a great many of us who are retentionists are violently opposed to the archaic and gruesome form of capital punishment adopted in this country, namely, hanging. We believe that a criminal who has been found guilty of first-degree murder, without any extenuating circumstances which would lead the judge or jury to advocate mercy, should be removed from society as painlessly and as quickly as possible. I have stated categorically that a drug could be administered, a needle could be given, and that would be the end of it. But no, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) down we keep hearing about hanging, hanging and hanging. I received a copy of a sermon—

Mr. Blaker: What about your own party leader?

Mr. Darling: I have answered that question before.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) has the floor and I suggest he should not be interrupted.

Mr. Darling: Our own party leader, you ask? This happens to be a free vote on this side of the House at least, and you cannot say the same of your side. Are you going to tell me that 29 cabinet ministers—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Would the hon. member please address the chair?

Mr. Darling: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. They certainly cannot sell me that bill of goods, that the entire cabinet, deep down in their conscience, every damn one of them, is an abolitionist.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Darling: Nor can they sell me the idea that all the parliamentary assistants are also abolitionists. So far as our leader is concerned, let me say, in answer to my illustrious colleague's interjection, that certainly our leader is not voting the way the great majority of us are, and I am well aware of that; but at least he is doing it on his own and with a low profile. He has made his position known, but he has not been using the big stick, as the Prime Minister has.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Because he hasn't got one.

Mr. Blaker: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the hon. member who is speaking would permit me to ask him a question on a point of order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Darling: It is a point of order, not a question, he says.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is a point of order first, then a question. Would the hon. member permit it?

Mr. Blaker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. member permit a question?

An hon. Member: He already has.

Mr. Blaker: Apparently there is some misunderstanding as to whether we are under any constraint to vote one way or another. I should like to point this out to the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling)—and I will pose a question to him so that he can answer it in due course—with regard to whether or not some force is applied on this side of the House to vote one way or another. Because his leader has chosen to have the guts and the courage to go against the wish of the population as demonstrated in the polls on the subject of the death penalty, I would like to know whether the hon. member is prepared to indicate if there is some kind of force on individual hon. members in the House to vote one way or another, because I do not believe there is.

An hon. Member: Sure there are.

Mr. Epp: Ask your whip.

Mr. Darling: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure you would state categorically that that is a point of debate, not a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): No, it is a question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): As I pointed out, the hon. member was asking a question, not making a point of order.

Mr. Darling: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to my colleague's question I should like to state that he could not possibly state that in their case there is no constraint. After all, there are a good many members on the government side—I believe 37, if my memory serves me right—who voted against the government's bill.

Mr. Blaker: There is no constraint on this side.

Mr. Darling: Just a minute. There are different types of constraint. You can beat someone up and have him covered with marks, and all the rest of it; or you can do it in a gentle way with a rubber hose.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest we are getting into debate.

Mr. Darling: That is what I am trying to do. What I am suggesting, of course, is that certainly it is a free vote in parliament; there is no question about it. We saw a so-called free vote here the other day. When the Prime Minister stood up, he stood up alone, and all at once he raised his hands—

● (1530)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Darling: Yes. He just raised his hands, and they rose as one. So that was the free vote!

Mr. Blaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I understand that the rules of this House do not permit hon. members anywhere in this assembly to seek out the motives of hon. members for the way they vote. If I am correct in that understanding, and if the rules of the House do not permit any hon. member on any side or of any rank to attack the motives of hon. members who vote, then I suggest that the hon. member for "something" Davenport is completely out of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Caccia: No, it is Parry Sound-Muskoka.

Mr. Blaker: I suggest that when I vote, I do so with the freedom of my own conscience, and I do not want any hon. member of this House, on the hon. member's side or on my side, telling me that I have been forced to vote a certain way. I have not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I would like to quote Standing Order 35 which reads as follows:

> No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of His Excellency or the person administering the Government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof. No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Darling: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Now, if I could get back to my brief remarks—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest that the hon. member should withdraw those last remarks.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Darling: Mr. Speaker, on that basis I will certainly withdraw my remarks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: What a "darling."

Mr. Darling: However, let me qualify that. Some hon. members opposite, who are looking with a very hungry eye at the front benches, might have second thoughts, if you know what I mean. If the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker) will keep quiet for a few moments and let me finish my remarks, I want to go, along with 17 of my hon. colleagues on this side, to view the Olympic site and see where much of our money is going. We will be leaving at four o'clock. Is that all right?

If I could go back to what I was going to say, Reverend C. W. Sorley of Stouffville, Ontario, pointed out in a sermon:

> The Prime Minister says, "if we retain hanging somebody will get hung." Why is he so concerned about murderers and seemingly little concerned about decent citizens?

The Reverend Sorley is certainly a man of compassion, but he has more compassion for victims than for criminals. To point out how concerned our policemen are, I have here a brief from the National Police Committee for the Protection of the Citizens which says:

> If the Solicitor General truly believes that neither the state nor any agency nor anyone has the right to take a life, then we must assume that he will shortly propose that all law enforcement officers in Canada be disarmed for fear that they may take a life while in the lawful execution of their sworn duties.

Hon. members are shaking their heads, but who knows what the next directive from the Solicitor General's office will be? This brief continues:

> What preparations have been made by the minister to house the increased numbers of murderers who will be sentenced to long prison terms if Bill C-84 is passed in its present form? We are told that our present prisons are overcrowded, archaic and nothing more than institutions of enforced idleness. How will these institutions and prison authorities possibly cope with the influx of more prisoners serving longer terms?

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is a very important one because, if I understood the hon. gentleman properly a moment ago, in answer to the hon. member on this side he said that it was very important that he finish his speech right now because he and 17 others are going to visit Montreal. There are only four or five hon. members opposite holding the House here because of a bunch of amendments upon which a vote could have already been taken. Either we are for or against capital punishment. Hon. members opposite are taking a holiday and only a few remain to keep the House going. I believe that is most unfair. The hon. member is the one

who said it, nobody else. It is costing the taxpayers a heck of a lot of money to keep this House going.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): That is a matter of debate and not a point of order.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It is a point of order, because they are going on holidays.

Mr. Darling: What do you mean, going on holidays?

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You said yourself that you are going to visit the Olympics.

Mr. Darling: As a member of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, which approved the Olympics in the first place, or at least the coins, stamps and the lottery—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It is a farce that you should say that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. We are debating motion No. 13 and I suggest that the hon. member get back to the motion.

Mr. Epp: That was one of your better interventions, Joe.

Mr. Blaker: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Darling: I wish the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore would let me finish.

Mr. Blaker: Mr. Speaker, with the very kind permission of the hon. member I rise on a point of order. I referred to him as the hon. member for Davenport, and I was quite wrong. I know now that I should be referring to him as the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling). I would be glad if the record would reflect that, and I thank the hon. member for permitting my intervention.

Mr. Darling: The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) sits immediately in front of the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore. I thought the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore would at least know that he has represented Davenport and, I must say, represented it very well for a number of years. We will be going through the riding of the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore at around six o'clock this evening.

If I may repeat what I said before with respect to this very important amendment, the policemen of this country wonder where the government will find enough jails. The Solicitor General probably has in his mind, and probably in his estimates, beautiful, palatial, long-term residences for hardened criminals so that they will have a very enjoyable incarceration—and the taxpayers will be paying for that. Deterrence is a reasonably important thing which must be emphasized, especially with regard to killers of policemen and prison guards. An executed murderer cannot murder a second time.

About six weeks ago I said that former governor Ronald Reagan was an abolitionist and during his term of office as governor he commuted the sentences of 12 murderers. They were let out into society, and those 12 murderers committed another 22 murders. If that is not proof that capital punishment would have saved a great many innocent lives, I do not know what is. Some hon. members say that it is terrible to exact the ultimate penalty. Let me tell them that if we are to protect our policemen, prison guards and those in authority looking after prisoners, certainly this amendment should pass. I hope that when this parliament votes, whether it be on Thursday night or at a later date, it will give serious consideration to this amendment.

● (1540)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words to support the motion before us. Recently I had the opportunity to meet a convict who was on parole. Of course the capital punishment issue was raised and I wish to tell you the essence of what this man told me: He said: I favour the amendment to the Criminal Code. I think it amounts to abolishing capital punishment. Bill C-84 proposes to abolish capital punishment and replace it by a period of imprisonment for 25 years. If I am given the choice between capital punishment and 25 years in jail, I shall choose jail in the hope of escaping. Then he told me that his trade was theft, armed robbery and that over a few years he had committed several thefts in different areas of the country and made more than $1 million. He added: I enjoy a certain legal immunity following a court judgment exonerating me of all blame for my involvement in those crimes. You will readily understand, he said, that I am for the abolition of capital punishment and for firearms control as family men and other businessmen will no longer be allowed to have firearms. They will not be able to defend themselves against us who will continue to use firearms. Of course the legislation will not say explicitly that murderers can keep their weapons notwithstanding the regulations, but it is implied as our trade requires the uncontrolled possession of firearms.

This is why syndicates of professional killers exert pressure on hon. members for the abolition of capital punishment. You will also understand, he added, that the people in our trade must be free to operate without the threat of capital punishment.

And we must of necessity have firearms, and also some kind of protection, assurances against those who would not let us take their property or their lives. Contract killers have a right to earn a living without hindrance, don't they, Mr. Solicitor General? I see he is absent for the moment.

Killers and thieves are supported by revolutionaries and outlaws, who also require guns. Once firearms have been controlled and capital punishment abolished by Parliament, killers and thieves of all kinds finally will be able to breathe. In countries where firearms are controlled and capital punishment abolished, professional criminals are quite prosperous. They enjoy complete safety. That is why professional criminals spare neither efforts nor money to ensure speedy passing of firearms control and abolition.

Firearms control and abolition go hand in hand. Through abolition, routine perpetration of theft and murder will become easier. That is what the government can expect if this legislation goes through. Mr. Speaker, certainly it is only human that people get emotional during a murder trial. The majority of people tend to react violently when a criminal gets a sentence out of keeping with what the community expects. Recently the Solicitor General, the

Hon. Warren Allmand, went on record to state he would not want at any price to be associated in any way with a hanging. This was a debasing act, he said, which did not solve in any way the problem of crime in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, while agreeing that the reinstatement of capital punishment will not solve every crime problem in Canada, the question we must address ourselves is this: Will reinstatement in effect solve the problem for some? Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some time ago in Oshawa, a young man shot his parents and then gave himself up to the police, but he was still holding his loaded gun and was ready to fire at the slightest movement of the policeman who arrested him. During the interrogation he was asked: Why did you not shoot the policeman? He answered quite frankly that he simply did not want to be hanged.

Personally, I am satisfied that on various occasions several police officers or prison guards were saved because, in principle, the death penalty is applied for the murder of a police officer or a prison guard; I think that is the reason. If we could better plan the operations of our rehabilitation institutions and of our penitentiaries, perhaps we could improve and correct several imperfections or problems. Of course, Mr. Speaker, when the Solicitor General of Canada, the hon. Warren Allmand, presented this bill, he was not the only one to support that opinion, quite the contrary.

He feels supported by the whole cabinet and by a good majority of the Liberal caucus. He is more strongly supported by his colleagues than by the Canadian population. As a member of the Canadian Parliament, in all justice, I think that it is undeniable that the present government should take into account that 81 per cent of the Canadian population is in favour of maintaining the death penalty.

The Solicitor General of Canada says that the death penalty will not act as a deterrent for potential murderers. This may be true to a certain extent. But long prison terms will have very little deterring effect, and this logic were carried to extremes, one would have to conclude that criminals should be rewarded.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that many crimes are not premeditated and that those responsible are not hanged for such offences. We, of the Social Credit Party of Canada, want the death penalty to be applied only in cases where premeditation is clearly established. Moreover, the Solicitor General claims that the death penalty does not reduce at all the number of murders in Canada. In this regard, let me point out that since 1962, when the last hanging took place in Canada, murders have increased by 42 per cent, or 1.7 per cent per 100,000 inhabitants and 2.4 per cent for the total population.

In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, by voting for Bill C-84, the members and ministers of this illustrious assembly are giving future murderers who are condemned to life imprisonment a free hand to kill all those who stand between them and freedom. Under this bill, someone facing life imprisonment, either for armed robbery or for any other crime liable to this sentence, would actually benefit from killing the incriminating witness or witnesses or the policeman. This action would have the advantage of enabling him to escape without any risk of increasing the sentence he must serve. The myth that a murderer rarely repeats his crime may be true when the murder is committed on the spur of the moment, but it is something else when a murder is committed by a professional killer.

If the death penalty were maintained, those would be the ones to be punished and they would deserve it. Moreover, the Solicitor General claims that murderers should not suffer the death penalty. But what alternative solution does he propose? That policemen and prison guards be better trained? Is the Solicitor General of Canada suggesting that all the policemen or prison guards who died on duty were not well trained? To this, I would reply that in most large cities such as Detroit and Montreal policemen are very well trained and armed, but violence is on the increase in these cities.

Moreover an effective gun control system, such as that proposed in Bill C-83, does not give more protection. On the contrary, its sole effect is to restrict the freedom and the rights of honest people. I really believe that the present legislation should be applied more severely to criminals and outlaws. Gun control might reduce certain types of violence, but in my humble opinion, it will have no effect on cold-blooded killers. Our social and economic security programs no longer truly meet present needs. A proof of this is that in the last few years, crime has been increasing. I believe we should review our way of life and take action to ensure that authority at all levels is respected, and to that end, we should start by applying the death penalty in Canada to people convicted of premeditated murder.

● (1550)

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, this issue demands our calm reflection. First, let it be said that when the people of a nation make their position on any issue known, there is some kind of emotional underpinning to their position. When it is said that 80 per cent of Canadians favour capital punishment, I think it can be said, equally validly, that most people are not asking for the imposition of capital punishment per se but are saying that they have lost faith in the law and order system of this country.

Consequently, since Canadians across this country have lost faith in our ability to maintain law and order and ask for capital punishment, we are brought face to face with the fact that the government has done nothing to make people feel that if capital punishment is removed from the statute books, they will be secure.

What do the people of this country face? On the one hand they face the prospect of the abolition of the death penalty; on the other hand there is no indication of any identifiable concern with regard to the increasing incidence of violent crime in this country.

The government introduced Bill C-84 as a companion bill to Bill C-83 which was to extend protection to Canadians. It is well known that Canadians do not think Bill C-83 will ensure a greater measure of public security and safety. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) would reinstitute that which the government reneged on during two five-year experimental periods, namely, capital punishment for the murderers of police officers and those engaged in security and guarding roles.

If we consider the situation which faces the people of this country, we must recognize that even if this bill passes there will still be a continuance in this country of a form of capital punishment. Therefore, the fundamental question we face is whether there is to be a trial before the imposition of capital punishment. This question becomes obvious when one considers the unfortunate position in which we may place our police officers. As it is, the government has done little to improve our security and decrease violent crime in this country. It has done nothing to lessen the psychology of crime heightened by television and the movies. It has done nothing with regard to child-abuse laws, and has done little to negate impressions created by the press in sensationalizing crime. Because of lack of government action, if the capital punishment sanction is removed from the statute books we shall live in a law and order vacuum, as I shall soon demonstrate.

Consider how police officers will act. Because they will not be protected, we can expect that policemen, faced with people of intemperate or violent temper, will shoot first and ask questions afterwards. Therefore, even under the new regime of Bill C-84 we shall have a continuation of capital punishment but it will be capital punishment without trial. If we look at the question calmly, we will realize that we are not debating whether or not there is to be capital punishment in this country: we are debating whether or not there is to be a trial, whether we are to continue to extend to people the right to a fair hearing before sentence is imposed. If you weaken the protection afforded to the police forces of this country, it goes without saying that when policemen act under duress, people will be killed. Policemen will obviously want to feel secure and, not having the protection of the law, will shoot first and ask questions afterwards.

The real question at issue is not whether we are to be an abolitionist or retentionist state. The real issue is whether the government has taken the necessary measures to protect us all by way of law and order, has taken those measures which are the prerequisite of abolition of capital punishment. How can you remove the sanction of capital punishment unless you have first removed the threat of violent crime in this country? But the fact is that violent crime in the last ten years has increased over 300 per cent—and violent crimes are reported daily in the press and on radio and television.

I do not argue that Canada should never be an abolitionist state, but I do say that the government could explore at least 50 different avenues for making the social environment of the citizens of this country safer and reducing the incidence of violent crime. Only after crime has been reduced can we become an abolitionist state. If we now remove the death penalty we shall threaten the safety of policemen and cause them to use their weapons more readily in order to protect their own lives. That brings us back to the fundamental question I first raised: Even if this bill passes, we shall continue to have capital punishment, but this time without trial.

● (1600)

The amendment put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta does not ask whether we have capital punishment; it asks whether we have due process of law. That is something very fundamental that we should be exercising and talking about at this time. If the government wants to take the position of being an abolitionist state, it must first demonstrate clearly to Canadians that they come first and that law and order against violent crime is intact. What is important is not the question of whether we are abolitionist or retentionist, but whether the people of Canada are being protected. According to statistics, about 80 per cent of Canadians are in favour of retention. That is a reflection of the mood of Canadians about law and order, more than a reflection of their mood about hanging or the death penalty.

According to a survey which I conducted in my constituency, 86.6 per cent are in favour of capital punishment. What is really symbolic is that these Canadians have lost faith in the fact that they are secure in this country. It does not necessarily imply that they want people to be hung or executed in some other form, but that before we disband capital punishment, whatever needs to be done ought to be done. The government must earn the right to be an abolitionist state. They must have a valid reason for taking away the death penalty.

The government has twice brought forward an experiment in five years with capital punishment only for those people who have killed a police officer or a security guard. However, that is a period that has never been honoured. Something which disturbs Canadians very much is that they are being asked to accept a change in law with regard to capital punishment when they note very clearly that for a period of nearly a decade the government has not obeyed its own law. If we are to believe in law, if it is to be a fundamental cornerstone of our democratic society, then surely the government must obey and practice the laws that it puts on the statute books. The fact that the government has ignored its own laws and regulations certainly enhances the distrust of Canadians.

I do not believe in the concept of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." That does not underscore any purpose. We would have a whole nation that is blind and toothless. Those who believe in the notion of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth are really saying, "Do not get angry; get even." We must have a feeling that has some purpose. At the present time there is an eroding of the feeling of security and law and order. Without the protection of the death sentence for those who will kill for the second time in order to escape from an institution, once having been incarcerated for a crime of murder, police and prison guards are in the vulnerable position of having to protect themselves in the psychology of "shoot first and ask questions later." We must underscore the fact that the government needs to earn the right to implement an abolitionist state. We must also recognize the fear that our police officers and prison guards will have.

If this amendment is not passed, capital punishment will not be done away with. It will be simply a case of the due course of law not being followed. Police officers and prison guards in this country will, in more rapid succession, be using their weapons in self-defence. The result will be capital punishment without trial.

The government has an obligation to ensure that we retain intact the symbol of peace and security. In my second reading speech I listed in some detail a number of different aspects that would assist our achieving a situa-

tion of peace and security. It is extremely important that we begin to move toward a psychological environment that does away with the threat of violent crime in this country and brings us to a position where police officers and guards can feel a sense of security and will not use their weapons for capital punishment without the due course of law.

I think we can underscore something that has been established over and over again. A negative kind of input or feed into society reflects itself with negative reactions. This has been done with children. It has been demonstrated psychologically that when people are fed negative kinds of information, the relationship of people one to another is usually that of a more violent negative society. It does not take a person with any academic understanding to quickly recognize that Canadian society today is compacted with negative input. The press hunts for the negative. We do not read the news in the papers, hear it over the radio or see it over television: all we get is a portion of the news, that which is negative.

Until there is a concerted effort in this country to emphasize some of the positive activities and relationships within our society, those who are of weakened psychological balance will always try to achieve public attention and recognition from others. Many actions of people are an attempt to gain recognition from their fellow man. If they cannot gain recognition in a positive sense, the struggle to be recognized is so great that they will gain it in a negative sense.

The obligation of government is not to do away with the position that has been long-standing within this country, but to create the kind of society that gives us a sense of peace and security. If they cannot do that, they have no right to bring forward a piece of legislation that attempts to enhance peace and security but undermines and erodes the opinions of Canadians generally that something is being done to offer a real feeling of security in this country.

● (1610)

It is of the utmost importance, I think, that members of parliament recognize that police officers and security guards are placed in a most vulnerable position should the bill pass unamended. We are placing what is the cornerstone of peace and security in this country, namely, our police forces who are in charge of enforcing the law, in extreme jeopardy. Those who write the law are putting those who enforce the law in an uncompromising position. What we owe these people is some symbol to show we support them. But we must do our work first by bringing about a greater degree of security in this country.

We can ruminate on this subject for some time, but as mentioned before in the House there has been much focus upon the architectural designs of our cities. For example, we can demonstrate statistically that if a city of 100,000 people expands to one of one million people, we should expand our police force sixtyfold, not tenfold. As we increase the size of our cities, so the rate of crime increases.

Studies of animals other than the human species have shown that crowding together produces a change in normal behavioural patterns. The Lithwick report on urbanization in Canada discloses that in its founding year of 1867 about 80 per cent of the country was rural, whereas now is it something like 85 per cent urban. The report predicts that 95 per cent of all Canadians will be living in five cities by the year 2000.

Although we recognize the danger of concentrating masses of people within a small area, government policies fail to take account of this. I suggest that the transportation and communication policies of this country are winning out over social policies in terms of social welfare, law and order and simply the happiness of human living. We are bartering away what we call efficiency in communications and transportation so as to save money in one particular pocket, without recognizing that sooner or later we will have to pay the cost in another social sense. The fact of the matter is—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Malone: I simply want to add, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the size of cities that increases the crime rate in this country; it is also the architectural design of our cities. Some interesting studies have been made showing that apartment dwellers, especially those in certain designs of apartments, are a stimulus to the crime rate in this country. The very nature of housing and of housing policies in this country reflects the amount of crime that is committed, and as legislators I suggest we should have something more important to do than simply talk about whether we are retentionists or abolitionists.

This bill is removing from society one of the symbols of law and order. It will create a vacuum. I believe that all Canadians would quite willingly accept an abolitionist stance, but only after the government has demonstrated clearly that peace and security is the right of all Canadians, and that the government has put in place the right psychological environment from coast to coast, and from the forty-ninth to the pole, the kind of society in which violence is deterred.

This may sound in some ways as if we are being over optimistic about the role of government and the behaviour of people, but studies made in numerous countries of the world demonstrate that different societies do, in fact, have different rates of crime. Anyone observing the psychology of human behaviour soon recognizes that crime rates do not differ from one country to another simply because the respective populations live in two different countries but rather because the cultures are different. I suggest that Canadian society has got itself on the wrong track. In Canada violence has become entertainment, not only on television, in our movies and in the press, but even in sport and other activities. We enjoy violence.

In summary, what the amendment moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta is seeking is not a return to capital punishment per se, but is asking the Canadian people, through their members of parliament, whether or not the due process of law should be carried out. If we take away part of our present system of justice

and leave a vacuum in its place, one obvious result of this will be that the prison guards in this country will be more trigger-happy. They will have no other choice, since they will have been placed in a position of greater fear. This is why the legislation must be amended. Until we have earned the right to be truly an abolitionist state, this parliament has no right to take away what appears to be, to the policemen of this country, a sense of security. We must first assure our policemen—indeed, all Canadians—that it is safe to live in Canada.

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I spoke on second reading of this bill and was not planning to speak on this motion. However, since my position is the complete opposite of that taken by the previous speaker I felt I should make a few comments.

I believe that the murder of a policeman or a prison guard is no more, or no less, important than the killing of a child, a fisherman or any other member of our society. I felt our present legislation was discriminatory in that it provided that only two classes in our society were of importance, in that only if a policeman or prison guard was murdered would capital punishment be carried out. I still feel that this is a discriminatory provision, and the sooner we get rid of the idea that some groups in society are more important than others, the better off we will be.

● (1620)

I believe in the retention of capital punishment, for a variety of reasons, but this is in relation to our whole Canadian society and not just one small part of it. The argument that a job is dangerous could be applied to any so-called dangerous job, such as that of a fireman, a pilot and of various other people in our society; but when they get into those jobs, they get into them with the realization that there are dangers involved. Having accepted those dangers, I do not think there should be further consideration given such as we have had under the legislation I consider to be improper, discriminatory and which in fact makes second-class citizens of those people who are not policemen or prison guards but who have been murdered over the years in Canada and in respect of which capital punishment was not applied. Many of us in this House have felt this way.

What are we now attempting to do? We have a motion before us that would attempt to bring back the same discriminatory practice that has existed and which many of us have decried for very good reason. I believe, in all honesty, that if we look at our society, not only in Canada but throughout the world, we will find that in the last 10, 12 or 14 years there has been a tremendous change and the change has occurred in respect of criminal activity. I think when you and I were growing up, Mr. Speaker, it would have required a very deep search to find a case of hijacking of an aircraft, of kidnapping or of terrorist activity. In order to be pragmatic, one would have to realize that our society has changed in the last 10 or 15 years. It is the duty of parliament to reflect these changes and to ensure that the law-abiding part of our society not only feels secure, but in fact is secure.

The argument in favour of capital punishment for premeditated murder is a very strong one. Anyone who becomes involved with premeditated murder for gain or profit or as a result of organized crime should be dealt with quickly. I am afraid the milk of human kindness in my body runs very low for those people who go out on contract to kill another individual. Again, regardless of who that individual is, whether he be a policeman, a prison guard or just an ordinary citizen, I feel that person should be dealt with most severely. Such individuals must know that if they become involved in that sort of situation, the results will be dramatic, sudden and positive.

As I said earlier, I cannot vote for this particular motion and I trust that my colleagues who are retentionists cannot vote for it because it is discriminatory. It is a motion that would make second-class citizens of a great part of our population. Surely, this parliament must take actions which are non-discriminatory and should not allow a phrase or a principle like "second-class citizen" to occur in legislation. We are all equal in Canada, and the law should apply to all Canadians equally. I do not think we have an elite in society, and for that reason I will vote against this motion.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, the amendment of my colleague, seconded by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), would strike clause 4 from the bill in that it would introduce into our Criminal Code and our criminal law what is known popularly on television and elsewhere as "murder one" and "murder two". I thought we had escaped that horrible classification. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) seems to take umbrage with the phrase "second-degree murder" in that it makes people second-class citizens. In any event, I could not catch the trend of his argument.

The result of my colleague's amendment would have the effect of maintaining in force section 214 of the Criminal Code. That was the section brought in at the time of the restricted interpretation of capital punishment, in 1967 I think it was. Prior to that, section 214, or its predecessor number, had regard to categories of capital murder and non-capital murder. There was a much wider application under section 214 because at that time it dealt with murder for gain, a killing committed as a result of another violent act such as armed robbery, rape, kidnapping and others, and in addition deliberate poisoning. Poisoning was capital murder for which the penalty was death. We are now back to define defining, again, categories of murder, but not capital murder. No, that would be treasonous, but treasonous in the linguistic sense.

An hon. Member: Treason is out.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Yes, the word "treason" is out because it has an entirely different meaning within the context of this bill. Apparently it would be quite wrong to use "capital" and "non-capital" murder. Heaven preserve us from falling that low! I have been looking with considerable care through the evidence at the committee hearings and, with the greatest respect, there is very little discussion on this subject. Most of it seems to have involved parole. Let us look at some of the problems the courts will have to wrestle with in the future. We must remember that it is not what is said in this chamber, at the committee or by the minister, that will determine for the judges what shall be the interpretation of the statute. Let

us read what it says in clause 4. The new section of the Criminal Code will read as follows:

214. (1) Murder is first degree murder or second degree murder.

The new subsection (2) will read:

Murder is first degree murder when it is planned and deliberate.

I suggest to hon. members that the interpretation of the word "planned" will give the courts a good deal of exercise over the years. It is true that new subsection (3) gives one illustration of planned and deliberate murder, and that is the contract murder of one either in the underworld or by the hiring of a killer. That is the deliberate, planned killing of a person. But there still remain a great number of murders that are planned and deliberate. There is the individual who himself hunts and stalks another individual, regardless of the reason, and kills that person. The hunting is planned and the killing is deliberate whether it is accomplished with a gun, a knife, bare hands or a club. How long must the planning take place? I can plan something and do it deliberately within five minutes. That is not done on the spur of the moment; the spur of the moment is the instant reaction.

● (1630)

I recall a case in common law in Britain which caused trouble to the courts because of the definition that exists in respect of the charge of murder where there is no uncontrollable reaction in the individual. There is the example of the husband who discovered he was being cuckold and found another man in his wife's bed, and in a towering rage killed one or both of them. That has been classified as a legitimate defence to a charge of murder and the courts have so held up to the Court of Appeal. On the other hand we have the case of a husband who, being cuckold, lies in wait to spy on his wife and her paramour. They, having come to the home, he sits on a ladder up on the second storey window, looks in, sees the couple in bed, goes down the ladder, goes into the woodshed, gets an axe and then proceeds up the stairs to the room and kills one or both of the parties. This is an actual case, but I do not remember whether one or two persons were killed. That was deemed not to be justifiable homicide because it was not instantaneous. This man had planned to spy and in the event he discovered there was misconduct on the part of his wife and her paramour.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): What about the offence relating to a Peeping Tom?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It would hardly be in that category. The court held that was not a justifiable homicide. I suggest the courts would have just as difficult a time determining what is planned and deliberate. I expected the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) to participate in this debate. I invite the Solicitor General, or the Attorney General of Canada (Mr. Basford), to explain to the House what they mean by the words "planned and deliberate".

There is an example given in subsection 3 of section 214 of the contract murder. That is point number one. Now I shall look at first-degree murder, preserving, in effect, what now is contained in section 214 concerning a police officer, a police constable, and so on. I have always wondered about this, now that we are using private security firms for the maintenance of public peace.

I would want the Solicitor General to say that this includes personnel hired on a temporary basis by a security firm to keep the peace and public order, say at a football or hockey game or at a sale at a department store where security personnel are employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace, and are killed. Is it first-degree murder if an employee of a firm hired by the government of Canada to act as a night watchman in a government building is killed in the course of his duty? Those are questions which the law officers of the Crown must explain. It is not satisfactory that they sit, as I would say in French, muets comme une carpe, and expect anyone in the House to approve this legislation without explanation. I ask for that explanation as a lawyer who may be asked to interpret this section for the benefit of the public.

What is the intention of the government in this legislation? Are we to be treated, as we often are treated in the House, with deathless silence? I assure hon. members that I intend to put all these sections through an examination in order to see just what they mean.

In line 6 on page 4, subparagraph (b), we find the second category of individuals the killing of whom is deemed to be first-degree murder. This deals primarily with officials or security officers in a prison or jail. Why is there the designation of "permanent employee"? The person involved might be a temporary employee. He might be a university student who, in a temporary or casual capacity, is carrying out the duties of a security officer in a jail or prison. Such person is not a permanent employee. Is the killing of such a person to fall under subparagraph (c) which refers to a person working in a prison with the permission of the prison authorities and acting in the course of his work therein, or is subparagraph (c) merely to cover social workers and other persons?

● (1640)

Take the case of the hostage incident in New Westminster, for instance, where social workers going into the prison were with the prisoners, were taken hostage and one of them was killed. I would say that such a person, if employed by someone outside such as, say, the correctional service of the government of Canada or of any province, would be covered under subparagraph (c), but I am wondering about the "temporary" employee. I am being careful with the language. I trust we will have the word of the Solicitor General that he will participate in the debate on this clause. I ask for an explanation.

An hon. Member: He is not listening.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I know he is not listening. Next—and this was a point which was fully covered in debate yesterday—is the matter of piracy. The Solicitor General did not intervene in the debate to tell hon. members to refer to subclause 5(a) which reads:

Irrespective of whether a murder is planned and deliberate on the part of any person, murder is first degree murder in respect of a person when the death is caused by that person

(a) while committing or attempting to commit an offence under section 76.1 (hijacking aircraft)—

This is the answer to many of the questions that were put yesterday. It is first-degree murder if committed in the attempt of a hijacking and the killing does not have to be planned or deliberate, or in respect of a person when death is caused by that person—again, the consequential death of a plane hijacking or even kidnapping. Then we have first-degree murder, such as in the case in British Columbia where a man who was a convicted rapist has been charged with the murder of a young girl. I will go no further. He has not been tried and he has not admitted the offence. This is all I can say. But he would be charged with murder in the first degree. All murder that is not first-degree is second-degree. That, again, is what I would call legalistic jargon. We already have the provisions for hijacking of aircraft and the penalty therefor, kidnapping, rape, and so forth.

As I have said many times, I do not like section 214(1) as it stands in the Criminal Code. I much prefer the definition that existed prior to the 1967 amendments defining capital and non-capital murder. I do not like the amendment in clause 4 because it does away, by repealing section 214 of the Criminal Code, with the death penalty for murder, either first-degree or any other murder.

Therefore, I ask the House to accept the amendment of my colleague and to reject what I suggest is a very loosely-worded definition of murder in the first-degree when it is planned and deliberate, which is fraught with all sorts of danger in interpretation. I know that if it does become law it will cause difficulties in the courts.

I hold no brief for the particular advantage held by policemen, prison guards or security officers acting in the course of their duty. While their job is much harder, I do not think their lives are any more valuable than those of citizens walking on the streets. To that extent I am not in favour of the continuation of the principle of discrimination in favour of these individuals. In so saying, I do not want to detract in any way from the difficult job they are doing, the danger to which they are exposed and the far greater danger to which they will be exposed when, and if, Bill C-84 should come into force, because from then on it will cost a man nothing to slip a knife into the ribs of a security officer, to shoot a guard or to kill another prisoner, if he is in prison already.

You cannot get a life sentence on top of a life sentence. I suppose that if the individual was in prison for second-degree murder and was serving a short sentence, he could then be charged and convicted of first-degree murder. But then he could go merrily on his way. In my view, clause 4 of Bill C-84 compounds the difficulty. I do not like the present section, 214, but to me it would cause less difficulty than the proposed law. Therefore, I support the amendment of my colleague.

● (1650)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on these very important amendments. I had the opportunity like many others on second reading, to express the wish that Parliament defeat this piece of legislation and at the same time meet the wishes of a large number of Canadians. While respecting the opposing views expressed in this House, I urge all members to consider the importance of our duty towards public opinion. I understand that many members listen to their own conscience, but I also wonder whether we should not take due consideration of the wishes of the majority of Canadians.

These amendments deal particularly with a second capital murder and ask that such a murder be considered as a first degree murder. This should not cause any problem to most members, and the amendment recommending that Parliament retain capital punishment for the murder of police officers and prison guards is a very serious and very important amendment. If we really want to protect society, we must consider this amendment very carefully, and I hope that some amendments for which I should like to commend the movers will be passed. It is unthinkable from the outset that all these amendments be rejected at one fell swoop.

The government introduced a piece of legislation; it has passed second reading and was finally reported from the committee. Some amendments are considered by the House, and their objective is to improve the legislation and to meet a need: public security. Given the circumstances, I dare believe that freedom of expression will make it possible to have some amendments passed.

As so many other hon. members, I should like very much to see the reaction of the government members to these amendments. To consolidate my argument on both amendments, I should like to quote from a letter. Perhaps it has been quoted in the House, but still I want to include it in my comments to remind the Solicitor General of the dangers inherent in going on supporting the bill he is advocating. The members of the Public Service Alliance of Canada sent us a letter. It was addressed to the Solicitor General, and at the same time to hon. members of the House, for their information, and I quote:

> Before the final vote on Bill C-83, we want to ask you to consider, in your soul and conscience, the remarks made on June 15, 1976 by the Prime Minister of Canada in his speech in the House of Commons, as reported on page 14499 of *Hansard:* "I want to make it very clear that, if a majority of hon. members vote against abolition, some people are going to be hanged. Their death would be a direct consequence of the negative decision made by this House on this bill.
>
> As for us, we appeal to your conscience and we take the opposite view of that expressed by Mr. Trudeau by saying that abolitionist would be responsible for all future murders of penitentiary employees and law enforcement officers, and we swear that each time one of these murders is committed, we shall impute them to all those who have supported the abolition of capital punishment.
>
> Here are a few facts that you should consider in our opinion:
>
> 1—The irresponsible attitude of penitentiary commissioners and directors before the pressure groups who visit the institutions;
>
> 2—The lack of proper management by the authorities of most penal institutions in the country;
>
> 3—The shocking convict classification system which endangers the life of penitentiary employees as well as the life of most convicts who only want to obey the rules they must follow during their prison term;
>
> 4—The present lack of facilities likely to guarantee the protection and safety of the staff of the penal institutions and of the prisoners against these criminals who have nothing to lose because of the 25 years of imprisonment they would have to serve under Bill C-83.
>
> For these reasons, the Hon. Warren Allmand, Solicitor General of Canada, who did not have the courage to reveal these facts to the members of the House of Commons, should, in all conscience, resign his ministerial responsibilities since he has lost the confidence of all penitentiary employees and all law enforcement officers in Canada.

It is still Mr. Caouette, the Secretary Treasurer of the Association who is speaking:

We urge you, in your heart of hearts, to consider the safety of your family and that of penitentiary employees and law enforcement officers while reflecting on these words: "We want everyone to clearly understand that if most members of Parliament vote against the retention of the death penalty, people will be murdered. The death of these people would then be a direct result of the negative decision made by the House of Commons on this bill."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this letter is extremely important. That is an appeal made by those who are responsible for maintaining authority in our institutions. And I feel that those remarks should give us cause for serious reflection and prompt us into supporting the amendment we are advocating today.

I would believe that most members will understand the position in which those who are responsible for security in our institutions and in our country generally find themselves, and one only has to consider what has been going on those last few years to understand. As recently as a week ago, I think, a Montreal newspaper reported that a young Montreal police officer checking on an apartment in Montreal had been shot in the chest quite unhesitatingly. That is the kind of protection we get from this government.

They have introduced a piece of legislation which, far from giving us additional security, is of enormous concern to the population. Is there need to recall also, Mr. Speaker, that they do not dare hold a referendum to know what is the public opinion since they already know that Canadians would favour retention of capital punishment, bearing in mind the circumstances we are all aware of.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, I know that it is a question that has to be resolved deep in one's conscience and I respect everybody's position. I would like to be sure that the government members did not take that position merely to save the Solicitor General or the Prime Minister. I suggest that we have reasons to wonder, after all the comments and discussions we have had with various members of this House.

Once again, I am not assuming that anyone is dishonest. I believe the issue is important enough that no hon. member should take a decision concerning this legislation for the sole purpose of saving the Solicitor General's neck or defending government policy. I think I am right in asking that this issue be considered in the light of much more solid reasons than those I have just mentioned.

● (1700)

We are also often reminded of the following commandment: Thou shalt not kill. I have on hand some comments, some information given to me by a priest who is not reluctant to give his opinion and information to the members of this House, who were very happy to receive it. He says clearly:

While I am writing this, our members in the House of Commons are discussing the advisability of retaining or abolishing capital punishment . . . What will be the situation when this article will be published?

I would like to submit a few comments in favour of the retention of capital punishment.

I know different views were expressed from all sides. I think it is my responsibility to bring forward certain

[Mr. La Salle.]

arguments presented by someone who is, after all, a parish priest in Lévis county. I quote:

(a) I point out that by "retention of capital punishment", I do not mean retention of hanging, but this: Anyone who criminally and voluntarily kills another person is liable to expiate his crime through the sacrifice of his own life if he is recognized as actually and legally responsible for this crime unless it has been committed by accident (manslaughter) or in case of self-defence.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that those remarks are perfectly related, at least to the group of people we wish to protect through the amendment before us. I continue:

(c) The retention of capital punishment is not a matter of revenge, but it is legal reparation of the most serious crime and is also aimed at protecting the life of the people in the interest of public weal and order.

Those are the reasons given by this parish priest for the retention of capital punishment:

1—The inestimable price of life and its protection require the retention of capital punishment.

2—The Holy Bible says in Genesis 9,6: "Who so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" and, in Exodus 21,23: "And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life".

3—The Christian theology always recognized to the state the right to inflict capital punishment for instance in case of murder and this because of the invaluable price of life and for its protection and the protection of the whole society, this fair reparation is in the spirit of God and the Holy Bible.

4—The Council of Trent says that the legitimate authority that condemns a murderer to death not only is not guilty of murder, but eminently obeys the fifth commandment that forbids murder.

5—The Old Testament says in Exodus 21, 12: "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death".

I continue, Mr. Speaker, because I think that those comments should make us think. They might also relieve some consciences.

The Catholic Church always taught that the state has the right to apply capital punishment for a serious crime, like murder, and this to protect peace and security.

Christ himself said so to Pilate who told him: Do you not know that I have the authority to release you or crucify you? And Christ answered: You would have no authority over me if it was not given to you from above, that is to say by God. The state has the right to inflict capital punishment.

It was not a mere nobody who said this, Mr. Speaker.

6—St. Tomas Aquinas teaches not only that is it permissible but that it is necessary to punish some criminals with death to protect society and for the good of all.

And the fear of a possible error concerning the real criminal is no reason to ignore thoses principles, no more so that an accidental error in an operation would justify the scrapping of that operation which might already have been very helpful . . . and would be later on.

In any event, one is condemned to death only when there are real proofs that he is in fact responsible for voluntary homocide.

I remember that the Solicitor General expressed his concern about the possibility of hanging an innocent, saying that the most destitute may not have the tools or the money required to defend themselves on an equal footing with the more wealthy. He recognized that often the poor do not have the same advantages or tools to defend themselves, and that the government had the responsibility of providing them with a perfect defence and all the tools required to face the better off. And I continue with the quotation:

How many times in the past have I heard someone say: "If it were not for the death penalty, I would do away with him".

Nowadays, we often hear: "I would not be afraid to kill because going to jail is not so bad, you get free food, free board; you only have to keep

quiet and eventually you are released, sometimes much sooner than expected—there is always the hope to get out . . . or to escape.

And if we look at what has happened over the last few years, we see that many indeed have managed to get out.

Therefore, a 25 years sentence or even life-imprisonment is not commensurate with the crime of murder.

I am thinking of those old people cowardly murdered because of their alleged savings.

I am thinking of those children who were tortured and savagely killed by this second offender. The mother of one of those children is still in hospital and probably will be all her life, as she became mentally ill because of her insurmontable grief . . .

I have in mind the settling of scores between members of the underworld even they have a right to live.

Human lives are being taken away as easily as dog's . . . and then we feel pity for the criminal and we forget the innocent victim and the flight of his family as well as the protection of the public.

And I think it is a good thing to remind all those who point out regularly that we must respect life that we also have the basic duty of respecting the lives of innocent persons. I continue my quotation:

I now raise a specific point: what about the eternal destiny of the victim who, without expecting it, is thrown into eternity? . . . Was this person morally ready to appear before God? What will be the consequences?

In this view, the criminal condemned to death punishment will benefit, for he will at least have time to regret his sin and to get his soul ready for the judgment after paying with his life: this will be his last hope.

After all those considerations and being aware of how priceless life and its protection are . . . for the sake of peace and social security . . . knowing that murderers do commit second crimes . . . considering mainly the lack of proportion between the taking of a human life and the few years spent in prison in payment for such a crime, we can say that mercy and pardon are irrelevant and do not correspond to the importance of the situation.

And if we deny the courts any possibility of applying capital punishment when appropriate, we take a serious risk that people might do justice themselves. Consequences that might arise are already predictable.

Retaining capital punishment will not deter the state from trying to improve social conditions and our judicial system in order to prevent violent crime.

And there again, there is much to say and I think the state has a great deal to do in that direction.

. . . thus the state will consider this unexplainable tolerance which allows the mass media to spread violence, murders and immorality and condone crimes of passion where the killing of a man or a woman is seen an ordinary fact of life . . . Living conditions in prisons will also be changed to have prisoners work and improve on their behaviour instead of letting them get worse through idleness . . . and as society improves, murders will be prevented and capital punishment will no longer need to be applied while being maintained.

Canadians hope that their representatives will really take a position in terms of justice and of the well-being of the whole of our society.

I think it is most important that our courts should always be able to apply the death penalty when needed.

Besides, we should know that the individual that respects the lives of others will never have to fear or undergo capital punishment, even though it is maintained in the books.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make these few comments which, in my opinion, will make us ponder over that issue seriously, regardless of the opinions expressed so far by members of this House.

As a matter of fact, the amendment now under consideration is quite important and the law enforcement officers have already stated their views and their concern about it. I hope that the members of this House will consider the amendment as absolutely essential, if we wish to attain the objective we call public security.

We do not hesitate to suggest to day that the bill now under consideration is inconsistent with the objective which the government is aiming at. The Solicitor General may say whatever he likes, his arguments have been knocked out by experts and people much more qualified than I am. I have personally observed certain facts in my own constituency.

They should shocked to learn that on second reading we endorsed that legislation by a small majority, hoping that the amendments would allow light to enter our conscience and we hope at least that the amendments will correct that legislation.

[*English*]

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, this amendment is particularly important. I hope that all members, no matter how they have approached this measure in the past, will give their support to the proposition before the House. We ask the law enforcement officers and the employees in our federal penitentiaries to accept a very special responsibility, one which weighs heavily upon them, and which should weigh heavily upon us as legislators because we know what they face in a society which has become increasingly violent. Somehow, we have to find a formula which will stamp out the escalation of violence which we see about us nationally and internationally.

● (1710)

I do not like quoting statistics to show what has happened to this country's murder rate, but undeniably it is going up. No one can convince me that the elimination of the death penalty will not result in the further increase of the number of people who in days ahead will die violently in this country.

When you stop to think of it, all members of this House, including the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the leader of my party (Mr. Clark), or anyone else believes in capital punishment. I say that for this reason: if any one of us faced the situation in which someone was either going to take our life or we had to kill to defend ourselves, there is no question in my mind what each and every one of us would decide. That being the case, each and every one of us believes in the ultimate punishment for an individual who has a determination to kill. Therefore, I cannot understand why some members would wish to oppose the strong demand of the public for parliament to mirror the public's feeling with regard to capital punishment.

The public has told us, in no uncertain terms, that it wants parliament to enact legislation which will make the death penalty the ultimate punishment for the ultimate crime. The amendment we are discussing does not go that far. It suggests that we should impose the ultimate punishment only on those who commit the ultimate crime against those charged with the special responsibilities of policing our nation and protecting us from the inmates incarcerated in our penal institutions. It says that only if the life of one

of these persons is taken shall the criminal pay the supreme penalty.

I suggest, sir, that the general public which thinks parliament should be a mirror of public opinion and that parliamentarians ought not always to vote according to their personal convictions want the death penalty to be mandatory for a greater number of crimes than contemplated by this amendment. I am sure the general public supports the amendment we are discussing. Therefore, I suggest that if we adopt the amendment we shall let criminals know they face the supreme penalty if they kill certain individuals in our society. There should be no alteration of the present law. When such crimes take place, the criminals should pay the supreme penalty.

One hears many arguments about why we have capital punishment and why we should or should not have it. I hold in my hand a copy of a letter, which I gather was sent to all members of parliament, from Pastor Ernest Kennedy of the Forward Baptist Church, Cambridge, Ontario. The original letter was addressed to the pastor's member of parliament, the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman). It outlines why, in the pastor's view, capital punishment should be retained. I shall put on record some of the views expressed in the letter by the pastor of the Forward Baptist Church, because I am impressed by the sincerity of the man and by his interpretation of what the Bible says on capital punishment. The pastor's letter reads in part:

> In all my reading concerning capital punishment, I have yet to find what I believe to be the basic reason for capital punishment. In the Book of Genesis, long before Abraham, Moses or the nation of Israel was in existence, God laid down a simple covenant with man, in Genesis 8:22 to 9:16. This convenant was to last "while the earth remaineth, for perpetual generations, and everlasting covenant." This covenant included:
>
> 1 Gen. 9:2-3: Man's dominion over the animals. Man is to kill animals for food and protection. Man is unique and given dominion over the animals.
>
> 2 Gen. 9:4: A commandment against cannibalism. Man is allowed to eat all kinds of vegetables and meats, but not human flesh which contains the life and living soul.
>
> 3 Gen. 9:5-6: Murder of another human being is forbidden, and capital punishment is to be enacted.

I note that the pastor used the authority of the Old Testament. Most of us realize that Christ used the Old Testament to assist in guiding his disciples during his lifetime, just as he has guided Christians ever since his crucifixion. Pastor Kennedy went on to say:

> It is interesting here to notice the one and only reason given for capital punishment. Genesis 9:6, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." The reasons for capital punishment is not vengeance, not to get even with the man, not an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, not as a deterrent to others, not for the well-being of man or the protection of society, although some of these things in themselves may be true and involved. The reason God demands capital punishment is just the opposite reason the behavioural scientists want it stopped. God says man is not an animal, but is a created being, made in the image of God and the man who is murdered bears in some way, the image of God, his creator. Murder at its roots is rebellion against God who created and gave dignity to the man murdered.
>
> Consider the following ways that man is the recipient of God's divine image and is, therefore, more than an animal.
>
> 1 Mentally—man has an intelligence, capacity to reason, to evaluate and criticize himself.

[Mr. Coates.]

> 2 Morally—man has a conscience, a capacity to recognize moral values and make moral choices.
>
> 3 Socially—man has a society, a capacity to love and to be in personal, social relationships.
>
> 4 Creatively—man has dominion, a capacity to exercise his lordship over creation, to subdue the earth and to be creative.
>
> 5 Spiritually—man has a soul, a capacity to worship, to pray and to live in communion with God.
>
> The man who puts a gun in his pocket and deliberately drives to the bank and shoots the teller is playing God. He is deciding that another human being should die and has chosen to destroy the image of God as created in the dignity of that man.
>
> When a man is solemnly put to death by the government for deliberately and premeditately taking another man's life, it is in serious recognition to the nation that murder is not just another crime, but is the taking into one's hands the life of a human being who is created in the image of God.

The pastor concludes by saying:

> Mr. Saltsman, in the light of what I have written, I trust that you will give serious consideration for the sake of our country, the responsibility of our government to God, and the dignity of human life to reverse your vote when the bill comes to third and final reading.

● (1720)

I believe that Mr. Kennedy has touched on the most significant aspect of this whole debate. It is not only to deter others from committing murder that we want capital punishment. We believe that when an individual commits a premeditated murder he is, in effect, playing God: he takes things into his own hands and destroys that life. By doing that, that individual sacrifices any hope of mercy by his fellow men. When he destroyed that individual, he destroyed a part of God. God himself said when that was done that individual sacrificed any right to live. That is the way it should be.

There is a penitentiary in my constituency, at Dorchester. There are a great many employees in my area who live and work in that maximum security institution. I have conversation on an almost constant basis with those employees. The kind of experimentation that has been imposed upon employees of penal institutions makes one shudder. There is a degree of permissiveness in our penal system today that gives little protection to the employees. It is no wonder that soon after the vote on second reading, when the bill was given approval in principle, a great many penitentiary employees in the province of Quebec resigned from their employment. If this government has no respect for their lives, they do. They knew that to continue their employment in those penitentiaries, without capital punishment on the statute books, was inviting the possibility of dying in their employment.

There must be a degree of protection for society in general and employees of penal institutions in particular. They must have a fair assurance that if they continue in their employment they will return home in the evening to their wives and families. However, that kind of assurance does not exist today. Therefore, I believe that capital punishment should be retained on the statute books. In fact, I believe it should be enforced in cases where individuals have been found guilty of capital murder and sentenced to death.

It is not a case of whether we are putting the noose around someone's neck, or someone else is: it is the law of the land. The courts of this land make a judgment with

regard to the penalty an individual should pay for a crime. Almost consistently since 1962 they have said that criminals who commit capital murder should die, especially in cases where the jury has not made a recommendation for mercy. However, that has not been the case.

At this time we have in our penitentiaries the most dangerous types of individuals, individuals who would not think twice of killing again. I think of Ambrose and Hutchison who were in Dorchester penitentiary. They showed no mercy. Indeed, they showed the most grotesque inhumanity in the murder of two police officers in Moncton. There is a great danger to every employee because of the inmates who are there. I think of the terrible penalty that inmates in penal institutions must pay so that the government can work out a public relations campaign to convince members of parliament to support abolition. The government says that inmates should remain in those institutions for a longer period of time. The government is trying to sell the public a hard line as far as individuals who have committed capital crimes are concerned.

I do not believe we are going down the right road as far as far as rehabilitation and reform of inmates in our penal institutions are concerned by taking a hard line and having longer sentences in order to eliminate the possibility of having to carry out the death penalty against a very small coterie of inmates who have committed capital murder—in other words, those who have killed a police officer or a penitentiary employee. I firmly believe that the citizens of this country would be quite willing to sacrifice the lives of the few who have been convicted and sentenced to death in order to develop a more realistic rehabilitation program within our penitentiary system.

I assume my time is running out. I will conclude by saying that I support this amendment, as I hope most hon. members will. If that is done, we will then be able to convince the Canadian public that we have acceptable protection for at least one segment of our society, those involved in law enforcement and the protection of society.

● (1730)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) for his intervention. He spoke of the Public Service Alliance of Canada. It was said that the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had claimed that those who were retentionists would be, in their soul and conscience, responsible for the death of the 11 criminals who are now waiting only for our decision to know whether they will live or hang.

I believe the individual who is about to commit a crime knows very well that, when he goes out to rob with a loaded firearm, if he shoots at a policeman he will obviously hit him and possibly kill him.

So all told there are now 11 criminals waiting to know if they will continue to live or not. Mr. Speaker, I try to be human with everybody; we know very well that the cabinet can commute these death penalties into life imprisonment penalties. On the other hand, if the House could retain capital punishment, particularly in the case of the murder of policemen and prison guards who are here to guarantee the security of society, then the would-be murderers would know that if they commit crimes, there will be no mercy. Of course, we could argue that there are judicial errors, but today we know very well that people are not sentenced to death by hanging when there is the slightest doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be allowed to speak not only about the retention of capital punishment in the case of policemen and prison guards but also to say—and I wanted to take the floor again because I maintain my position—that if we want to reduce all this, we will be able to do it but only in the long term. And I quote from a document from the Public Service Alliance of Canada which all hon. members received and which is dated June 30, 1976. In the last paragraph of this brief, they say this: We asked the Solicitor General that his bill be tabled as long as he will not have provided for the establishment of a special institution responsible for the security, namely the safety and the security of all the employees of the Canadian penitentiary service who work in the institutions. We humbly ask you to do this on behalf of all the employees of penitentiaries and their families and so on.

Mr. Speaker, to prove to the House to just what extent the government puts forward a bill designed to abolish capital punishment, what is offered in return to society, what is offered to Canadian people to protect them? Nothing. As evidence, last October I asked the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Allmand) whether there was in his department anything planned to provide some grants to associations across the country, which would be used to curb juvenile delinquency and help reduce the crime rate.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to the House quite briefly, of course, why this bill is not justified, because they precisely forget to offer alternatives. The media can say that with or without capital punishment, nothing will change. Any one who wants to kill will kill anyway. I respect the opinion of my colleagues who feel that way. As far as I am concerned, I think that to provide the public with a minimum of protection, we must have maximum security in our penitentiary institutions, especially for those who guard the inmates. I am not saying you should give them all powers or extraordinary powers, no, but we must ensure the security of those convicts and maintain the death penalty for the murder of policemen who are there to protect us.

But can we afford, as legislators, to let this go, only to see people in our penal institutions strike or resign? A dozen or so have already done so. Can we afford it? In my view, no. Right now, I would like to go back to the prevention of juvenile delinquency and general crime, since, if we mean to prevent, we have to start somewhere. In my view we should start with youngsters aged 13 to 15. There was a patent discrepancy between the Solicitor General of Canada and his officials regarding programs to reduce the crime rate, starting from the basics.

Mr. Speaker, when some groups are interested in preventing crime in our society at the adult or youth level, I think the government ought to consider this solution while preserving the death penalty. And why maintain it? Simply because, as time marches on, within 5, 10 or 15 years, this prevention will be established and a new outlook will pervade our society. Instead of a violence prone society, we shall develop a new one which will encourage

people to produce for their country and to respect the rights of others.

● (1740)

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in today's society, we may have lost the sense of values, and this is why a host of young people hang around on street corners, sniff glue or what have you. We ask the government: What are you going to do to protect society against this kind of thing? How are you going to deal with the situation? They say: It is only a few. Of course, it may be so. They want to protect a minority.

An hon. Member: How true!

Mr. Lavoie: But what do we do as legislators as regards capital punishment? Actually, Mr. Speaker, in my heart of hearts, I am not the kind of man who would hang a criminal, but I believe that as a legislator, and after consulting my constituents, I must protect the majority of Canadians. This is my first concern.

Regardless of their views, be they abolitionists or retentionists, all members must act according to their own conscience. If abolitionists wish to vote according to their conscience, without consulting their constituents, they have the right to do so, and I respect it. I, for one, did the opposite and I will stick to my position in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I said I would be brief. In conclusion, I wish to repeat what I said about prevention. Therefore, I will quote an extract of a booklet sent to us by the Solicitor General now and then and called "Liaison", a monthly publication on criminal justice, Volume I, issue 9, October 1975. The article is entitled "People and sentencing", and I quote.

I also have the feeling, like these school officials, that a wider use should be made of community services, open residential centres and other types of rehabilitation centres of a non-prison nature in which the young child, the juvenile delinquent and certainly the first-time offender would be looked after.

Mr. Speaker, all this comes down to say that today, when an individual is caught, even for the first time, he may have committed a crime using a gun or otherwise. Because even if he has committed a crime, this does not mean he is an habitual criminal. This one can be saved, I believe that, but when we make an habitual criminal of him, when we mix him with hardened criminals, at that point Parliament should have the opportunity to reexamine the whole penal system to ensure maximum security for prison guards and police officers and also to protect the population and some inmates who can be rehabilitated. We can give a chance to the criminals. That does not mean they should all be hanged.

Again last week, in Montreal, a man shot a policeman and fortunately the policeman was not killed. I am very glad for him but if the bullet had been deflected, maybe by a few inches, he would have been killed. Mr. Speaker, these people could not care less whether they kill a police officer or a prison guard. A man will be sent to prison for 25 or 35 years. What does he have to lose? He has nothing left to lose. For him, one crime more, one crime less, he is almost for life behind bars so he does not give a hoot, but we should think of protecting those who try to protect society. That is why I support the motion. I agree, and I hope that the others, whatever their opinion, I respect it, may have the opportunity of reconsidering this motion and then, together, we can decide.

All I wish is that we finally provide this minimum of security to those whose duty is to protect us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) seems to be rising to speak. According to the notes I have here, he has already had the floor.

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the floor yet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the amendment we have before us is in my opinion, very important. When we are discussing the protection of innocent citizens, when we are dealing with the importance of preventing criminals from continuing to play havoc with society, we are in fact speaking about the means to prevent criminals from going on killing innocent victims. When a criminal is sent to prison, no matter for how long, he is put into the hands of guards whose duties is to keep criminals away from society. In our opinion, this is, Mr. Speaker, protecting society.

Prison guards and police agents risk their lives protecting citizens against criminals. So honest citizens will not have to face hardened criminals those prison guards must live every day with people for whom human life has no value. Because of the bill which was introduced in the House they feel that the very same human life has no value in the eyes of the Solicitor General of Canada. Those policemen and prison guards risk their lives every day. At any moment they can see hardened criminals attack them to defend themselves since capital punishment will no longer exist for them.

They also risk everything they have to lose, those few years behind bars, everything they have, to allow other citizens to be protected against the actions of criminals. How does this government thank those valiant prison guards who risk their lives? Well, the only thank the Solicitor General gives them is the abolition of capital punishment, so that murderers sentenced to life have nothing to lose in escaping.

Mr. Speaker, when somebody has already been sentenced to life imprisonment what does he have to lose? We feel that he has absolutely nothing to lose by trying to escape if the maximum sentence he can get is life imprisonment, and we feel that sentence now exists. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, prison guards are at the mercy of the first inmate who decides to escape. Even if he were to kill a prison guard or two what is that going to change in his case? He is already sentenced to life imprisonment. At worst, he may be recaptured and sentenced once again to life imprisonment. Mr. Speaker, it is a bit like someone who has the mumps or the measles. Once you have had them, you cannot get them again. So, Mr. Speaker, the obvious consequence is that prison guards are no longer protected at all.

● (1750)

With the bill proposed by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), the lifer will be able to kill as many guards as he wishes as he will not get more than a life term. He has nothing to lose and everything to win by killing a guard in an escape attempt. If the Solicitor General himself was a prison guard and had to face those criminals every day, he would probably understand how important capital punishment is for those who must face criminals day in and day out.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, from his comfortable seat in the House of Commons it is easy for him to say that capital punishment is not useful and does not protect policemen and guards. If the Solicitor General had to cope with killers and criminals every day, as do policemen and guards, he would have a different view. He would not brag so much and would probably better understand the people responsible for maintaining peace and order who ask for the retention of capital punishment to have minimum protection against killers and criminals.

If the Solicitor General listens to policemen and prison guards, he will realize that they do not accept the attitude of the government and the personal attitude of the minister concerning that issue. I have here, Mr. Speaker, an article from the newspaper *La Presse* showing very clearly the intention of prison guards and policemen to join forces to fight the government bill. This is what the article says as it reflects the attitude of prison guards concerning the abolition of capital punishment.

Prison guards intend to join forces with policemen before going into action.

A new common front is about to appear. This time, it will be prison guards asking for the support of various Canadian police corps to give more weight to their demands.

That response came on the heels of the vote on second reading of the bill to abolish capital punishment. The security staff of the federal prisons in Quebec, gathered in a general meeting a few days ago, gave their union executives a mandate to rally all forces before using pressure tactics.

Many people in the audience were in favour of unlimited strike action. However, they accepted the idea of a common front so that the measures to be taken will have a real impact. Prison guards of several other Canadian cities also held meetings, a few days ago to protest against the government decision. Some prison guards said they would accept the abolition of capital punishment if super-maximum security jails are built, something that does not exist in Canada at this time.

"Criminals saved from the execution by the new legislation are a constant threat to our security" declared the guards at Saint-Vincent-de-Paul. "We cannot forget what happened to our colleague Paul Gosselin, killed last year by a prisoner".

Another guard who was held hostage a few weeks ago believes that he owes his life to the existence of the death penalty. "When I told my aggressor who was pointing a knife at me, if you kill me, you are liable to be hanged" . . .

And this guard sincerely believes that his aggressor thought twice and decided to leave him alive.

The executive of the prison guards union and top officials of the Public Service Alliance of Canada discussed a possible mutual agreement with policemen and obtained a clear mandate: we must strongly protest against abolition of the death penalty and negotiate once and for all for our security.

Mr. Speaker, I continue the quotation:

Mr. Jean-Guy Chalut, Vice-President of the Alliance for Quebec said he welcomes such a clear mandate and has assured guards that there would be new developments . . .

—in the coming weeks.

According to Mr. Chalut, even the prisoners are against the abolition of the death penalty because they also fear for their life.

Mr. Speaker, when we read such comments, we wonder how a minister could come here to withdraw the only protection provided to those people, to assure some protection to every Canadian.

It is clear that prison guards fear for their life. Unlike the Solicitor General, they do not have the advantage of being constantly protected by the RCMP. They must live daily with people for whom human lives are worthless. Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

An hon. Member: It is not yet six o'clock, there three minutes left.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree with the hon. member that it is six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not seem to be unanimous consent, so the hon. member may go on with his remarks.

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: We can go on until seven o'clock!

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the same thing goes as far as police officers are concerned. They also have to face criminals during bank hold-ups, takings of hostages and murders. When the criminal knows he is risking life imprisonment for his action—

An hon. Member: You are repeating yourself!

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): I may repeat myself, but the hon. member certainly knows he does not have the courage to get up on his feet.

Mr. Guay (Saint-Boniface): I said there was no courage in that!

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): The murderer has nothing to lose by killing one, two, or three police officers to avoid being arrested. If he is arrested, what is he going to get on top of that? Life imprisonment. If he kills a policeman to avoid being arrested, what sentence will he get?

How is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that gangsters hesitate before shooting policemen in such circumstances? It is worth stressing that no fewer than 51 police officers have been murdered since 1964. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that no fewer than 51 peace officers have been coldly murdered by hoodlums since capital punishment ceased to be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, it is six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Unless the hon. member wishes to conclude his remarks, and providing the House grants him five more minutes by unanimous consent, he could then go on.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve): It is six o'clock. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Liberal members who did not stop interjecting should get ready tomorrow and find the courage to get up on their feet.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Monday, June 7, 1976, this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, July 8, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed from Wednesday, July 7, consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and Motion No. 13 (Mr. Reynolds).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Before concluding my speech, I would like to mention by the way, as recorded in *Hansard* of July 7, 1976, that many government members have been pointing out that we are repeating ourselves. Mr. Speaker, of course we have been repeating ourselves. Why? Merely to make some members understand their irresponsibility in introducing such a measure as Bill C-84 which does away with the security protecting on duty policemen in a country where criminality is constantly increasing. So if we repeat ourselves, as I have just said, it is only to make an individual as irresponsible as the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Allmand) understand that policemen and prison guards can be heard in this Parliament.

It is almost impossible for them to be heard because some members of the opposition and even some government members stubbornly reject clause 4 of the bill before us. I hope that in view of the opposition the government, and the minister in particular, will withdraw clause 4 of the bill. Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General ought to be sensible enough to realize the uneasiness which exists among police officers and prison guards, since those people must risk their lives every day. This is not a time for philosophy or for hot air, like the Solicitor General seems to think.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot deny that most criminal actions are committed by a small number of individuals whose only purpose it to flout the laws passed by this House. On reading the *Journal de Montréal*, we see that it is always the same people who commit crimes and who threaten peace and security in Canada.

I quote that paper:

80 per cent of all prisoners are habitual criminals.

On reading things like that, how can we understand that the minister should introduce such a bill? We are told that about 80 per cent of those who are behind bars in Canada—10,200 in the provincial institutions of the country and 8,200 in federal penitentiaries—all hardened offenders? Now, to go back to the quotation:

That high percentage is not surprising to anyone who is aware of the traditional weakness of our prisons in the field of rehabilitation, as well as of the obvious hostility of society towards prisoners or former prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, much more could be said about the bill now before the House, and particularly about the amendment moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). He, at least, understands the opposition of the prison guards and policemen who want to ensure security to the Canadian people in the exercise of their duties.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I shall support this amendment gladly. If the Solicitor General lacks the judgment and common sense to understand the situation, I trust that at least hon. members, even those of the opposition, who are against the amendment, will show enough good will to recognize that prison guards and police agents have good reasons to demand that the death penalty be maintained. Consequently, I intend, on my own behalf and that of my party, for the ridings we represent in Canada, to support this amendment: it is designed to protect the valorous guardians of the peace and public security that police and prison guards are.

● (1110)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for British Columbia—Fraser Valley East (Mr. Patterson).

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that there are other representatives from British Columbia here as well. It is a wonderful, large province inhabitated by great people, and it takes a considerable number of members of parliament to represent the people of British Columbia in the way in which they deserve. However, I am honoured to be one of the group from British Columbia.

We are currently discussing amendments to Bill C-84 in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences. The motion proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), proposes to delete clause 4, and I take the opportunity to indicate my support for the motion. It would retain for policemen and prison guards a measure of safety which presently exists under our ineffective and sloppy administration of justice.

I listened with interest and amazement to the comments made by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) yesterday when he stated that while he was in favour of retention of capital punishment, he was going to vote against this motion because it would retain protection for a

certain group of people which was denied to other groups. The hon. member knows very well that this motion is not a discriminatory action on the part of the members who support this motion but is an endeavour to salvage something from the wreckage of a very bad bill proposed by the present government.

It is hardly necessary to remind ourselves of the history of the provision that is being discussed today. It was included in a bill to abolish capital punishment for one reason, that was, I believe, to get the measure through the House of Commons and have it become law. The proposal was that capital punishment be retained for the murder of policemen or prison guards but, as every member of the House is aware this morning, that was just a farce because the government had no such intention at that time, nor has it since that time allowed an execution to be carried out under the provisions of the present legislation. There was a measure of public protest that arose over the inclusion of the exception at that time and many communications came to the desks of all members of parliament, not to object to the protection granted to policemen and prison guards, but to the fact that the same protection was not granted to all the citizens of Canada.

As we look at the facts, we discover that the policemen themselves took exception to the fact that the same protection was not granted to the other citizens of Canada. In a brief, which I am sure every member received, from the Metropolitan Toronto Police Association, we find several brief paragraphs in this connection which I should like to read. On page 15 of the brief we find the following statement:

> We must make our position clear with respect to the current law dealing with capital punishment.' It is our contention, clearly and emphatically, that we never proposed, requested nor supported the law as it now stands. In other words, we were not the ones to suggest, request or propose that capital punishment be retained for the killing of police officers, as we are sure neither did the prison officials request capital punishment be retained for the killing of prison officials.

Farther on it says:

> We must criticize the current law as being discriminatory in the sense that it places a greater value on the lives of policemen and prison guards than it does on the lives of children, housewives, shopkeepers, businessmen, cab drivers, etc.
>
> Not only do we wish the present law to be retained but we wish it to be expanded to cover the murder of any citizen during the commission of a crime.

I think that is very clear in the presentation of the views of the policemen of this country. So, I wanted to put that on the record to make it clear that this was not a special request made by the policemen or the prison guards of this country. In spite of the fact that protests were raised by citizens, I do not believe that they wanted this clause to be removed. They wanted it to be expanded to include the protection of all Canadians.

Those of us who are speaking on this motion believe that all citizens should be guaranteed the maximum degree of security—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Patterson: —that this penalty affords. But if the government is determined to remove this degree of security from society in general and succeeds in doing so, it should be known that we are endeavouring to retain it at least for those who are charged with the responsibility of ensuring the apprehension and incarceration of criminals in this country.

The policies advocated and put in place by this government have underlined the preoccupation of the government with the so-called rights of the criminal element, to the neglect of the rights of society in general. It seems to me that this motion should carry, so protection could be retained at least for prison guards and policemen. What do we find today? We find that our prison guards are shorn of authority to maintain discipline, and this has been done by government direction. The prison guards have been hassled and insulted by the inmates. They have been deprived of the maximum safety measures. These public servants are working under the severest of handicaps in their efforts to contain the lawbreakers in this nation.

● (1120)

I would like to call attention to a document which has been forwarded to all members of parliament by the Public Service Alliance of Canada. On page 3 there is a reference to a telegram which was forwarded by Mr. J. K. Wylie, executive vice president of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, to Mr. A. Therrien, commissioner of penitentiaries, concerning the measures to protect custodial officers. I would like to quote just one statement made in the reply to that telegram. It was sent by Mr. Therrien, the commissioner. He states, and I quote:

> In closing, I wish to assure you most emphatically that the Penitentiary Service considers it of the utmost importance that custodial staff should enjoy secure, peaceful working conditions in which they are able to go about their duties unharrassed and unmolested. The measures I have outlined above are intended to create and maintain a safe environment for personnel, and I am confident that with the co-operation of all concerned, they can be effective in doing so.

I will not take the time to place on the record the statement outlining what has been done, but I do want to point out that I question very much the statements which are made by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), the commissioner of penitentiaries, and others who are trying to insinuate that adequate measures are in place or will be in place to guarantee the safety of the personnel in these institutions. I do not believe that they are sufficient or adequate, and I question very much whether there will be any really effective administration to ensure that the regulations which are now in place will be actually carried out to the fullest extent.

The question then comes to us: what is in store for our penitentiary personnel if and when the legislation is passed and becomes law? Reference has been made to 25 year sentences, but here again there is a catch, and it is quite possible that the exception will become the rule. The clause providing for consideration for parole after 15 years under certain circumstances could become the regular procedure. The precedent that has been set by the government by its actions, including the retention of the death penalty for the murder of certain classes of citizens and then refusing to allow sentences to be carried out, is an indication of what we can expect in the future administration of the law.

I would like to call attention to a portion of the presentation made by the Toronto Policemen's Association in this regard. Page 22 reads, in part:

News reports of the new law have left Canadians to believe that if capital punishment is abolished it shall be replaced with a mandatory twenty-five year prison term. Very little, if any, mention is ever drawn to the attention of the public that there is provision for a review of that twenty-five year prison term after fifteen years have been served. Our concern based on past experience is that if capital punishment is abolished in return for longer prison terms, then shortly after the abolishment of capital punishment we will see a lessening of the mandatory jail term and a lessening of the time for a review.

Apparently I am not the only one who questions the credibility of the statements made by the Solicitor General, or even those included in the law, because those who are charged with the responsibility of apprehending criminals—and I believe this feeling is shared by those who are charged with the responsibility of maintaining their incarceration—have very serious questions with regard to the effectiveness of this particular provision.

As I return to the motion which is presently before us to delete from the bill the clause which would remove capital punishment, even as far as the murderers of policemen and prison guards are concerned, I believe this motion warrants the support of the entire House. It certainly should warrant the support of hon. members such as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni because it seems to me that the arguments he used were rather superficial. If he is in favour of the retention of capital punishment for all murderers in the category of first degree murder, or however it may be classified, then he should not withhold that protection from some categories, even if his government insists on removing it for the murder of Canadians in general. So I trust that when this motion is brought before the House for a final decision, it will receive the unanimous support of all hon. members of this House and that capital punishment, at least for the murderers of prison guards and policemen, will be retained in our legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to make a few remarks on that extremely important clause of the bill, because if there is a subject which should spur the conscience of all hon. members of the House, it is indeed this bill, and particularly clause 4.

Mr. Speaker, when we think about the role policemen have to play in Canada, we realize the full significance of the legislation before us. We know to what extent our municipal officials and our Canadian police associations at various levels rightly insist on the dedication, the competence and the respectability of our policemen. We even require a very high level of education for an applicant to be accepted in any police force. Courses are given every year in all provinces to our different police forces to ensure public protection, because the policeman, for any normal Canadian, should ensure public protection. That is why he is highly paid. This is why we now see policemen earning $15,000, $18,000 and even $20,000 a year. We are spending staggering amounts for our police salaries so that people may receive the best possible protection.

But while we are asking the police to ensure public safety we, in return, do not want to ensure police safety. We want our policemen to protect us but Parliament does not want to protect them. I cannot imagine more stupid, more inane legislation than the one which is before us. We are paying security forces to protect us, our children, our society, the taxpayers and their properties. We are asking the police to fulfill its role, namely to ensure the security of society; that is what we are paying for. On the other hand, the House of Commons refuses to grant those policemen the very protection they are expected to give the public. It is outrageous that this government has reached such a stage. In the final analysis, it means the present government is trying to bring this country to the brink or anarchy. From the moment we do not want to give any protection to the individuals who receive large amounts of money to protect us, this means, Mr. Speaker, that we are ready to live in anarchy in Canada as of tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker, we also expect policemen to be well educated and to drive good cars, we ask them to have good systems to fight fire, we also require our prison guards to be well equipped; nevertheless, the first facility we must give policemen is the opportunity to protect themselves, to protect their own lives. We must put ourselves today in the situation of the policemen who have to respond to a telephone call saying that a hold-up is in progress in a bank on the corner of a given street and that someone has already been shot by the bandits who broke into the bank. In the city of Acton Vale, we saw a notorious bandit, who had been swearing for years he would get rid of the police chief, take advantage of a fight in a hotel one evening to shoot this police chief in front of witnesses standing by, something like 200 people. The police chief of Acton Vale was the father of nine children.

● (1130)

How do policemen feel while they are waiting in the police station for distress calls from the public? How do they feel when they must take over after their chief has been shot by a bandit, when they are asked to protect them while they themselves are not even armed and protected, in the sense that it will not matter if the same bandit, who just shot the chief, guns down his assistant or other policemen because there is no punishment, because he is on the same social footing and enjoys the same credibility as the chief of police who had to submit references and a clean record. The bandit who just shot the chief of police, and who already committed many murders is put before society on the same footing as this policeman.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked to hear such an argument from a member who asks for the protection of policemen, and who refuses today to give them such protection. I have here the summary of the brief submitted by the national police committee. We must consider it because those concerned today are the policemen. We should have consideration for those who are bound to fight criminals rather than take the advice of political scientists, sociologists or demagogues who hide behind the Solicitor General, who have probably never seen a gangster in their life but who are good at counselling or advising the minister. The minister should choose policemen and nobody else as advisers because they are the ones who are concerned with clause 4. But as long as the government is going to sit and listen to public servants who have no responsibility in running the country, we are likely to be faced once again with bills as stupid and childish as the one before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the position of our policemen. Why are they so disgusted today to see that parliamentarians refuse them the same protection they have always

granted us? I know dozens of police forces in Canada and more particularly those in my riding. They have a conscientious approach to their work in providing public protection. They protect our children, our students and our properties which they defend with eagerness in spite of the risks. We call them to lend assistance to threatened people and to some organizations. They are called in case of fire, for instance, the same way the fire fighters are called, but they are policemen whose services are used to help the people when fire breaks out.

And today we have before us a bill which tends to deprive policemen of protection. I find that disgusting and I find that those who are going to remove the protection for policemen are without conscience. They want to deprive policemen of protection and at the same time they demand police protection. I can only feel revolted by this legislation which should never have been put before the House. And here is what policemen say about the Solicitor General:

We disagree with the minister when he says that it is up to retentionists to show why the legislation should not be changed. According to us . . .

They are policemen, they are not all fools, not all civil servants sitting in an office who never had to face criminality . . .

the minister is the one who should prove . . .

They are not listened to, the representations made in Canada by police forces are not taken into account, some of us would rather listen to representations made by criminals and those who have to do with crime.

According to us, the minister is the one who should prove that the legislation must be changed . . .

That is good logic. The minister is the one who should prove that the legislation must be changed, that is what policemen say.

● (1140)

We object to the public statement by the highest judiciary authority in Canada that he would resign if capital punishment were to be carried out.

Mr. Speaker, how can someone make such a childish public statement? A real child! If he does not get a toy, if he does not get a candy, he is going to go into tantrum. The minister has said that he would resign if anyone should hang. And this statement emanates from the highest judiciary authority in the country! He is the one responsible for the implementation of the law. And he would resign if his bill were not accepted. The brief goes on:

What if all law officers in Canada had this attitude regarding the laws they do not like to enforce?

If law officers were to have this attitude, Mr. Speaker, there would be a general strike overnight by all police forces in Canada because police officers now have to enforce laws they do not like, and yet they do not voice such irresponsible and stupid remarks as those expressed by the minister who said recently that he will resign if his bill is defeated.

We are worried by the public statements of the Solicitor General reflecting his intention to propose a reduced term after which murderers would be eligible for parole following the abolition of capital punishment.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

If the Solicitor General really believes that neither the state nor any individual or institution has the right to take a life, we can then expect that he will soon propose that Canadian policemen be unarmed lest they might kill someone in the course of their duties.

What action did the minister take to accommodate the large number of murderers . . .

It sounds good to say that those people will be sent to jail, but our current pentitentiary system in Canada prevents us from putting those people behind bars because we do not have enough jails, enough facilities and the minister knows it. No plans have been made yet to implement what is suggested in this bill: send murderers to jail for 25 years. Jails are already filled to capacity.

What plans did the minister make to accommodate the large number of murderers who will be sentenced to 25 years if the bill is passed in its present form? We are told that jails are already overcrowded, obsolete and are nothing but rest homes. How will these institutions and their authorities be able to face the flow of convicts sentenced to long terms?

Mr. Speaker, what do the policemen think of the deterrent effect?

The executed murderer cannot commit a second crime.

The fact that violent riots in prisons have caused the death of inmates and injuries to guards shows positively the deterrent effect of the capital punishment threat.

Mr. Speaker, about 500 feet from my home, two prison guards have witnessed last year the murder of their colleagues in the Cowansville jail. Presently, those people are on leave without pay because they suffer from a nervous breakdown after they realized what happens inside jails because of the lack of protection given to prison guards. Those people are still on welfare. They received a salary for some time and, today, their doctor gave them a medical certificate: nervous breakdown. It is not the minister, the Solicitor General who risks his life in prisons, without any tools, without any means of protection.

We recommend to the members of the justice committee to consider the findings of a study conducted by Ehrlich and Yunker of the United States, as well as the verbatim report that the American Attorney General filed with the Supreme Court of that country dealing with capital punishment and the constitution of the USA. It is interesting to note that out of the 50 states, 37 have now passed legislation on capital punishment. We are convinced that if we want to compare our jurisdiction with others, it would be more helpful to compare it with that of the USA, because it is more relevant to Canadian jurisdiction than any other in this world.

We take pleasure in this House in wanting to copy the legislation of countries that live under socialist governments, but we should be more inclined to imitate our next door neighbour whose methods we copy every day in the field of trade and in every other activity, except that of justice.

We think that the punishment should be proportional to the crime committed. To us that is justice, not revenge, nor retribution—justice.

Justice is not set by administrators, policemen or legislators. Justice is set by the acceptance by Canadians of the degrees of punishment and their relation to the seriousness of the crime committed.

The results of countless surveys indicate that the majority of Canadians demand justice for murder. The justice they demand is that capital punishment be maintained and that it be applied to premeditated murders, or murders committed during the perpetration of a crime.

That is signed by the Canadian Police Association, by the president, the vice-president and the past president.

I could also read what was done in England:

Return to hanging for murder or genuine life imprisonment.

While all Great Britain police departments are going through the country with a fine toothcomb looking for dangerous murderers, the widow of a recently slain chief of police launched a massive campaign in favour of the reinstatement of hanging in England.

"If the country were at war nobody would be offended that death would be the fate of the enemy and I think we are at war with criminals," said pretty Maureen Richardson, a 35 year old brunette.

Her husband, Superintendent Gerald Richardson was gunned down with several shots as he was attempting to arrest two bandits who were trying to flee after stealing jewelry estimated at over $120,000 in Blackpool.

The police identified Richardson's assassin as being Frederick Joseph Sewell, age 34 or 36; this would be his second murder.

Forbes had escaped last Monday from the Peterhead prison in Scotland. He would be the first individual in the judicial annals of Scotland to be guilty of a second murder after being paroled on a sentence of life imprisonment.

That is what the Solicitor General's policy will lead us to with paroles and 25-year terms. Because after a few months, we have seen that individuals commit one, two, three or four murders.

It goes on to state:

Commenting on her campaign, Mrs. Richardson indicated: "I urge reinstatement of hanging for premeditated murders, and I stress that anybody who puts a loaded revolver in his pocket is premeditating something".

Also, as my hon. colleague from Moncton (Mr. Jones) suggested, and I quote:

The Maritimes police officers urge for a return to capital punishment.

This is what Senator Robichaud indicated, and things become serious when a senator suggests he is going to make his own justice.

Senator Louis Robichaud, former premier of New Brunswick, suggested he was opposed to violence under any form but could not accept the way the parole boards and the judicial system let murderers go unpunished in a number of instances. "If someone rapes and kills my daughter, and if adequate punishment is not inflicted by the judiciary, I will personally make it my duty to apply punishment". Such were his words.

Mr. Speaker, when we hear a senator going on record to say he will protect himself, what can we expect from police forces in Canada when they find they have no protection anymore? They will be considered just as criminals are. They will be afforded the same kind of respect given gangsters who perpetrated three, four or even five murders. We will see criminals put on the same social footing as a chief of police with credibility and an impeccable record. Police chiefs are men of talent and character, they often have very important responsibilities outside their official function, as some I have known in my own constituency. At this point in his conscience, the Solicitor General is placing the gangster and the chief of police on an equal footing before the law.

The Quebec Association of Police Directors is fed up with the way the parole board behaves; they blame it for being too generous toward recidivists.

Recidivists are awarded medals! I wonder why, in his bill, the minister did not ask that bandits and criminals be given credit cards and Cadillac cars to better rehabilitate those poor souls into our society.

The Quebec Retail and Services Federation said the following:

The Quebec Retail and Services Federation covers seven professional associations of retailers in various sectors of the retail trade . . .

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret I must interrupt the hon. member, to inform him that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on motion No. 13 brought forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). The amendment calls for the deletion of clause 4 of Bill C-84, the clause which would repeal the present provisions of section 214 of the Criminal Code and substitute the penalty of life imprisonment for first degree murder. In effect this would mean a penalty of 25 years in the case of a first conviction for the murder of a police officer, prison guard or correctional officer. I support the amendment because if this clause were deleted we would go back to the law as it was.

● (1150)

I wish to refer to an excellent article by Michael Marley in today's Montreal *Gazette* in which he comments on the convoluted thinking of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on the death penalty. I quote:

It is because I have an enduring confidence in mankind (the law-abiding sort) and confidence in society's ability to protect itself (if it is given the chance) that I favor retention of capital punishment.

This is certainly a volatile enough issue for a general referendum. The government should either give us one or resign and allow us to choose leaders who will be less autocratic and more responsive to the desires of the population.

I agree with Mr. Marley that the government should resign. However, I do not think there is any need for a referendum. There have been many polls taken in Canada as well as questionnaires and letters to members of parliament. We already know the views of the Canadian people.

On April 30, 1975, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) presented a petition. At that time he said, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on capital punishment on behalf of over 200,000 concerned people across Canada—a very small percentage of the overall majority who are in favour of capital punishment. May I say the petitions forms were made available in both official languages across Canada.

I understand the end result was that this petition finally had about one million signatures. That in itself should give this government something to think about. It is another reason for them to consider supporting motion No. 3.

There was another article which appeared earlier this year headed "Gospel church poll is 90 per cent in favour of death penalty". I quote:

A Hamilton minister wrote to Canada's Solicitor-General yesterday calling for the retention of the death penalty, based on a survey of the membership of the Associated Gospel Churches of Canada.

It will be found that many opinion polls reached 90 per cent in favour of the death penalty although the overall average for Canada is 75 per cent.

On February 2, 1976, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) issued a news release containing the results of a questionnaire sent to his constituents. It stated that no fewer than 73 per cent of the citizens of Ottawa West favoured retention of capital punishment. Because of his actions there, in all probably the hon. member for Ottawa West will return to this House after the next election.

We cannot ignore the presentations we received from police associations and prison guards. I wish to read into the record a letter that was sent to the Prime Minister, copies of which were sent to all members of parliament. I quote:

The Canadian Police Association, which represents 40,000 municipal and provincial police officers in Canada, met in Toronto in February 1975 to discuss the issue of capital punishment. The Association is deeply concerned over the fact that there is now no penalty of consequence imposed on persons who commit murder in our country. Persons convicted of murder who are given a "life" sentence can be eligible for parole in seven to ten years after conviction. It is the view of the policemen of this country, as represented by the association, that this is not a suitable penalty and does not serve to protect society.

There have been some changes with regard to the length of sentence, but that is not what the Canadian people want.

In July 1972 the Association informed the Honourable John Turner, then Minister of Justice, of our position with respect to capital punishment; a copy of the submission setting out our position was forwarded to you as well. Our recommendations were ignored by your government.

The government is not only ignoring the police association and the guard's association, but between 80 and 90 per cent of the Canadian people.

In July 1973 the association wrote to the Honourable James Jerome, Chairman of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee of the House of Commons, advising him and his committee of our views on the issue of capital punishment. Once again our recommendations were ignored.

It is our belief that our position, as outlined to the government in 1972 and reiterated in 1973, is even more applicable in 1975 since crimes of violence continue to plague this country at an alarming rate and since the penalties imposed by present legislation are no deterrent.

We recognize that it is the responsibility of police officers to enforce the law and that it is the responsibility of government and parliament to make the laws which police officers must enforce. However, the law must serve to protect the citizen and it is the view of the Canadian Police Association that the present laws with respect to punishment for murder are inadequate and fail to provide for the proper protection of Canadian citizens.

It is our belief that unless substantial steps are taken to provide meaningful penalties for the murder of our citizens the rate of these violent crimes will continue to escalate.

The Canadian Police Association is again advancing to members of parliament the position they take with respect to capital punishment and are advising the Canadian people of this position so that citizens can be aware of the concern felt by their police officers in every province in Canada.

The Canadian Police Association strongly recommends that the government of Canada immediately review the present laws pertaining to punishment for murder, in line with the following resolution:

"Capital punishment must be extended beyond the present limitations so as to include all crimes in which acts of violence result in the death of any person.

Persons who take the life of another while committing such crimes as child molestation, rape, air piracy, political assassination, treason, and robbery must be charged with capital murder and, if convicted, should face the death penalty.

In cases where persons are found guilty of capital murder, after all levels of judicial appeal have been exhausted, and no recommendation for mercy is forthcoming from the judicial process, the federal cabinet shall be prohibited from interfering with that sentence and subsequent punishment.

In cases where a recommendation for mercy is forthcoming from the judicial process the federal cabinet should be permitted to commute the death sentence. However the alternative to the death sentence should be limited to natural or true life imprisonment."

We, the police officers who have sworn to serve and protect the citizens of Canada, firmly believe that all law abiding citizens have a right to expect, and indeed to demand, to be able to live in peace and safety, free from fear of criminal acts being perpetrated against them or against member of their families. The continued eroding of this feeling of security by elected representatives, through their failure adequately to maintain legislation guaranteeing every reasonable protection to all law abiding citizens, is of the greatest danger to our free society; if allowed to continue, this erosion will ultimately destroy our accepted way of life.

The letter is signed by S. R. Scarr, the president of the association. I might point out that the police association has the support of the majority of Canadians. I find it strange that this government continually ignores these types of requests, as well as representations received from constituents across Canada.

Members of parliament received a letter from the Public Service Alliance of Canada dated June 24, 1976, which reads as follows:

Before you cast your final ballot on Bill C-84, we would like to bring to your attention the following facts so that in conscience, as you were reminded by the Prime Minister of Canada in his address to the House on June 15, 1976, appearing in the Commons Debates, page 14499, and I quote "I want to make it very clear that, if a majority of honourable members vote against abolition, some people are going to be hanged. Their death would be a direct consequence of the negative decision made by this House on this bill."

Mr. McKinley: What about the victims?

Mr. McKenzie: It is to them we should be giving consideration, but this government is not too concerned about the victims.

On our part, we would also like to appeal to your conscience and revert the statement of the Prime Minister on all abolitionists that they would be held responsible for all future killings of penitentiary employees and law enforcement officers across this land, and we make the pledge that every time one of those killings takes place, we will remind all those who will have voted for the abolition of the capital punishment.

● (1200)

The facts that we would like you to take into consideration are as follows:

1. the irresponsible attitude adopted by the Commissioner and the directors of institutions in regard to the pressure groups entering the institutions;

2. the lack of proper management now in charge of the majority of institutions across the land;

3. the horrible states in which the inmates are being classified, endangering the life of both penitentiary employees and the majority of inmates who would be ready to accept the rules that they have to conform with for the length of their sentences;

4. the lack of facilities to guarantee the protection and security of both penitentiary employees and inmates against murderous types who will have nothing to lose by the proposed sentence of 25 years as being considered under Bill C-84.

I would remind the House once again of the recent escapade of Donald Kelly who obtained a toy gun and attempted to escape from an Ontario prison. Imagine what would have happened had it been a real gun: we would probably have had six dead guards on our hands. To continue:

For those reasons, the Hon. Warren Allmand, Solicitor General of Canada, who did not have the courage to disclose those facts to the hon. members of the House of Commons, should in conscience resign from his cabinet position since he has lost the faith of all penitentiary employees and law enforcement officers across this land.

Please consider very carefully in all conscience, keeping in mind the security of your own family along with the penitentiary personnel and law enforcement officers of this country, the following: "We want to make it very clear that if a majority of hon. members vote against retention, some people are going to be murdered. Their death would be a direct consequence of the negative decision made by your House on this bill".

In conscience,

Paul Caouette,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer,
Public Service Alliance of Canada

These are some of the reasons for which I am supporting this motion, and I hope every member of the House will give serious consideration to supporting it.

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have a further opportunity to speak on this important subject because I believe we are dealing with a critical aspect of our whole system of law and order when we address ourselves to this motion. We have an opportunity before us now to uphold that system at least to a degree by affording to police and prison officers the protection which many Canadians are demanding.

Prison guards and policemen are, by the very nature of their work, in contact most of the time with lawbreakers and the criminal element of our society. In other words, their chances of being attacked or murdered are very much greater than those of the average citizen. This being the case, they deserve special protection. We owe it to policemen and prison guards to provide them with every reasonable protection we can offer. In recent times we have seen an alarming increase in the taking of hostages both inside and outside prisons, an exercise often designed to make possible the escape or release of inmates held in prison. Such incidents will probably have serious consequences for us in the future and will, undoubtedly, result in the murder of prison guards.

Those who take on jobs as police officers and prison guards are fathers and husbands just like anyone else. When they undertake to make a career as policemen or in prison work they recognize there are certain risks attached to their decision. The question here is how high this risk ought to be. Surely, men and women who embark on a career in this type of work should be able to enjoy a normal life expectancy. We are increasing substantially the risks run by these public servants if we fail to pass the amendment before us.

One of the immediate concerns affecting police forces across the country is whether they will be able in future to recruit sufficient men of high calibre, such as we are privileged to have in our police forces at the present time, to meet the needs of our law enforcement requirements. At the present time, for example, I am advised that the Calgary police force is experiencing great difficulty in meeting its recruitment needs in spite of the fact that pay for policemen in Calgary is No. 4 in Canada and that fringe benefits are equal to the best. The pressure is already beginning to be felt. The removal of capital punishment to the extent indicated in this motion is likely to have serious effects in terms of police reaction and morale.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that last winter, following the killing of policemen in the province of Quebec, there was a strong likelihood of the entire Quebec provincial police force going out on strike in protest. A few years ago, in Montreal, when the police decided to walk out the result was chaos. If we remove this important protection from the law we are inviting a reaction from our police forces every time there is a brutal slaying of a policeman in this country. We have all witnessed the paralysing effect of a walk-out by airline pilots. I ask hon. members to consider the effect of a police walk-out, whether in a city or in a province, or of a walk-out by prison guards.

The government, either on purpose or by bad management, seems to have pitted almost every conceivable group in our society against another ever since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came to power. They have set labour against business, rich against poor, French against English, and in this case law-abiding citizens against the government. If there were to be a widespread walk-out by police or prison guards, or a tide of resignations, the result could be the imposition of martial law in this country.

Why is the removal of the death penalty for any and every possible offence necessary or desirable? The government across the way is directly responsible for the deterioration of law and order in Canada. Its permissive actions and the changes it has made in the law have brought about a much worse society than we had hoped for or deserved. Under this administration, the man who obeys the law, the man who works for his living, is taking a back seat to the law breaker, to those who will not work and to those who are encouraged to live off the system. The removal of protection for our police forces as prescribed in the bill before us is another step backward, a step toward anarchy.

I wish the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) would tell us more about the trial period in connection with abolition which began in 1967 and which was extended in 1973. What trial was conducted? What scientific evidence was gathered? Why did the minister ask the House to extend the trial period a short 32 months ago? What further evidence does the government require? What further evidence did they get? Mr. Speaker, the so-called trial period was not a trial period at all. The whole exercise was a farce. Since the law of Canada was never carried out, no one was ever hanged for the killing of a policeman or a prison guard. There was no deterrent, no experiment. We have, in effect, been living with the complete abolition of capital punishment since the Prime Minister took office.

This example of lawbreaking and disregard for the wishes and feelings of the people is a matter of national concern. The government seems to believe that laws are to be passed with no regard whatsoever for the wishes of the people. It will learn that as a result of this arrogance and disregard it will be thrown out of office. Governments and members of this House, no matter what anyone says, are here to speak for their constituents, and when they do not the voters find representatives who will speak for them. I know that members opposite are under tremendous pressure from their constituents. I understand this is particularly the case with members from the province of Quebec. It is interesting that their leader has so much influence on

those opposite that they listen to him and not to their constituents.

● (1210)

Capital punishment in the United States is an example which cannot be overlooked. The Supreme Court ruled very recently that the death penalty is not a cruel or unusual punishment. Thus, the death penalty can and will be imposed by many more states. Some 37 states have returned to the death penalty and it is expected now that many more, in fact most states in the United States will.

If we do not uphold capital punishment in respect of the killing of prison guards and policemen, I would ask you to consider what are the consequences for our Canadian police forces which are considered to be basically conservative groups of men. If we remove this important protection from the law in respect of our police officers, and they are faced every day and night with investigations, checking out people in automobiles and strange, dark places, they are going to step out with their guns drawn. I can assure you that they are going to shoot first and shoot to kill if there is any question about their own security or their own lives. There will be no trial and no jury. The action will be all over. In addition to that, it is clear today, although it may not have been a few years ago, that in such instances these police officers who kill in the carrying out of their duty will have the full support of the Canadian people.

I think it is important to put on record the fact that since this experiment of partial abolition, which truly has been complete abolition, there have been 37 policemen and three prison guards killed in our country. If we consider the statements made by the Solicitor General even in the last few weeks, we see that he has made it very clear in his speeches around the country that he intends to alter the commitment he is apparently making that the 25-year imprisonment provision will be enforced in respect of those convicted for first-degree murder. It is very clear from the history of this government and the statements of the minister that they will very soon start to whittle and chip away at this proposed punishment so that it will be just a matter of time until it is reduced to 20 years, 15 years or perhaps even 10 years.

The Solicitor General has a very important place in this whole matter of law enforcement in our country. He answers to parliament for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, for the prisons and penitentiaries of our country. When it is clear that the prison personnel and, certainly privately, members of the RCMP do not agree and take a very strong reaction against the bill, specifically the removal of this clause to protect prison guards and policemen as referred to in the amendment we are now discussing, then it becomes clear he has lost the confidence of those to whom he is supposed to show leadership. If this clause of the bill is defeated, then I think the Solicitor General has no alternative but to resign his position as Solicitor General.

In closing, I wish once more to refer to this question of capital punishment and whether it is a deterrent. This has constantly been the question raised by hon. members opposite and by the Prime Minister. A constituent of mine, Mr. R. G. Campbell, has stated, as have so many, that the question of capital punishment is one in respect of which each person's opinion is just as valid as the next. The claim of some privileged, or some special knowledge or understanding which is made by hon. members opposite that apparently is not available to Canadians at large is the basis of an absolutely foolish and ridiculous argument.

[Mr. Bawden.]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: What about your own members?

Mr. Bawden: Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot of noise from members opposite who undoubtedly feel terribly sensitive about this. They should feel sensitive, because it is clear we do not have a free vote as this is a government bill.

An hon. Member: It is a free vote.

Mr. Bawden: It is a government bill and there is no free vote on the government side.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bawden: If there had been a truly free vote on the government side, the bill would have been defeated on second reading.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bawden: I think it is clear to the Canadian people that by calling this a free vote, yet maintaining cabinet solidarity and putting heavy pressure on members opposite in the Liberal party, the government is truly deceiving the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bawden: I am not surprised that we hear from so many sensitive members opposite at this point in time. In closing, I would simply say that I hope when members vote on this amendment they will listen to the people of Canada rather than to their leader, the Prime Minister. I hope that after listening to their constituents they will support this amendment which provides for the retention of capital punishment for the murderers of policemen and prison guards. I hope, too, hon. members will reconsider their position on third reading, because if the current trend is not altered and this bill is passed, it will profoundly and adversely affect the future of all Canadians.

Mr. G. H. Whittaker (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in support of the amendment to Bill C-84 in relation to capital punishment for the murderers of policemen and prison guards, presented by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). I was not going to enter this debate until I heard the speech of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson). He claims to be a retentionist, but during his speech he said he would not support this amendment because it would make second-class citizens of many Canadians. I really do not understand the logic or the rationalization of that hon. member, if in fact he is a retentionist.

I heard this argument used during the last debate we had in respect of a further five-year experiment to abolish capital punishment with the exception of cases involving

the murder of policemen and prison guards. The people who put this argument forward were, of course, in favour of the retention of capital punishment for everyone, but they certainly agreed most emphatically that there should be capital punishment for anyone who murders a policeman or prison guard.

● (1220)

Now we are speaking about the total abolition of capital punishment and we have already had one vote in which those people who are in favour of abolition won by a very slim margin. A retentionist argues now that he will not support this motion, which is the very motion we should favour, that there be capital punishment for the murderers of policemen and prison guards. How can anyone rationalize his position and say he will not support the motion because it will make second-class citizens of people who are not policemen or prison guards? How can this position be rationalized thus?

The motion put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta is essential for the maintenance of law and order in Canada. The government came forth with what they call a peace and security package in Bill C-83 and Bill C-84 which they said would bring better law and order to this country. When we were able to analyze these two pieces of legislation, together with the people of Canada, we found we could not buy this package which, as the government said, would bring better law and order. Bill C-83 deals mostly with gun control. It will not do much to control guns in the hands of criminals; it could even make criminals out of people who have guns. The people of Canada quickly saw through this and the majority of them continue to favour retention of capital punishment. In my view, there are more people in favour of capital punishment since this package was presented than there were before. Before these two bills were put forward, well over 50 per cent were in favour of capital punishment, whereas now nearly 80 per cent favour it.

There was a five-year experiment in retaining capital punishment for the murder of policemen and prison guards only. A bill was presented a second time, which received less acceptance in the House, extending the experiment for a further two years. We know that during that time 37 policemen were murdered in Canada and three prison guards. These are the kinds of results that the people of Canada are looking at. Canadians want law and order in Canada, which they do not have under the present government.

The work of our policemen and prison guards should be made easier, and this is what the amendment before us attempts to achieve. Those of us who are retentionists, as well as those who are abolitionists, should look closely at this amendment and be ready to vote in favour of it. By taking away the last line of protection that policemen and prison guards have, we are making their jobs that much harder. People who are looking for jobs in Canada, the very people whom the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) wants to put to work, will not be interested in obtaining that kind of employment which affords them no protection, where they have to put their lives on the line at all times. The government will have a hard time recruiting people for these jobs.

We know that many prison guards who have been working at their jobs for a long time and who know much more about that work than we as parliamentarians do, are saying they will not be happy in their jobs if this bill passes unamended, and in fact they will be ready to retire early or find some other work. To replace them we will have to find another group of people; but they, also, will find these jobs hazardous, especially when they hear people who do not respect law and order saying, "Let's go out and get a policeman tonight". Policemen are very aware of this situation and aware of the hazards of their jobs.

I say we should make our policemen and prison guards proud of their profession and proud of the opportunity to carry out law and order. We should provide protection for them so that they do not have to be worried about their lives. I say to every member of the House—and especially to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni—that they should look at this amendment which would provide better protection for policemen and prison guards. It is a good amendment to Bill C-84. I am certainly in support of it and I hope the amendment will be accepted.

● (1230)

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this debate in support of the motion which is before us and which proposes that clause 4 of Bill C-84 be deleted. If I may, first of all I would like to outline why I am most anxious that hon. members consider allowing the death penalty to remain with respect to the killing of jail guards and policemen. If we read Bill C-84, it is very disturbing to find that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) proposes that a man may be convicted of murder and sentenced to life imprisonment and can literally be out on the streets—granted, with an escort—within a day for various lengths of time. I draw the attention of hon. members to clause 21 of the bill, which appears at page 12. It proposes an amendment to section 674 of the Criminal Code, and I refer specifically to section 674(2) which provides:

> Notwithstanding the *Penitentiary Act* and the *Parole Act*, in the case of any person sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole for a specified number of years pursuant to this act, no absence without escort may be authorized under the *Penitentiary Act*—

It specifies that this will be the case until there are only three years to run of the full sentence. In short, what the Solicitor General is suggesting is that even where a person is convicted of murder and sentenced to life imprisonment, under certain circumstances he may be permitted to leave jail provided he has an escort.

Let us consider those circumstances, because this is what I find most disturbing. We find that absence with an escort is dealt with in another bill which is before is, Bill C-83. In that bill it is clearly set out that if someone is incarcerated, he may be temporarily absent with an escort under two different circumstances. The first is that the Commissioner of Penitentiaries, for an unlimited period of time for medical reasons and for a period not exceeding 15 days for humanitarian reasons or to assist in the rehabilitation of the inmate, may grant leave with an escort to anyone in jail. Second, and this is what I find most disturbing, any officer in charge of a jail, for a period not exceeding 15 days for medical reasons and for a period not exceeding

five days for humanitarian reasons, or to assist in the rehabilitation of the inmate, may allow an inmate to be absent from jail provided he has an escort.

I have mentioned that the person in charge of a jail may permit an inmate to leave for five days. I point out that under the existing act it is only three days. However, the Solicitor General is proposing in Bill C-83, that such a person be given two extra days leave or the right to be absent, provided he has an escort.

I think the misrepresentation which has taken place with respect to the so-called life sentence which the government is proposing is most unfair to the Canadian public. The Solicitor General should have made it abundantly clear that there is no life sentence in the context in which that term is usually used. Abolitionists have said to me, in referring to life sentences, that they generally think of a Devil's Island type of situation where a man is convicted and for 25 years, come what may, he stays shut off from society and there is no way he can get back into society. In effect, the key is thrown away.

Let us be clear; that is not what the government is proposing in the bill before us. It is suggesting that even where a person is convicted of murder he will be sentenced to a term of life, or 25 years, which is open to review in 15 years, but let us bear in mind that during that period even for the first 12 years he can be absent from prison as long as he has an escort. Who is the escort to be? The escort is to be a policeman or some other peace officer as defined in the act. I think that is an extremely dangerous provision.

As hon. members know, I am proposing that the Solicitor General's amendment to the Criminal Code contained in Bill C-84 be amended, because I believe that under no circumstances should a person be permitted to leave jail, even with an escort, without further review or confirmation that there is a minimum of danger. My amendment suggests that absence with an escort should not be granted unless there is a judge's order. I have discussed this with the minister. He points out that the wording may be ambiguous. With that I agree, and subsequently a colleague of mine will be moving a further amendment to my amendment to make clear exactly what we are trying to achieve. We are saying that there should be no absence without an escort, under any circumstances, but that absence with an escort must only be with the approval of a judge or, as has been suggested, perhaps with the approval of the National Parole Board. That will be the tenor of our amendment to be introduced subsequently.

I was a little startled when the hon. member who spoke before me referred to the remarks which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) made yesterday. Speaking on the amendment which is before us, namely, the retention of the death penalty for murderers of prison guards and policemen, the hon. member stated that, while he is a retentionist, he felt it unfair to have the death penalty for what he though was a select group of society. He wonders why policemen are different from others. He stated, as reported at page 15133 of *Hansard:*

> I believe that the murder of a policeman or a prison guard is no more, or no less, important than the killing of a child, a fisherman or any other member of our society . . . I still feel that this is a discriminatory provision, and the sooner we get rid of the idea that some groups in society are more important than others, the better off we will be.

[Mr. Stevens.]

I am not saying that the death penalty should not be extended to many more classes of murder than simply the killing of a jail guard or a policeman, but I do say that the hon. member is quite wrong in saying that policemen should not have the added protection which the death penalty provides. I say that because we must accept that policemen, contrary to what the hon. member says, unlike firemen and unlike most people in society, are charged with the preservation of our whole system of law and order. They are the front-line troops, so to speak, and I think this parliament must do everything in its power to ensure that they are respected when they are on duty.

Perhaps one of the main reasons I feel so strongly about the retention of the death penalty is that when I was a reporter for the Toronto *Daily Star*, many times I had the opportunity to be with the police when they brought in people who were involved in crime. I remember very vividly that day in March, 1952, when two detectives were shot down in the city of Toronto by Steven Suchan and Leonard Jackson. I think if any member of the House had witnessed what transpired before that shooting, what transpired after the shooting and what happened afterwards as far as the police were concerned in rounding up the two convicts, they would be a lot less sure that they should vote for abolition.

● (1240)

Perhaps many hon. members do recall that shooting. Sergeant detective Edmund Ton died 17 days later, and his assistant detective sergeant Roy Perry was wounded and recovered but could take no part in active police work and occupied a desk job for the rest of his days on the force. He is now dead. I mention this because I remember the night they finally cornered Leonard Jackson in Toronto. I remember the apprehension of the police as they left police headquarters to try to arrest Leonard Jackson. I remember Jackson's statement, hollered from the house he was in, that the police would have to come and get him. They did, Mr. Speaker. I remember the account of what happened in Montreal when Steven Suchan was cornered in his apartment. The police had to go in with guns drawn. He was shot as he tried to shoot the police who went into the apartment.

I believe for members of the House to suggest that policeman should not be given the added protection of making it clear to a criminal that if he dare shoot a policeman or a prison guard he, in turn, will lose his life is to let down our police force and prison guards. In fact, I think the government must carry a heavy weight through insisting that this legislation be passed.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), perhaps feeling that there was not sufficient support for this bill, stated in this House that members should keep in mind that if they voted against this bill and it did not pass, some people in this country would hang. I say, let the Prime Minister remember that to the degree he insist and his cabinet colleagues insist that this bill be passed, every future murder in this country is on their hands to the degree that it could have been deterred. While the government weighs the fate of the 11 people who are now sentenced to die, while they hesitate to commute, hoping that this legislation will be passed and then they will not have to take that position, I say to hon. members that since the death penal-

ty was abolished, to all intents and purposes, 65 people in this country have been sentenced to die. Of that number, 54 death sentences have been commuted and 11 are awaiting the decision of the government and the passage of this bill.

As we weigh the possibility of whether these people should be legally executed or not, let us not forget that in the same period over 4,000 Canadians were illegally executed. They were the victims of this type of crime. I think it would have served the Prime Minister better to have pointed out that retention of the death penalty, at least in a limited sense and certainly for prison guards and policemen, may help to deter future murderers, and if in any way we can lower the death rate from murder in this country, we should. I think the government is not acting responsibly and I call upon hon. members to support this amendment on that point alone.

The government likes to raise the question of how some of our members have voted. Have hon. members on the government side noticed that in the second reading vote on this matter, 80 per cent of the Conservative caucus voted for retention?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: I would suggest this means that 80 per cent of the Conservative caucus is right in step with 80 per cent of the Canadian public.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: I would find it interesting if government members could explain why approximately 17 per cent of their number voted for retention and something over 80 per cent voted for abolition, bearing in mind that the cabinet bloc—27 in number—voted solidly for abolition.

An hon. Member: Like your front bench.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, 80 per cent of our caucus voted for retention, and a little over 80 per cent on the government side voted for abolition. Let us not confuse the question of who is voting how. The other point I would make—and obviously government members are confused about it—is that this is represented by the government as a free vote. Where is the freedom on their side to reflect the 80 per cent of public opinion in Canada that says retention should continue? The free vote is on this side of the House and we, to the extent of 80 per cent, voted for retention. I think it is a credit to our caucus that we were allowed that freedom of vote.

I have touched briefly on why I believe this amendment should be supported and why we should allow the death penalty to continue with regard to the killing of prison guards and policemen. I should like to back this up with some statistics. It is often stated—I notice the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) said that somehow what I was saying was totally different from what the Prime Minister was saying—that it is a deterrent to have the death penalty.

On January 26, 1973, at page 688 of *Hansard*, speaking on Bill C-2—which was the old version of Bill C-84—the Solicitor General stated that he would like to have three six-year periods to compare with respect to three approaches to capital punishment, and at the end of that time he could decide whether the death penalty should be eliminated permanently. The minister said, in 1973:

> We are just receiving the statistics for 1971. It seems to me that we must see the process, commenced in 1967, through to its logical conclusion. That further necessitates making no substantial change in the law until such time as we are in a position to fully understand the impact of the partial abolition. Bill C-2 will allow us to complete this evaluation. If the House agrees to the provisions of Bill C-2 we will be able to compare three periods of approximately six years when three distinct and different laws concerning the death penalty prevailed. If we are properly to acquit ourselves of our responsibilities to the public, Mr. Speaker, we must be prepared to grant the time necessary to study the effects of the three laws so that decisions can be made on sound ground.

I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I believe it was an interesting approach to suggest that we look at these three six-year periods, but I would point out that the minister has very cleverly avoided comparing the three six-year periods either in this House or anywhere else. I should like to give the basic statistics of what has occurred in those three six-year periods. For example, the first period ran from 1956—

● (1250)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member may only put those facts on record if he has the unanimous consent of the House, because his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members. The first period was between 1956 and 1962. I am referring to Statistics Canada figures regarding murders. The average number of murders per 100,000 of population during the first six-year period, when the death penalty not only was on the statute books but criminals were executed was 1.1 in Canada. I have referred to Jackson and Suchan in Toronto who were executed in December of the year they committed the crime. In the next six years, while in theory the death penalty was still in force in this country, in practice every sentence was commuted and there was no death penalty. In that period the murder rate rose to 1.5 per 100,000 population. Now let us look at the last six years. As the minister said when speaking on second reading, last year the murder rate in Canada had risen to 2.4 per 100,000 population, a rate more than double that applying to the 1956 to 1962 period.

An hon. Member: And what about other serious crimes?

Mr. Stevens: The hon. member asks, what about other serious crimes? That is a strange twist. The hon. member should realize that our crime rate is rising because the government is taking a more lenient attitude to those who commit crime.

Mr. Horner: It is too permissive.

Mr. Stevens: Those guilty of the most serious of all crimes, murder, should be punished with death; only then will people realize that this government means business. I emphasize that I am not making an emotional argument. Statistics show clearly the rising murder rate in this country and elsewhere. Faced with such a rise in the murder

rate, the government should propose the continuation of the death penalty, not its elimination. In short, it is evident that the government's attitude to the death penalty in the three six-year periods to which I have referred has allowed the murder rate to rise. Ordinarily, you would think that a minister would say, "I have looked at the figures and think for the time being the death penalty should continue." But for reasons which I do not understand, the minister says exactly the opposite.

I have referred to the attitude of the solicitor general of the United States who made known his views on the death penalty in a brief submitted to the supreme court of the United States. As you know, the United States supreme court has held that the death penalty, in certain circumstances, is constitutional and may be imposed. Many attorneys general of states of the United States hold similar views. They think the death penalty is a deterrent, are fighting to have it instituted in cases where it is not on the statute books and to have it retained in cases where it is.

The attorney general of California, E. J. Younger, submitted two briefs to the United States supreme court. I invite hon. members to read those briefs. In them he set out clearly why it is thought in California that the death penalty is a deterrent. For example, in one brief he says that the Los Angeles police department conducted a survey between December 21, 1970, and February 4, 1971. It interviewed 316 arrestees. Unarmed suspects were asked why they did not arm themselves, and armed suspects who did not use their weapons were asked why they did not. Of the 316 persons interviewed, 217 denied their crime or refused to make a statement, primarily out of a desire not to jeopardize their case. The positive statements made by the remaining 99 are classified as follows:

1. Deterred by fear of death penalty from carrying weapon or operating weapon, 50 (50.5 per cent).

2. Unaffected by death penalty because it was no longer being enforced, 7 (7.07 per cent).

3. Undeterred by death penalty, would kill whether it was enforced or not, 10 (10.1 per cent).

4. Unaffected by death penalty because they would not carry weapon in any event, primarily out of fear of being injured themselves or of injuring someone else, 32 (32.3 per cent).

Clearly, the majority of those who made statements agreed that they did not carry a weapon because they were frightened of the death penalty. I suggest that even if only one person is deterred from carrying a weapon and committing murder, the death penalty should be retained as a worth-while measure. The attorney general of California stated in his brief:

The conclusions drawn from the study are as follows:

The adoption of an effectively enforced death penalty system is a deterrent in the prevention of homicides.

The report also notes:

If this study contained only one and not the 50 documented cases supporting the fact that the death penalty is a deterrent, there should be no question of its retention and enforcement—

Appendix C to the brief quotes the actual statements made by people who had been arrested. The reasons given for using or not using a weapon are most interesting. For example, one suspect said:

Since in reality there is no death penalty in California, I would kill to obtain what I want.

[Mr. Stevens.]

That was the statement of an unarmed robber. A suspect charged with armed robbery said:

I used a pellet gun because I didn't want to kill anyone and be put to death in the gas chamber.

An unarmed burglar who was charged said:

I don't carry a gun. I don't want to be shot at by police and am afraid of the death penalty.

Another man interviewed who had been charged with armed robbery said:

I used an unloaded gun in the robbery of a market so I would not hurt anyone and because I am afraid of the death penalty.

May I call it one o'clock?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): But the hon. member is already on overtime.

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

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SMITHS FALLS

CONGRATULATIONS ON ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the terms of Standing Order 43 fully realizing that unanimous consent is a rare thing in this House. The motion which I will read is of a strictly non-political nature, the substance has been communicated to the appropriate persons in all parties, and I understand that general agreement has been achieved on the matter. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That the elected representatives of the people of Canada assembled in the House of Commons on July 8, 1976, extend congratulations and best wishes to the mayor, the members of the municipal council and to all the people of the municipality of Smiths Falls in the province of Ontario on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of this leading community in eastern Ontario.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

FISHERIES

PROPOSED FUNDING TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE OF PATROL OF SALMON RIVERS IN NEWFOUNDLAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Lack of funding to provide for the protection of salmon rivers in Newfoundland necessitates the lay-off of river guardians one and two months before the close of the season. The situation is made worse because of low river levels and both these circumstances provide a paradise for poachers. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert):

That this House order the matter to be deemed an emergency and that funding be provided to allow continuance of patrol activity on rivers affected.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can only be presented for debate by the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTION AMOUNT OF LOAN FOR WHICH STUDENTS ELIGIBLE BE BASED ON ACTUAL EARNINGS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the fact that all signs indicate that unemployment among students this summer will be even higher than last year's level, which was 14.4 per cent; in view of the fact that the government is directly responsible for much of this unemployment because of its withdrawal of the Opportunities for Youth program, the lack of which departmental studies indicate could have raised student unemployment by two or three per cent last year, and in view of the fact that present Canada student loan plan regulations do not use the amount a student earns during the summer to gauge how much he should be eligible to borrow but instead examine only the number of weeks during which the student was available for work, a procedure which, if followed this fall, will force students unable to find work this summer to discontinue their post-secondary education, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the government of Canada follow the example of the Province of Nova Scotia in dealing with students by basing eligibility for loans on their actual income as defined by the Income Tax Act rather than on the number of weeks they are available for work but are possibly unable to find it.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House before the presentation of such a motion for debate. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

INDIAN AFFAIRS

AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL ABUSE PROGRAM TO NATIVES IN QUEBEC—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the National Native Alcoholic Abuse Program has not been effectively implemented in the Province of Quebec—indeed, no moneys have been allocated for the program in Quebec to date—and in view of the fact that Indian people have been denied the right to become involved in their own health programs, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith):

That the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of National Health and Welfare immediately consult with the responsible native groups in the Province of Quebec to resolve this critical issue.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED EARLY SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE WITH AIR INSPECTORS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion on an urgent and pressing matter. In the light of the fact that the Ministry of Transport has been unable to resolve its differences with air inspectors, and since this dispute is causing considerable hardship to aircraft owners and pilots, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom):

That this House instruct the Minister of Transport to give his attention to a rapid settlement of this dispute along lines acceptable to both parties.

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

Some hon. Members: No!

• (1410)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DESTRUCTION OF INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE OF PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture but, because of the serious nature of it, perhaps I should direct it to the minister responsible for his department in

his absence. In view of the fact that the operational head of the PFAA has been committed to trial on charges of criminal fraud and that the House leader has postponed the legislation to repeal PFAA until the trial is over, did the Minister of Agriculture approve the burning of the internal correspondence of PFAA as reported in the House yesterday by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) will be in the House in a couple of seconds.

[*English*]

An hon. Member: Let's have the minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps that question could be deferred until the arrival of the minister.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PURCHASE OF "ORION" AIRCRAFT FROM LOCKHEED—ALLEGED UNITED STATES PRESSURE TO DEAL WITH LOCKHEED

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Defence I should like to address my question to the Prime Minister. Has the question of the purchase of the Orion aircraft from Lockheed been determined by the Cabinet and, if so, will an announcement be made by the appropriate minister to this House with a full statement of the reasons for the decision so that this House, being concerned as it is with a billion dollar deal, with the controversy that surrounds the matter, the doubt about the strategy involved and the stability of the aircraft concerned, will have an opportunity to hear about it and an opportunity to comment on it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it will be our intention to report to the House when the cabinet has come to the consideration of this matter in a final way. We did not discuss the substantive item this morning in Cabinet. We expect to do so probably next week. Whether we can make this report to the House or whether we will make it to the country will, of course, depend on whether the House is still sitting. It would be our intention to make it to the House if it is still sitting at that time, and I hope it won't.

Mr. Brewin: Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a question that would be much more appropriately addressed to the Minister of National Defence, but in his absence—

An hon. Member: Here he is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain).]

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of National Defence has recovered his breath I should like to ask him this question. There is a story published by the *Financial Post* under the byline of Clyde Baxter which says that the minister recently took a rather quite, unannounced trip to Washington, and suggests he was there advised, or perhaps pressured, that the United States authorities would prefer Canada to purchase Orions rather than consider Boeings or some other possibilities. Is that correct?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, parts of the statement are correct and parts are not correct.

An hon. Member: Which are which?

Mr. Richardson: The part that is correct is that I did go to Washington, and I did have discussions with senior officials of the government and the United States navy. My main purpose in going was to find out what they are going to do over the next 20 or 25 years, not to have them tell us what we should do. They did not offer the kind of gratuitous advice that is suggested in that report. They did, however, confirm that they intend to use Lockheed P3-C's well into the 1990's.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister advise the House whether any of these very important discussions going on between the government of Canada and Lockheed aircraft are being committed to paper, or is the whole thing to be conducted on the basis of a gentleman's agreement similar to the type that the Prime Minister a few weeks ago told me very definitely in this House he preferred for important matters of this kind?

An hon. Member: Between friends.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. gentleman is not remembering what I told him. I said that every day hundreds of millions of dollars of transactions go on through gentlemen's agreement and he, as a gentleman, should remember that. He should also remember that having been, I think, president of a stock exchange, where a large part of these transactions take place.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister, of course, as he usually does, did not make any attempt to answer my very pertinent question and it was this. Would he advise the House whether the discussions that are being carried on are being committed to paper, so that each side knows where the other side stands and we do not have this musical comedy fiasco type of thing that we had a few weeks ago when the whole Lockheed deal with Canada fell apart right before our eyes.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I would perhaps reassure the hon. member by telling him that we are being cautious this time, but I would not like to have to say whether we are putting it on paper or on tapes.

[*Translation*]

HARBOURS

MAINTENANCE OF WHARVES ALONG ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—MINISTER'S POSITION

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

A few weeks ago, I asked the Minister of Transport in the House whether there were discussions between the officials of his department and those of the government of the province of Quebec concerning the wharves along the St. Lawrence River, which constitute the link between the islands and the mainland. He had assured the House that the discussions were continuing. Is the minister in a position today to tell us whether these discussions had favourable results?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Not at this point, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO ANNOUNCEMENT OF INCREASED SEAWAY TOLLS WHILE HOUSE IN RECESS

Mr. Frank Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the House that the increased tolls on the St. Lawrence which are estimated at an additional $15,000 for every load of grain that goes down the river will not be announced while the House is in recess?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to a purely speculative story. This whole question has not yet been considered by the government. I do not know at what particular point in time it will come before the government; therefore I cannot tell him whether the House will be here or not.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DESTRUCTION OF INTERNAL CORRESPONDENCE OF PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE ORGANIZATION

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I telephoned the minister's office a couple of hours ago about this question, so that he knows of it. In view of the fact that the operational head of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act has been committed to trial on charges of criminal fraud, and in view of the fact that the House Leader has postponed the legislation to repeal the PFAA until the trial is over, may I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he approved the burning of the internal correspondence of the PFAA administration, as reported to the House yesterday by the parliamentary secretary?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is well aware of the fact that the RCMP had access to all the material, went through

all the files for the court case, and so on. As far as I am concerned, the officer in charge was within his rights and juridiction because they were closing the offices of PFAA. I am sure the hon. member is also aware that all the other documents, books, etcetera, are in the archives at the present time and therefore anyone can check, excepting the material—

Mr. Fairweather: Excepting the evidence.

Mr. Whelan: The material that was destroyed was destroyed by the officer in charge under normal circumstances, I am told.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It is very obvious that someone must have authorized the burning of this internal correspondence. Does the minister know who it was, and specifically, does he or anyone in his office know whether the advice came from the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board or any of his staff?

● (1420)

Mr. Whelan: The information that was given to me was that no instructions were given to the person in charge who decided that all insignificant documents should be destroyed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whelan: As I said earlier, the RCMP went through all the files and kept all the documents they thought of any importance, and those are still before the courts.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): In view of the minister's answer that the person in charge of the office on his own authority destroyed these documents, is the minister fully aware of the fact that the person in charge of the office is up on a charge of criminal fraud laid by the RCMP?

Mr. Whelan: I am sure the hon. member knows that that is not correct. I am sure he knows also that the RCMP said there was insufficient evidence of any wrong-doing to proceed any further with the case, and it is up to the attorney general of the province of Saskatchewan to do anything further if he so desires.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the hon. member at three o'clock. The hon. member for Red Deer.

INQUIRY WHETHER PFAA PAPERS DESTROYED INCLUDED DOCUMENTS RELATED TO FIRING OF STAFF

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same minister. In view of the fact the Minister of Agriculture has been warned and that he was questioned in the House as early as December, 1974 concerning improprieties within the PFAA administration, can he inform the House whether or not the statement by his parliamentary secretary yesterday that internal corre-

spondence has been destroyed included papers related to the firing of long term PFAA staff?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): The statement in the House is clear. It states clearly what was done. I have nothing further to add to it.

INADEQUACY OF REPLY TO MOTION AS RESULT OF DESTRUCTION OF PFAA PAPERS

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): In view of the fact that the PFAA fund amounts to approximately $9 million plus compound interest, will the minister be accountable, and with what accuracy can relevant questions be answered when documents have been destroyed? The papers delivered to my office in response to motion 102 are inadequate.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): The hon. member has the right to his opinion but the motion clearly asks that material such as travelling expense accounts, wage claim reports, fieldmen's work reports and mileage diaries be made available, but internal correspondence was destroyed in the process of closing down the office, and that is what is usually done when an office is being closed down.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fraser: But it was done just before the cops got there!

* * *

TRANSPORT

PROPOSED SUBSIDIES FOR RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. A few days ago the Consumers' Association of Canada in a brief to Ottawa stated:

> The federal government should negotiate contracts with the railways for specific passenger rail services in Canada with subsidies increasing with the number of passengers carried.

In view of the fact that incentives of this kind are very likely necessary in order to encourage the railways to put more into passenger services, will the federal government give serious consideration to these representations by the Consumers' Association of Canada, and can we expect action pretty soon?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): In view of the fact that when the policy was announced in January we indicated that it would be our policy to move to a 100 per cent subsidy basis in that we will be looking for a system that gave incentives to the railways to run the business as well as possible. The proposal from the Consumers' Association of Canada is fully in accordance with government policy. Indeed, I have asked my office to indicate to them that I appreciate their specific suggestion. We will be looking at this and other alternatives to accomplish that result.

[Mr. Towers.]

TRADE

MEAT AGREEMENT WITH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND— REASON FOR LOW PRICE

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and it relates to yesterday's agricultural news release covering Canada's new meat agreement with Australia and New Zealand which effectively establishes a discount price on all Oceania beef imported into Canada of 6 cents a pound below the same meats entering the United States. Will the minister explain why Canada's trade representatives agreed to any price discount at all? Why should a pound of imported offshore beef be worth any less in Canada than in the United States? I ask this question in view of the very serious market depressing effect—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Let's hear the answer to that one.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice in order to prepare the mathematical calculations. I will be very glad to find out the basis of the conclusion which was drawn and make it available to the hon. member. I understand that it constitutes certain differentials in cost with regard to shipments to Canada and to the United States, but I will get the figures for the hon. member.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF INTRODUCING MEAT IMPORT LAW— MINISTER'S VIEW OF PRICE ESTABLISHED IN AGREEMENT WITH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the serious consequences of these offshore imports, which have now increased 51 per cent in 1976 over 1975—and during last week alone some 6.4 million pounds of these imports came into Canada—will the minister indicate if his department will now give serious consideration to a Canadian meat import law, as suggested by cattlemen's representatives yesterday in Ottawa in discussions with officials from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and from the Department of Agriculture, and does the minister personally support the 6 cent discount price which was agreed to yesterday?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that I am glad to see that, along with the Canadian cattlemen, it appears that the hon. member also wants more intervention in the beef marketing system we have in our country.

An hon. Member: Oh, come on.

Mr. Whelan: He seems to realize that there is something more than the North American market affecting beef marketing in our country.

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Whelan: I am sure the hon. member knows that the 6 cent differential per pound, as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said, shows that this can be a realistic figure because of the tariff and freight rates which are involved in this type of program. I am certainly not happy about what is happening, and I have asked my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to investigate whether chain restaurants or the consuming public who are going to be buying processed meat, hamburger, etc. are going to be ripped off.

However, I also want to point out that our figures show nothing as outlandish as the hon. member has indicated with regard to the increased importation of Australian and New Zealand meat into this country. Our figures show it would be more like 25 per cent.

Mr. Hargrave: I can assure the minister that those figures are entirely up to date. I would like to ask him if he is aware that at least another 16 million pounds of offshore imports can legally come into this country, exclusive of the 6 cent discount price, that is, at discounts of up to 25 cents.

Mr. Whelan: I apologize for not answering part of the question the hon. member asked before about the import law. We are studying the ramifications of having such a law, but I want to make it plain and clear that the Americans, who have been pointing out that they are the great free traders of the world, have such an import law, and we think it is darned restrictive. If the hon. member and his party are asking us to interfere with that free market, we are willing to consider that if they are willing to back it.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP

REQUEST FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION OF CASE OF DR. GERALD WIVIOTT

Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in the absence of the Secretary of State, and I hope he will relay the question to him or attempt to answer it.

Now that Bill C-20 has passed through the Senate without amendment, making the residence requirement three years rather than five years, is there any method to deal with such urgent cases as Dr. Gerald Wiviott, an eminent psychiatrist and Olympic fencer who has held landed immigrant status for your years and eight months but cannot compete for Canada without clarification of his Canadian citizenship status, in view of the fact that the IOC must settle these matters before 12 o'clock tomorrow night?

● (1430)

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Citizenship Act is under the jurisdiction of my colleague, the Secretary of State, but I believe the fact of its passage should be made known to the Olympic Committee so that they can make the decision which is theirs to make, recognizing that this is now only a technical matter involving the timing of proclamation which would permit the gentleman to become a full Canadian citizen and therefore eligible to compete.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN AS REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It concerns participation in the Olympic Games of the representatives of the Republic of China under their flag. In view of the degree to which Canadian public opinion has been aroused, and considering the views of Canadians of Chinese origin who have overwhelmingly condemned the attitude of the Canadian government in this regard and coupled with the condemnation in the press of Canada and the international press—yesterday the New York *Times* and the Washington *Post*—and the condemnation today by the representative of the Canadian Olympic Committee, would the Prime Minister consider permitting the representatives from the Republic of China and their flag to be shown and to participate in the Olympics?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman has quoted some authorities to support his two-China policy but I am sure there are many Canadians—I would say the overwhelming majority—who have accepted and support this government's position that there is only one China and that there may—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: —so I am not overly impressed by what the right hon. gentleman describes as "an overwhelming majority". I am somewhat disturbed that on an issue like this, where the government of Canada has an obvious case, where the IOC has been given more than a year's warning about this difficulty and where it has let it ride, I am a little disturbed that as a matter of course so many Canadians follow the example of the right hon. gentleman and assume the government is wrong. The government is right on this particular issue.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it certainly would be an abnormality if this government were right in anything.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I ask the Prime Minister if he has forgotten the contribution made by the Republic of China whose government through the years stood with us for freedom against the surrender to communism. Are they now to be thrown overboard—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Back in 1962?

Mr. Fraser: You fools thought you could win a nuclear war!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot hear the supplementary question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Has the Prime Minister forgotten that, and will he not take action on it because this is giving Canada a black eye everywhere in the world? I ask him to give reconsideration to it.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that assertion. This gives Canada a black eye with those people who still believe there are two Chinas or alternatively—

Mr. Fraser: We still believe in undertakings.

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps it is a mistake to talk of the two-China policy. I think the right hon. gentleman believes there is only a one-China policy but he still thinks Taiwan is the government of China. The world has moved on since the right hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

HOUSING

RENT INCREASES IN LIMITED DIVIDEND PROJECT ON JEAN BRILLON STREET, VILLE LA SALLE—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to move on to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. In view of the dispute between the tenants and the landlord at a CMHC financed limited dividend project of four buildings on Jean Brillon Street in Ville La Salle, Montreal, concerning proposed increases in rent and breaches of the landlord-tenant agreement, would the minister contact the parties concerning the dispute and determine if the proposed rent increases of 19.4 per cent are in violation of Quebec rent law and if the breaches of the landlord and tenant agreement are contrary to landlord-tenant law in Quebec?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not keep track of every individual project across the country but on this one I happen to know that my officials have been in touch with the tenants. There has not been an increase in rent since 1972. The total increase was 19 per cent and the tenants have been informed. It was in keeping with the undertaking we have with the owner of the building so that it reflected actual costs. In so far as whether it is in line with Quebec legislation, I shall check that out and advise the hon. member.

PARTICIPATION OF TENANTS OF LIMITED DIVIDEND PROJECTS IN NEGOTIATIONS FOR RENT INCREASES

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister going to give the tenants of limited dividend projects and public housing units the right to participate in the negotiations concerning rent increases with regard to the maintenance of standards and also in providing a grievance procedure? When will tenants have the opportunity to negotiate on these very important matters in view of the fact that the minister has promised it many times over the past year?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the rental agreement was an agreement between the lender and the landlord under specific conditions. As the hon. member will understand, this is an even more tenuous relationship than when the private lenders are the principal lenders, as in this case. We are working out procedures with some of the tenants groups that are organized. We are trying to be as responsive as possible and to make sure that rules are followed and standards maintained. Under the arrangements that we are working toward to which the hon. member is referring in Toronto, these were superseded by the rent control regulations in Ontario. We are trying to be as responsive and sensitive to the needs as possible but there are contractual difficulties.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ALLEGED ABANDONMENT OF SERVOCENTER AT BRANDON—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Transport? Is the minister aware of the threatened closure of the CNR Servocentre in Brandon notwithstanding the promise that was made when local railway stations were closed a few years ago that service to customers in western Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan would be upgraded by establishing a centrally located Servocentre? Would the minister undertake to end this continuous downgrading of transportation services in western Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the report to that effect until the hon. member very kindly gave me notice of his question at a couple of minutes before two o'clock. I shall look into the matter and see where it stands.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for the delay in sending the message—it must have gone through the mail. In view of the CNR statement that the move would mean a saving of only $7,000 a year, would the minister in his reply square this with the large sums of money that have been spent by DREE in regional development in that area—development that will be placed in jeopardy by this constant downgrading of transportation services, including the discontinuance of air service begun some three years ago?

● (1440)

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the impact is one of those things which will have to be looked at. I think of greater importance is the first allegation, namely, that an obligation would be neglected. I think the hon. member may want to look into his own postal services. I am informed that the message arrived by personal messenger at two minutes to two. There may be some problem between our offices.

HARBOURS

HALIFAX—REQUEST FOR AID FOR EXPANDED CONTAINER FACILITY

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Probably it should be supplementary to the question which may be asked by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants. I will put mine first. In view of the necessity to treat equitably all developments in our major ports and inasmuch as Beaufort Flats received the sum of approximately $20 million with respect to land fill for the development of that container facility would the minister be prepared to give equitable consideration to the port of Halifax with respect to its expanded container facility?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, naturally we attempt to give equitable treatment to all our ports. Indeed, we are adopting a policy for better reflecting costs in various structures, which will do just that. I think the hon. member will support that program. This specific action with regard to Beaufort Flats arose partly because of dredging needs; therefore the fill is for developing the future use of the property, but it is without any immediate use.

HALIFAX—ROLE OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN EXPANDING CONTAINER FACILITIES

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a two-part supplementary question to the Minister of Transport? First, would the hon. gentleman not agree that the initiative for the expansion of container facilities in Halifax-Dartmouth by general, that is, dominion-provincial, agreements are being left with the provincial government; second, that so far as the government of Nova Scotia is concerned, it has not made its representation to the federal government as to the site, or as to cost sharing?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we will not close any doors absolutely, although what has been done so far has been done essentially at provincial initiative.

* * *

FINANCE

LOAN BY IMPERIAL BANK OF COMMERCE TO BRITISH FIRM FOR USE IN RHODESIA—ALLEGED CONTRAVENTION OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Will the minister ask the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce to explain allegations that it participated in a loan to a British company to exploit its mining interests in Rhodesia which, if true, is clearly contrary to the United Nations sanctions and contrary to Canadian foreign policy?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I had the same reaction when I read the story this morning. I will be gald to pursue the matter.

PUBLIC SERVICE

RECLASSIFICATION OF ECONOMISTS, SOCIOLOGISTS AND STATISTICIANS—CONSULTATION WITH GROUPS CONCERNED—APPOINTMENT OF CONCILIATOR

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question to the President of the Treasury Board relates to Treasury Board's unilateral decision to reclassify the positions of economists, sociologists and statisticians. Can the minister assure the House that the association will be allowed adequate consultation in setting up the new classification structure, particularly since they were not consulted in the decision to dismantle the existing one? Would the minister also advise the House what length of time he expects this procedure to take?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, we have proceeded as usual when it was necessary to do some reclassifications. I do not know how long it will take, but I think it could take two or three months. The growth in that sector has been quite extensive during the past six years. It was obvious that the number of classifications was inadequate, this is why we were compelled to proceed in such a way.

I think that my officials are prepared to consult. However, the decision rests with Treasury Board.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the House why Treasury Board refuses to bargain with the association on all cost items until the new system is set up and why Treasury Board has so vigorously opposed the appointment of a conciliator; and can he assure the House that Treasury Board will abide by the report of the conciliator in this matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I have just said that reclassification is the responsibility of the employer and we expect to exercise our rights to that effect. However, if we can consult, we will do so, but we cannot submit ourselves to arbitration in such circumstances.

* * *

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

RESPONSIBILITY FOR REQUESTING STAY OF PROCEEDINGS IN CASE OF ERNEST BUCHAN

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice, of which I gave him notice earlier this day and which is supplementary to questions asked by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain and the hon. member for Red Deer? Did the Minister of Justice issue instructions to the attorney general for the province of Saskatchewan to ask for a stay of proceedings in the case of the Queen v. Ernest Buchan who was charged with fraud pursuant to section 338(1) of the Criminal Code in relation to his duties with the Prairie Farm Assistance Administration?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. The answer to it is, no. He referred to a prosecution under the Criminal Code; therefore it is within the responsibility of the attorney general of Saskatchewan. Whether my officials have had communication with him I do not know, but I will look into the matter.

Mr. Neil: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would look into the matter and determine to his satisfaction whether the stay of proceedings was justified.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, the stay of execution—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wagner: We can see what is on the minister's mind.

Mr. Basford: Any stay could have been undertaken by the Crown officers of the attorney general's department in Saskatchewan. It would not be proper for me to determine whether they were justified, but I will be happy to inquire about the reasons.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

GRANT TO MR. STRUZIK—REASON FOR SECOND GRANT BEFORE FIRST PROJECT COMPLETED

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour and is supplementary to the question with respect to multiculturalism grants given in London asked yesterday by the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot. I wish to make it clear that I am referring to the grant to Mr. Ed Struzik, in London. In light of the fact that the individual who was awarded a controversial grant to study immigration patterns in London and Windsor this year also received a grant from the multiculturalism branch last year which, although scheduled for completion last September 1, is still not finished, may I ask the minister whether he feels it is an acceptable practice for his department to award a second grant to someone who did not complete his first project and what steps, if any, he proposes to take to ensure that people who are given taxpayers' money to complete a project do, in fact, complete it?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite right. I thought yesterday the hon. member who raised this question was referring to another grant on which I based my reply. Certainly, in view of what the hon. member is now alleging I will be happy to look into the matter and report at the earliest opportunity.

REQUEST MINISTER MEET REPRESENTATIVES OF ETHNIC GROUPS DURING VISIT TO LONDON, ONTARIO

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State? Since the Secretary of State is to go to London this week end, to meet with the publisher of the London *Free Press* and, as well, with the writer of a series of articles exposing the practices of the minister's office in London, can the minister indicate what the nature of his London visit will be and if he is willing to meet with representatives of the various ethnic communities in London who are asking to meet with him at that time?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, yes. I was not aware that certain groups are interested in meeting with me. I will be pleased to meet with them. I will be going down tomorrow morning; I will be in London most of the morning and will be delighted to meet these groups. Perhaps the hon. member could give me the names of the groups.

* * *

CURRENCY

PROPOSAL TO PRINT NOTES WITH DISTINGUISHING BUMPS FOR BLIND PEOPLE

Mr. Mike Landers (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: That's you, Pierre.

Mr. Landers: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Landers: Mr. Speaker, since blind people handling paper money have been cheated in the past and since Switzerland apparently has printed its paper money with raised bumps on the lower left hand corner of notes, to enable blind people to determine by the number of bumps the denomination of the bill, would the government of Canada consider printing Canadian paper money with similar sorts of bumps?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raised this question with me some time ago and has given me the opportunity to inquire into the matter. I must say this is a good and generous idea. On inquiry, I found that, according to the knowledge we were able to gather, the amount of people being deceived because they were blind by the absence of such identification marks is infinitesimal. It is not certain whether the use of this device would be of any help, even to that very small number who are deceived, because the possibility of counterfeit would still exist. I repeat, the idea seems to be a very good Liberal one, and we will continue to look into it. If the idea seems worthwhile, we will consider its application.

● (1450)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

FINANCE

REQUEST THAT AMOUNT OF LOAN FOR WHICH STUDENT ELIGIBLE BE BASED ON ACTUAL EARNINGS

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Considering the fact that the government has not taken steps which will effectively counter very high levels of unemployment among students, and in view of the fact that the Canada Student Loan Plan now bases the amount of loans available to students not on actual earnings but on the length of time they are available for work, and in view of the fact this will mean many students will not only be unable to find work but will have great difficulty even borrowing enough money to return to school, will the minister tell this House if he is now going to take steps to have the basis of the Canada Student Loan Plan changed to actual earnings as defined by the Income Tax Act in order to be fair to the thousands of students unable to find work this summer?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the best thing is to check the accurancy of the hon. member's assertions first.

* * *

ENERGY

DATE OF DECISION ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE DUMP

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Now that the Atomic Energy Control Board has at long last ruled that the Port Granby area is not suitable for a radioactive waste dump, will the minister tell the House when a decision will be made on the site of another dump so that again at long last the cleanup at Port Hope can start?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, this work is continuing. There are discussions between two levels of government. There is a good deal of discussion with the citizens' groups in the area. The hon. member referred to the Port Granby site. He was referring to the permanent disposal site of the existing refinery. That particular refinery has two other problems. One is the cleanup of Port Hope and the other is a permanent disposal site for that low grade radioactivity. The agency is looking at a number of places in Ontario. It has not been able to come to a conclusion on that. However, I can assure the hon. member that work is progressing at a very rapid rate. The other question is the permanent disposal for the wastes of the refinery. The Eldorado Nuclear Corporation presently has this under consideration.

Mr. Lawrence: Since the lifespan of this radioactive waste is only 22,000 years, I wonder if the minister could hurry it along.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROPOSED SALE OF URANIUM TO JAPAN BY SASKATCHEWAN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It concerns a recent announcement by the premier of Saskatchewan that he had negotiated with the government of Japan an assured supply of uranium from the province of Saskatchewan. As the federal government has control over the export of this very important commodity, will the minister inform the House whether any negotiations are now being carried on or whether consent has been given to the government of Saskatchewan with regard to this assured supply to Japan?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received any official statement or report on the conversations by the premier of Saskatchewan in Japan. I know that he is aware of the federal power in this area.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF AGREEMENT WITH CUBA ON LEASING OF DC-8 AIRCRAFT

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister prepared to table the agreement between Canada and Cuba on the DC-8's today?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No I am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I have asked this question two or three times in the House. I would like to know what the Prime Minister is trying to hide. Are these planes being used for military purposes or some other purpose?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I have answered this question before in some detail. I did not realize the hon. member wanted a written report. If he has a precise question, he should place it on the order paper as I am answering dozens of these questions all the time. Perhaps he could screw up his mind and write something down on paper so that we will know exactly what it is he wants.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

TRANSPORT

ALLOCATION OF DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR COAST GUARD—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister indicate to the House whether cabinet has come to a successful conclusion regarding the allocation of departmental responsibility of the Coast Guard, and if so, when will an announcement be made?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, any such announcement will be made when a decision has been made.

Mr. Reynolds: Will the minister indicate what the policy is with respect to the funding of the Coast Guard Auxiliary since in Delta, volunteers have already undergone training, but are impeded by lack of formulation of policy and fund finances?

Mr. Speaker: The question period is surely not the place to outline a general policy of that nature.

* * *

STATISTICS CANADA

REASON FOR CHANGE IN REPORTING OF LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I have given him rather brief notice of the question and I have talked to his officials. He is the Minister of Trade and Commerce and sometimes he is industrious.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: Can the minister advise or find out from his officials why there has been a change in the reporting of statistics of the labour force from absolute figures to seasonally adjusted figures for the preceding months or years so that these figures will have some relevant use?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for notifying me and also having asked my officials about this. There is quite a lengthy explanation which I am sure Mr. Speaker would not permit me to give in detail. However, I can say that it was in the interest of making for a shorter document that the monthly form was provided as it is now. There is a background document available, a report issued at the time of the change. By referring to it, you can get comparable data. Also, if you look at this month's publication and that of the previous month, you can get the comparisons. I hope the hon. member will permit me to send the detailed explanation.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

MEASURES TO ENSURE PROCESSING OF PILOTS' LICENCE RENEWALS IN VIEW OF AIR INSPECTORS STRIKE

Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that the current strike by civil aviation inspectors is causing great inconvenience to private pilots whose licences must be renewed, in some cases in order to keep jobs, will the minister consider taking action to ensure that the backlog of licence renewals is dealt with expeditiously?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, that would certainly be our objective as soon as the available staff is there to do the job. However, as long as strikes persist, we are obviously not capable of keeping up let alone catching up. The matter is receiving urgent attention. The AIB process is being pursued. It has been our hope that these individuals involved in the strike would be at work while the process ran its course, but that has not turned out to be the case.

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS

THREATENED STRIKE AFFECTING BROADCASTING OF OLYMPIC GAMES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Communications. In view of the fact that the Canadian Overseas Telecommunications Union have voted to take strike action against Teleglobe Canada, and in view of the fact that the strike can commence legally at any time with the result that no overseas broadcasting of the Olympic Games can occur, can the minister tell the House what plan is in place to guarantee the broadcast of the games to the home countries of the participants?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, there is no way we can guarantee the broadcasting of television and radio programs as we had hoped to do. However, if there is a strike at Teleglobe, steps have been taken to assure at least essential services. But the efforts of the management are now concentrated on the resumption of negotiations and I am hopeful, as the Teleglobe management is, that the two parties involved will reach an agreement to ensure service during the Olympic Games of 1976.

● (1500)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) on a question of privilege.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): I think, on reflection, that I will try to resolve the matter by a series of questions and then decide whether or not a substantive motion is necessary.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TEXTILE AND CLOTHING BOARD

TABLING OF REPORT ON TEXTURED POLYESTER FILAMENT YARNS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I regret I was not quick enough when you were inviting the presentation of reports. May I table a report at this time?

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Jamieson: Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table, in both official languages, a report on textured polyester filament yarns from the Textile and Clothing Board.

* * *

IMPAIRED DRIVING PENALTY ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR DAY-FINES

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-442, to amend the Criminal Code (day-fines).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill will bring greater equality into our sentencing procedures for impaired driving by basing the fine assessed on the offender's ability to pay. It will also eliminate the present inhumane practice where persons willing but unable to pay their fines must go to jail, thus ending the needless and costly imprisonment of thousands of Canadians each year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 5,743, 5,773, 5,784 and 5,809.

[*Text*]

LAST POST FUND

Question No. 5,743—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What is the maximum amount which the Last Post Fund will pay for the burial of a veteran?

2. Are the family or friends of a veteran allowed to contribute toward the burial cost of a veteran in order to pay for expenses in excess of the amount paid by the Last Post Fund?

3. When was the maximum amount, which the Fund will pay, raised to its present level?

4. What criteria are used by the Department of Veterans Affairs in determining the maximum amount which the Fund will pay for the burial of a veteran?

5. What amount does the Department estimate to be the average cost of a funeral in (a) Vancouver (b) Edmonton (c) Winnipeg (d) Toronto (e) Montreal (f) Halifax (g) Corner Brook (h) St. John's?

6. Is any consideration being given to raising the maximum amount the Fund will pay for burial of a veteran?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. $500 for the services provided by the funeral director (plus the actual cost of a grave, the opening and closing thereof and the provision of a grave marker).

2. No.

3. November 7, 1975.

4. The criteria used were: (a) to provide a dignified and honourable burial for veterans who served in Her Majesty's Forces or forces allied with Her Majesty, who at death are in destitute circumstances, friendless, indigent or liable to become a public charge, (b) to pay for the services provided by a funeral director (and the cost of a grave, opening and closing thereof, and a grave marker) in relation to the average cost for similar services to major municipalities in Canada in 1975, with an adjustment to allow for subsequent increases in costs.

5. The average cost of a funeral, similar to the services provided for the Last Post Fund, paid by municipal authorities in 1975 was (a) $280; (b) $415; (c) $306.45; (d) $480; (e) $350; (f) $505; (g) not known;(h) $390. The average cost of a funeral to the general public in the locations specified is not available.

6. Not at this time in view of 3 above.

PASSENGER AND FREIGHT RULES ON ST. BARBE, NEWFOUNDLAND—BLANC-SABLON, QUEBEC FERRY

Question No. 5,773—**Mr. Marshall:**

What is the schedule of (a) passenger (b) freight rates on the ferry between St. Barbe, Newfoundland and Blanc-Sablon, Quebec?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: Schedule of (a) passenger; (b) freight rates as hereunder: (a) Passenger rates, one way, adult, $2.75, child, $1.30; (b) There are not rates on freight as such. Freight is carried by trucks and charge is made for trucks as follows: under 6,000 lbs., $ 10.50; over 6,000 lbs., $16.50; heavy equipment, $35.00; car and camper trailer, $15.00; large camper, $16.50; large truck camper, $16.50; bus, $35.00; mobile home, $35.00.

CONSUMER CREDIT DEBT CONTRACTED BY CANADIANS

Question No. 5,784—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. During the 1975 fiscal year, what was the consumer credit debt contracted by Canadians?

2. What percentage of the debt was contracted with (a) chartered banks (b) trust companies (c) finance companies?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada report that: 1. During the 1975 fiscal year consumer credit indebtedness increase from $20,784 million at March 31, 1975 to $24,071 million at March 31, 1976, (an increase of 15.8 per cent).

2. At the 1975 fiscal year end (March 31, 1976) the chartered banks held $13,624 million, 56.6 per cent of the $24,071 million total consumer credit outstanding; (b) trust companies held $226 million or 0.9 per cent of the total; and (c) finance companies held $2,842 million, or 11.8 per cent of the total outstanding.

CANADIANS IN FORCES DURING WORLD WARS I AND II

Question No. 5,809—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many Canadians served in the Canadian Armed Forces in (a) World War I (b) World War II?

Order Paper Questions

2. In each case, how many were born in (a) Canada (b) the United Kingdom (c) other British possessions (d) elsewhere?

3. How many were of (a) Anglo Saxon origin (b) French origin (c) other ethnic origins?

4. In each case, what was the total enlistment by province?

5. In each case, what was the classification by main religious denomination?

Hon. Donald S. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. (a) World War I, 619,636; (b) World War II, 1,081,865.

2 and 3. Information not available.

4. World War I, Information not available. World War II, Prince Edward Island, 9,649; Nova Scotia, 62,153; New Brunswick, 46,951; Quebec, 180,756; Ontario, 416,995; Manitoba, 80,541; Saskatchewan, 86,344; Alberta, 82,631; British Columbia, 97,649; Outside Canada, 18,196. Total, 1,081,865.

5. Information not available.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 3,338 and 5,808 could be made orders for return, those returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

BUSINESS DEALINGS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND OLYMPIA AND YORK DEVELOPMENT AND/OR ALBERT REICHMANN OR PAUL REICHMANN

Question No. 3,338—**Mr. Cossitt:**

From April 20, 1968, what is a complete description, with details, of all business dealings of any kind whatsoever between the government and Olympia and York Development Company or any subsidiaries thereto and/or Albert Reichmann or Paul Reichmann?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION—STORAGE OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Question No. 5,808—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. During the 1974-75 and 1975-76 fiscal years, has the Canadian Dairy Commission rented premises to store butter, cheese and milk powder and, if so, what (a) were the names and addresses of the persons and companies who rented the various premises to the Commission (b) was the total rent paid (c) were the renting conditions?

2. In each case, did the lease provide that the cost be (a) a set price (b) proportional to the quantity of dairy products stored and, if so, what was the storage cost of a (i) pound of butter (ii) pound of cheese (iii) hundred pounds of powdered milk?

3. As of March 31, 1976, how many pounds of (a) butter (b) cheese (c) powdered milk were stored?

4. Is the stored cheese imported and, if so (a) what kind (b) from what countries does it come?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Coates.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 13 (Mr. Reynolds).

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, before lunch I was about to conclude my remarks in support of motion No. 13, and outlining my reasons for hoping that this will be the view taken by the House generally. I was pointing out that there was considerable evidence that the retention of the death penalty would be a deterrent to murder, and to that end I was reading certain relevant parts of a submission made by the attorney general of California to the supreme court of the United States.

In Los Angeles, the police department interviewed various people who had been arrested for certain offences and asked them, for example, why they did not carry a gun or, if they did, why they did not use the gun, and so on. It is interesting to note the number of occasions on which those who had been arrested said they did not carry a gun or resort to the use of a gun because they were afraid of the death penalty. I drew attention to the words of a man charged with armed robbery who said:

I was afraid to use a gun because of a possible death sentence.

Another stated:

I did not use a gun because I am afraid of the death penalty.

Another told the police:

I never owned a gun because I am afraid of the death penalty.

I could go on and call attention to some 25 such comments. When the Solicitor General suggests it has never been proven either way whether the death penalty is a deterrent or not, he is bound to admit that though this may be so, there is strong evidence to show that it is a deterrent. I believe it can be shown that it is a deterrent to murder, particularly of a prison guard or a policeman, and that it would be in the interest of all Canadians if the death penalty for such an offence was retained.

While we torment ourselves over the question of execution, it should not be forgotten that although 11 persons are now in so-called death row—65 people were convicted of murder in the 12 years ending 1974—over 4,000 people have been illegally executed in this country in the course of the crime referred to as murder. Surely this is an equation we have to weigh. More than 4,000 people were illegally executed, or murdered, yet we hesitate to execute legally even the small number to whom I have referred—the 65 persons in the last 12 years who have been charged with murder and sentenced to death.

It is particularly important that we give this protection of a deterrent to those who are upholding our laws, that is to say, our prison guards and policemen. They, after all, are in the front line. They are the people who must deal with convicts and bring offenders to justice. We owe these men an assurance that if any one of them is murdered, his

assailant will in turn pay with his life. If we fail to do this, we have let down our policemen and prison guards. That is why I urge hon. members seriously to consider the merits of motion No. 13.

I would point out, also, that if under the present proposal a man who has been convicted of murdering a prison guard or policeman is sentenced to life imprisonment, it does not mean he will spend 25 years in prison. From the day he is put in jail he becomes eligible to get what is called leave of absence, with an escort, at any time. He is able to get that privilege by permission of the jailer or of the Commissioner of Penitentiaries. I believe this provision is unduly lax. I believe it is irresponsible for the government to be suggesting that a hardened criminal, a man convicted of murdering a prison guard or a policeman, should be allowed leave of absence from time to time, with an escort, bearing in mind that it would be easy for one of these hardened criminals to jump his guard and commit another murder.

● (1510)

That is the basis for my belief that hon. members should support motion 13. It is not enough for members on the government side to cite certain people who happen to be abolitionists or retentionists. I think they belie the free vote their Prime Minister claims is in existence every time they make these statements. We in the Conservative caucus believe this is in truth a free vote and that people should decide for themselves how we should dispose of each of these amendments and the bill itself. Every time a government member calls into ridicule, if you like, one of our members who has chosen to vote one way or the other, he is belying the free vote the Prime Minister claims to be in existence.

When speaking of the free vote I would point out that it is time members of this House reflected, in the free vote, the free opinion of Canadians. Canadians wish the death penalty to be retained. I think the time has come when we in this, hopefully, democratic institution should cease to frustrate the free will of Canadians, at least in the case of prison guards and policemen, by allowing the death penalty to be retained.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have read very carefully the speeches delivered during the past few days, including of course those of my colleagues of the Social Credit Party, on the proposed amendments to Bill C-84. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just resumed his seat has asked hon. members to vote conscientiously, according to the wishes of their constituents. I am greatly pleased to be the representative of my electors in Parliament. Since the introduction of Bill C-84, we have received hundreds even thousands of letters from all parts of Canada in which people state their views on the abolition of the death penalty.

I think I can truthfully say that at least 90 per cent of the population across Canada, out west, in the east, the Maritimes or the centre, 90 per cent of the people want to retain capital punishment. Now, Motion No. 13 before us advocates the retention of capital punishment for the murder of policemen and prison guards. Mr. Speaker, I believe that policemen and prison guards have made representations to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) as well as to the Prime Minister, the cabinet and all federal representatives.

On June 22 last, we voted on second reading on Bill C-84 which was defeated. The vote upheld Bill C-84 by 133 votes against 125. What happened to me may have happened to other members or other political parties. On June 22, the vote was taken at noon. At two o'clock in the afternoon, I was returning home to Rouyn by car, and in the evening, around 7 or 7:30, at my Hull residence, a carpenter was doing some repair work. A blue car stopped at my place and the driver, a chap of 25 or 26, called the carpenter to his car and asked him: Where is Caouette, the guy in favour of hanging; I want to kill him! As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this chap had a revolver next to him on the front seat of the car, and was ready to kill a member who had voted for capital punishment for murderers. But then, the protection we would need, no member has it presently. I know full well that those individuals, either in Montreal, here in Ottawa or in Hull, as it happened at my place, have set for themselves or have been assigned the task of trying to influence the members or to frighten them by threatening them with death if they vote for the retention of capital punishment.

Mr. Speaker, when in a system or a country like ours we have reached the point where we have to put up with or tolerate that sort of people, I think the members should think twice before deciding: For all practical purposes, we are going to abolish capital punishment in Canada, even for murderers of policemen, prison guards, my wife, my children, the wives and children of everyone, even members of parliament, the Prime Minister and the other ministers. We should have protection against those people! Of course not, there is an attempt to frighten people, and that is when I wonder how true is the free vote on capital punishment in this House.

I said before June 22 that I was in favour of capital punishment for qualified gangsters, and I say it again today: capital punishment must be urgently restored in Canada, not as a revenge against anyone, but so justice will prevail for all the public, for Canadians, for our families, for government leaders, authorities, everybody.

Mr. Speaker, when we reach a point where we have contract killers, people paid to go and kill someone, we are going to arrest those people, we are going to locate them, we are going to sentence them to 25 years in prison and they are going to cost us maybe $20,000 or $25,000 a year for subsistance, and we are going to keep those individuals under the pretext that we can rehabilitate them. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to see the Solicitor General try and rehabilitate just one of those notorious gangsters who have only one reason to live, to commit murders and kill their fellow men.

● (1520)

Mr. Speaker, recently the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who supports the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) on capital punishment, said that in the name of humanity, we have no right to kill a criminal, even if he has killed a guard, a policeman or anybody else, we have no right to send him off to the guillotine or to the noose because it does not bring back the victim to life nor does it rehabili-

tate the criminal. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that, we did not need a prime minister or a solicitor general to tell us that. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not here, but I hope he will read my comments. Recently, the Prime Minister took a little trip to Cuba, he told us how beautiful it was, how Mr. Castro runs the country well, that Mr. Castro was a very humane man. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister of Canada to send terrorists to Cuba, well-known criminals, to do there what they do in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa or Hull. How long would Mr. Castro tolerate them in Cuba? Precisely in the name of humanitarianism and humanity, in the name of the right to life, how long would those people live in the country known as Cuba, under the regime of Mr. Castro, a close friend of the Prime Minister of Canada?

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows the answer to that question. A bandit would not live two hours. Why? Because we know that what used to be past practise in that country is no longer tolerated. When Mr. Castro was a revolutionary, a terrorist, he was tolerated by the authorities of the day. The moment he took power in Cuba, he got rid of officials, lowly civil servants, people by the thousands. Pits were dug by bulldozers with special blades and people were lined up along the pits. Then, they were fired upon so that they would fall, dead, into the holes, on Mr. Castro's orders.

The Prime Minister did not tell us that when he came back from Cuba. He does not speak of that when he introduces or has the Solicitor General of Canada introduce Bill C-84. What group in our Canadian society asked that this bill to be introduced in the House? What part of Canada asked the Solicitor General or the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada or the Liberal government to introduce Bill C-84 to abolish capital punishment in Canada?

An hon. Member: The Catholic Church?

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Not so either. True, a few bishops did ask us to be more humane. That's fine. But none has said that the death penalty should be abolished at all costs. I am referring to the meeting of the Association of the Catholic Bishops of Canada, which took place in the province of Quebec. And even so, one or two bishops may favour abolition, that does not mean the whole Catholic Church is involved. It may be only one man's point of view, but we can—

An hon. Member: The Bishops' Conference—

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): The Quebec conference was precisely about that.

Mr. Speaker, we did not ask anybody anything, all we asked for was our constituents' opinion on this very important issue. We are talking about a free vote tonight on motion No. 13, as on all the other motions which will be put this evening. A while ago, the hon. member who spoke before me expressed doubts regarding a free vote. I have doubts as well. There are little intrigues going on behind the scenes. One can overhear somebody say: "Well, in your constituency, you may be reelected even though you vote against retention and for abolition.

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

Mr. Speaker, I know that some hon. members are now under extreme pressure in their constituencies that they are being harassed from all sides by their electors who are against abolishing capital punishment. But no, they come here and they say that perhaps they will be able to restore their popularity before the next election. They vote against and we say: we vote according to our conscience.

Mr. Speaker, why do 90 per cent of the population pay for 10 per cent? Even the 10 per cent do not speak as loudly as all that, but the 90 per cent do not mince their words when talking about punishments which bandits and hardened criminals deserve; we do not clamour for hanging as we knew it 25 or 30 years ago, but it is as clear as crystal that in the case of premeditated murder, someone wanted to kill someone.

Then, let us try to rehabilitate such a bandit or murderer; I challenge the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) to rehabilitate only one across Canada and in the province of Quebec. In his own riding, the Solicitor General has a vast majority of retentionists. He could not care less and goes even as far as to tell them to their face: before allowing any execution, I would rather resign. He lacks only one thing: it is the courage to resign, to walk out of cabinet and allow the population to respect him.

An hon. Member: He is not beaten yet.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): He is not what?

An hon. Member: Beaten!

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Then, I hope the hon. member will help me to beat him once and for all this evening.

The same applies to the right hon. Prime Minister. I mentioned earlier all those countries, I talked about Cuba, but there are other countries in the world. Let us talk about murderers in the U.S.S.R. for instance. Recently, a Russian businessman was conducting financial transactions with Swiss financiers. The Soviet government found him out. They did not charge him with murder; he was told that he has worked against the state and he was shot the next morning. Would terrorists be tolerated in Russia? Those who were in power in 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919 were terrorists. With Lenin and Marx first, and then with Stalin. Does the Prime Minister stand to protest against massive executions that are taking place in the U.S.S.R., in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in the whole communist block? The same is happening there. In other areas of the world which are not cummunist, in Africa, in Morocco, one day not too long ago 17 individuals were shot because of their revolting against a government bill.

In these countries, which are said to be as civilized as we are capital punishment exists for murders far less sordid than those that have happened in Montreal for too many years now. Recently, an aircraft was hijacked by pirates who flew to Uganda. We saw how this one ended not too long ago: about thirty dead. These people would be alive if there had not been any pirates, but there were and they were prepared to kill 106 hostages in an aircraft which did not belong to them. These pirates are dead now. But if they had not been shot and had come to Canada, we would have sued them and said: Gentlemen, there might be a way to

rehabilitate you. We will send you to prison for 20 or 25 years for life, but maybe you will stay only 15 or 10 years depending on the application, on the way the judge feels. Then you might be released in 10, 12 or 15 years.

Then, they had the right to shoot down the leaders of the hijackers. As for the policemen, the prison guards, since they expect some security, will we allow them greater latitude in return, will we let them defend themselves effectively and efficiently through Bill C-84? No, we still want to control their actions, to expose them to the bandits, the prisoners, the convicts in isolation who are ready to do anything in order to escape and commit the same odious crime.

Mr. Speaker, why are our policemen and our prison guards so shocked and so much against Bill C-84? Their security is at stake. When a policeman of about 24 or 25 arrests a bandit, charges him and proves that he is a bandit, this young policeman sees the bandit or the murderer condemned to 15 or 20 years in prison. Do you know that 15 years from now this criminal who is only 25 years old will be only 40, no more than that. At that time, he will be freed. Do you not think he will rather resent his 10 or 15 years in prison? At that time, he will be incited to settle with the policeman who arrested him when he was 25.

Mr. Speaker, I find absolutely illogical that supposedly reasonable people ask us and advocate across the board abolition of the death penalty in Canada. As I said earlier, we receive hundreds of letters from people protesting against the abolition of the death penalty and not only from people in the province of Quebec. One of these letters has been sent to me by a Mr. Lessard who lives on Henri-Bourassa West in Montreal. He simply sent me a few words to tell me:

I hope that, in Parliament, you are going to help us so that the death penalty will not be abolished.

Raynald Lessard, Montreal.

Some people ask that the death penalty be maintained, not for revenge but in a spirit of justice. As I said the last time I spoke in the House on this subject: There are traffic laws. I consider the death penalty as a warning to everyone: Do not kill your fellow being, or it will be dangerous for you. A red light at the corner of the street. What does that mean? Stop! Mr. Speaker, you are free not to stop but, if you do not stop, you might create a serious accident which could claim several lives. Mr. Speaker, at that moment, a man is free but the signal says: Stop. The law asks him to stop. I see the penalty in exactly the same way, it is a stop signal: Stop, do not kill your fellow being because if you do kill him you will bear the consequences of your act. That is what murderers should be told throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, those people know it. If we say to them: Listen, the noose is there. I do not want to hang anybody but neither do I want anybody to kill his fellow being. In this case, he will not risk hanging. I am not afraid to be hanged because I know that I have not killed anyone and I do not intend to kill anyone either. But when you see that there are people who steal, people who are contract killers and who are paid to kill, let us not imagine that I am going to believe that these people are fully repentant and have decided never to do it again when they are paid so much a head, so much per murder. Mr. Speaker, I do not trust these people and besides they do not frighten me. I am not afraid to tell them to their face what I think of those who are killers, these human monsters of our so-called civilized society. Mr. Speaker, I have other letters and this one from Toronto says this:

● (1530)

[*English*]

It was like a breath of fresh air to read that you and all members of your party solidly voted for the retention of capital punishment and it proved to all Canadians across Canada that you and your party was the only political party that was listening to the voice of the public to retain capital punishment.

[*Translation*]

All our members of the Social Credit Party.

I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that some members of the Liberal Party voted for retention of capital punishment, according to the views of thier constituents. I have noticed also that many Progressive Conservatives voted for retention of capital punishment. And I have noticed that among the members of the New Democratic Party—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does he have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank all hon. members for the opportunity they have given me to continue for a few more minutes. I will not abuse of their kindness.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, a letter from Toronto said:

An hon. Member: It was in French.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): That is right, my hon. friend points out that it was in French, but I think he got the translation, since we have simultaneous translation here, Mr. Speaker, I also noticed that our neighbours from the NPD voted massively for the abolition of capital punishment. I can never understand their attitude on that very serious and very sensitive issue. On the one hand, they all vote and clamour for abortion on demand, free abortion. They suggest leaving it to the discretion of the doctor or the patient. I think that matters of conscience are personal, that there is no global conscience. Abortion is a right, you can kill innocents, people who never committed murders of crimes. Let us kill them! On the other hand, when it is time to kill a bandit, a criminal, in the name of humanity, in the name of humanism, in the name of decency, we must save his life. You do not have the right to take it. The young innocent can be killed readily, even before birth. Yet, the young innocent did not ask to be born.

Of course, the big innocent did not ask it either, but he was born and we had at least the courage, the decency to respect his right to life. And in return, we ask him to respect the right to the life of others. But they say no. A criminal can be rehabilitated. Then we must be civilized when all socialist countries in the world are in favour of

capital punishment. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to understand in the New Democratic Party of Canada, and I think they will not get three votes in the province of Quebec at the next election. And I hope they will lose all the votes they now get throughout Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You are too kind and decent.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Yes, I know.

[*Translation*]

The letter from Toronto which I am quoting goes on as follows:

[*English*]

In view of the fact that the leaders of the other parties, such as Trudeau, Clark and Broadbent and the majority of their MPs ignored the desire of the voters to retain capital punishment, their actions on this critical issue will certainly cost them a loss of voters and MPs will suffer with the loss of their seats at the next election—

The letter was written by P. Bennett, of Toronto, on June 30, 1976.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is a Mr. Bennett, B-e-n-n-e-t-t, from Toronto, June 30. I did not request anything from him. I suggested some months ago to the Prime Minister that this stand on capital punishment was flying in the face of people in Montreal, Quebec, Vancouver and Toronto. That might be the issue that would cause the defeat of this Liberal government at the next election, either in one or two years. I am still of that opinion. The Canadian people has seen enough of a government that goes against their will, against their wishes, against their stated desires.

Here is another letter, from Ottawa:

[*English*]

What else can I say? Congratulations, but a poor result, 133 to 125. I am very pleased to see that your party MPs voted for hanging and it may pay off in the next federal election.

[*Translation*]

I am not counting on that, but I feel that all my colleagues in the Social Credit and myself voted according to the wishes not only of Quebecers, but of Canadians as a whole. Some Progressive Conservative and Liberal members know that. The New Democrats are insensitive, they are unaware of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter received from Résidence Dorchester, in Montreal, 1650 W. Dorchester Blvd. Mr. Lucien Roussel writes:

The abolition of capital punishment by our federal government is not fair.

Following that decision, I would agree if at the next federal election we were asked on every ballot: Are you in favour of capital punishment or not?

This is a man who suggests that a referendum be held. We talked about the referendum. I already suggested it to the Solicitor General, the right hon. Prime Minister, this government, this House. They are afraid to let the people speak up, and all those who held some kind of referendum in their respective ridings received similar answers. From 85 to 90 per cent answered this: Retain capital punishment for capital murders, premeditated murders, not only for murderers of policemen and prison guards but for all murderers. That is what those people are suggesting—a referendum. The Prime Minister tells us, no, no, no referendum.

The Solicitor General also tells us, no, no, no referendum. That is because he knows he would be beaten. That is why I keep asking who else has asked this government to bring Bill C-84 before the House? Who? What part of Canada? What member? What association? Would the murderers themselves have asked this government, please spare us the noose, we will be good little boys, so keep on protecting us. That is exactly what Bill C-84 does. It protects bandits against society instead of protecting society against bandits and criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I have here another letter from Montreal, from Mr. Bernard Molloy who says:

● (1540)

[*English*]

Congratulations on the stand you and your party took with regard to capital punishment. You are to be admired for having the courage of your convictions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of letters I get, but I did not receive a single one in favour of abolition. Is it because abolitionist are afraid to write to me? Not a single one! I got some against abolition from all parts of Canada, even the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Social Credit Party is not the only one who receives letters; others do too. My colleagues receive a lot of them and there is a general outcry for the retention of capital punishment, and I repeat, it is not in a spirit of vengence but in a spirit of justice. Let justice be done, rendered and obtained. Instead of thinking of the rehabilition of such bandits, let us think about their victims and their families. When a manager of a Caisse populaire with his child in his arms is killed in cold blood and shot point-blank, when that chap entered the house to rob with a loaded revolver, well, he did not go in with his rosary to do the stations of the Cross.

He went in there firmly decided to shoot if things turned out bad. Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what happened. The father, the wife, a mother of a family, were killed. Recently in Montreal, we have witnessed I think the fifty-second qualified murder in the City of Montreal alone, in the MUC. And the same thing happens in the Quebec City region and in the region of Trois-Rivières. The same holds true for Toronto as well as Vancouver.

Mr. Speaker, I think that motion No. 13 which aims at protecting policemen and prison guards must be agreed to by the House. I have noticed some hon. members who rose and were not afraid to vote on second reading. I congratulate them for that. As for those who were prompted by fear, who voted to avoid that this government be defeated, their case is a bit more doubtful and I say to them: You will have it out with your constituents. Meanwhile, let us think about the people of Canada who deserve to be protected, who deserve an assurance from a government that their life is being protected against gangsters, criminals, murderers, genuine and hardened criminals, those who cannot be rehabilitated.

If we secured the protection of policemen and prison guards, we would at least make a move in a direction where we might reach if not perfection at least a better safety than we now enjoy. For that purpose, I am still in favour of capital punishment, not against occasional criminals but for hardened criminals, those who have revengeful and hateful feelings for their fellow citizens or society as a whole.

Let us improve living conditions within society. I agree, if this means preventing some people from going wrong; however, I think it would cost less than maintaining criminals in our jails. If we gave them more respectable, more affordable living conditions finally to prevent those who have still some good in them from committing murder. Let us prepare ourselves before it is too late, but if society, government and the law are to be abused then let the murderer pay for his crime.

[*English*]

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing two amendments today. They have been joined together because they both refer to clause 4 of this bill. I was delighted to hear that in the last two or three days the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) indicated that he is prepared to accept the amendment proposed by my colleague and friend, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence).

I will not address myself to that particular amendment because my concern is mainly with a statement made by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) which appears in yesterday's *Hansard*. In that statement there was an unusual development of thought which I find difficult to understand. I thought I would use my intervention this afternoon to describe what an unusual position the hon. member has got himself into by using the logic he did. The anomalous situation into which he has talked himself is manifest in two clearly distinguishable respects. I cannot understand how he arrived at his conclusion. There may be some explanation and we may go into that afterwards. But we must remember that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is a self-declared retentionist, and I am glad of that. I am a retentionist myself. Also, on second reading the hon. member voted with the retentionists.

The hon. member declared, in a statement which appears at page 15133 of *Hansard*, that he believes in the retention of capital punishment. That is fine.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I remind the hon. member that there is a Standing Order which says that hon. members are not supposed to reflect on the way other hon. members vote.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I accept that admonition, Mr. Speaker. I was just pointing out that the hon. member voted the same way I did. I accept the admonition of the Chair and I will not come back to the voting pattern. However, in doing what he did, the hon. member obviously intended to show his opposition to the proposals put before him by his government. In other words, by his opposition and by his vote he wanted reinstatement of the law as it now stands, namely, the death penalty for murderers of policemen and prison guards and certain other classes of persons in dangerous positions like that. In other words, he wanted return to the law as it now stands, because he is a retentionist. However, the hon. member is opposed to the present amendment which would reinstate the death penalty.

Mr. Epp: And the law as it is.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): And the law as it is, although, granted, only to this extent. Why is he opposed to this amendment? He says it is because it introduces discrimination. The existing law is discriminatory, but the hon. member cannot go beyond that because backbenchers on this side or on the side opposite cannot extend the intent of the law as it now stands. That is the prerogative of the government. The extent to which the present law is discriminatory seems to have been what the hon. member voted for in the first instance. The second reason he has placed himself in this untenable position by his unusual stand is that he seems completely unaware of the fact that he could accomplish his purpose as a retentionist by supporting this amendment. It is as simple as that.

In my cogitations, if this amendment is carried it stands to reason the government will have to withdraw the bill. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) is approved in the vote tonight, the bill will be completely demolished and it will have to be withdrawn or rewritten. It would have to be presented again—and I have no doubt that it would be—but that is the situation and the purpose of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni would be accomplished for the time being, anyway. Is he a bellwether just giving an indication to the rest of the retentionists in this chamber that this is the way the backbenchers on the government side are going to vote? I am not sure of that, although it may be a possibility. I hope he will reconsider his position, and having reconsidered it will alter the way he intends to vote when the time comes tonight. I will not point the finger and say, "You have changed your mind"; no, sir. That hon. member can change his mind because he will see that he will be accomplishing his purpose if he votes tonight in favour of this amendment.

● (1550)

There are other aspects of the amendment on which I feel I must comment. Last weekend I was at a July 1 ceremony in a small community in my riding and I heard a story which upset me very deeply. This came to me from someone who had been talking to the RCMP, which is the police force responsible for enforcing the law in that community of 5,000 or 6,000 people. I was told that in that apparently law-abiding community where there is a detachment of three, four or five policemen, at least once a month, when in pursuit of their duty and on patrol, they stare down the operative end of a gun barrel. That is a frightening thought, in a community which I have the honour to represent, that once a month these men are faced with a weapon that could go off.

Let us not forget that police, prison guards, penitentiary workers and those listed in section 214 of the Criminal Code, such as sherriff's officers and prison employees engaged in the preservation and maintenance of public institutions, and so on, are all public servants. They are the only civilian public servants whose lives we have been

prepared to place at great risk, Mr. Speaker. I have just mentioned one of the risks these public servants have to face.

I would ask the government what plans it has to protect these public servants if this bill should pass. Most of them are married and have families. If the breadwinner happens to be a victim in the commission of a crime, what provision does the government make, over and above the ordinary provision that is now made by the public service, for this particular class of public servant? If there is a pension or superannuation plan, is the government going to demand extra premiums from them so that they can pay for taking these extra risks, or is the government going to provide the extra premium and the benefits that would be required by these public servants? These are matters that obviously have not been thought of, so far as I can make out.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the federal government could do this, but what about the provinces and the municipalities who also have public servants who are at great risk, some of whom might lose their lives? The risk is going to be greater if this bill should pass. Many more of these public servants, let us be frank, will pay with their lives. What about their survivors? What means does the government have to offer in order to entice, to induce or to recruit properly qualified persons to fill these risk positions? I do not think they have any particular plans in mind. These public servants are our protectors. They stand between us and the criminals in our society who have decided that they can disregard the law.

I do not think the government has looked ahead to see what the response of some of our policemen is likely to be when dealing with serious crimes. With the threat of the death penalty eliminated by the successful passage of this bill, when they are dealing with crimes involving the killing of policemen, who amongst us, would blame a guardian of the law who decided to use his sidearm first in the apprehension of a dangerous criminal? Who would be to blame if we were to find that the death penalty was carried out not infrequently before trial? Is this what we want?

Mr. Horner: Sidewalk justice.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): This is not just a remote possibility, Mr. Speaker. In raising the matter I do not question the integrity, self-control and discipline of our police forces. Wherever I have met them they have given me cause to be proud. But self-defence would be a justifiable defence in most of the circumstances that one can envisage. Is that what the government wants—execution without trial, to avoid execution upon conviction? That is what it looks like.

I therefore propose, even in this limited context, to support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta which will give policemen and others who work for our protection, at least some protection rather than have them face the dreadful decision of having to shoot first and ask questions afterwards.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a few of my thoughts before the House and say at the outset that I support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). In the days since the vote was taken on second reading of this bill a number of members who voted for abolition in the almost cocoon-like security of this place have possibly been faced with the stark reality of what their constituents were saying when they went back to their ridings. Some who thought that the figure of 80 per cent of Canadians endorsing the retention of capital punishment for premeditated murder was an exaggeration possibly found that 80 per cent was on the low side when they returned to their ridings.

I have to go back to 1972, Mr. Speaker. To all intents and purposes the amendment before us restores the law to the position it is in at the moment. Capital punishment would be the penalty for the murder of police officers or prison guards. I recall that in 1972 the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), an avowed abolitionist, said in an interview that he would have liked to go for complete abolition but this was the best he could get at the time. There was a minority government in 1972-73, and to my mind he had no intention of enforcing the bill that he proposed to this House. He was convinced that in every case to come before him he would try to convince the cabinet to commute the death penalty called for in the law which he sponsored.

● (1600)

The facts cannot be gainsaid. I submit that the death penalty should be maintained for the murderers of police officers and prison guards. Right now some prison guards are opting for early retirement. Many of them are veterans who took up their duties with the prison service at the end of World War II. Many have served 25 years. They need 30 years' service for a full pension, and quite a number are opting for early retirement. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? They seriously question the policies of the Solicitor General, the minister responsible for our prison service. They wonder if he has listened to their pleas. They are concerned not only about capital punishment; they are concerned about the whole question of security in prisons and say, "We do not have the support of the Solicitor General. Has he even listened to us?" Therefore, some of them are opting for early retirement. The situation in provincial jail systems is similar. Even now the Manitoba government is embarking on a plan whereby it will recruit officers to serve in Manitoba jails in future.

I know that last weekend many members did as I did; I visited the various parts of my riding and spoke to many people about capital punishment. Actually, it is more accurate to say that they spoke to me about capital punishment. There was no way to avoid them. They wanted to speak about it. I had the chance to speak with some RCMP personnel in my riding. I can best describe their attitude by saying they are angry, frustrated and, above all, cynical. They have become cynical about the government. You can tell them that the vote on the bill is free, but they know it is a government-supported bill, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Solicitor General, avowed abolitionists, wanted to bring this before the House for passage before the end of the last five-year experiemental period.

It is known that this bill has been brought before the House despite the objections of the vast majority of Canadians who hold retentionist views with regard to premeditated murder. RCMP officers legitimately ask, as do prison guards, how they are to act. Obviously, there is a

communications gap between the RCMP and the Solicitor General, the minister who is supposedly responsible for the force and who does not listen. He does not do what the RCMP recommends. A police organization in Calgary says it cannot place any trust in the Solicitor General, a position also adopted by some members of the RCMP.

It was put this way to me, and I emphasize that I am not alluding to a contrived or unrealistic situation, because what I am about to mention could happen, "How is an RCMP officer to act, once this bill passes, if he faces a gunman with a loaded gun?" Let us say the gunman has already killed an innocent victim who is not a police officer or prison guard. The RCMP are called in to apprehend that person; they arrive at the scene and find themselves looking down the barrel of a high-powered rifle. What are they to do? In that situation you do not use polite language and say, "Please put down your gun and come with me." Gunmen do not understand such language. Therefore, because a policeman must act in self-defence it is possible that the gunman will be shot and killed. Will the RCMP be accused by abolitionists, including the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General, of taking the law into their own hands, of setting up a kangaroo court, acting as judge and jury and, instead of arresting him, shooting the gunman down?

Some may say that argument is strained, that the situation is contrived. I submit they are wrong. The RCMP do not think that situation is far-fetched. Right now they could face similar situations almost every day of the week. They ask, if they are forced to act in the manner described, who will defend them? Will it be the Solicitor General in whom they have no faith? They have received no answer to that question. I submit that the Solicitor General is obliged to answer. Be that as it may, our policemen will face gunmen and the situation I have described is not contrived. Therefore, fundamental questions remain to be answered.

Today our police forces are cynical. Society is cynical. It feels that parliament defied the will of the majority of Canadians by voting for abolition. I suppose all members of parliament wonder how best to ascertain the opinion of those they represent. I do not know how other members operate, but speaking for myself I often phone the same people to learn their opinions. Unfortunately, this procedure is not always satisfactory. To ascertain more accurately the views of people in the riding with respect to the retention of capital punishment for premeditated murder, I found it necessary to conduct a poll. The poll showed that the majority of my constituents are in favour of retention. I suggest that in no constituency is the majority of constituents in favour of abolition. If that were the case we would have heard about it a long time ago. One would have heard abolitionist members saying, "The majority of constituents in my riding favour abolition." They have not said that; on that point they have been remarkably silent. One can only conclude that such sentiment does not exist.

When I spoke on second reading I made my position as a retentionist well known and told the House that I had conducted a poll with respect to Bill C-84. Mr. Speaker, 90 per cent of the respondents in my riding opted for the retention of capital punishment for premeditated murder. I am not a professional pollster and my poll may not have been conducted scientifically. But even if you reduce the percentage in favour by 10 per cent, from 90 per cent to 80 per cent, you still wind up with an overwhelming majority, with a virtual consensus. That is how the people of my riding feel. I suggest that the poll results pertaining to my riding are not unique but hold true to a lesser or greater degree in every riding across Canada.

● (1610)

It is not only police and prison officials who are cynical and frustrated. Canadians are frustrated as well. They are questioning whether the representations they have made have been listened to. We have in this motion the retention of capital punishment for the killing of police officers or prison guards. Police associations and policemen's wives associations have indicated their position to us. They live under constant fear because of the risks inherent in their jobs. They have indicated that their fear is intensified because there is no longer the ultimate deterrent. Even though death sentences have been commuted since 1962, there has always been the possibility that a person convicted of murder would in fact pay the supreme penalty.

An example of the deterrent value was clearly brought out in the Israeli raid. I know that treason and hijacking were discussed earlier. However, one of my constituents pointed out that if capital punishment had been in force, and enforced in the countries where the terrorists were incarcerated, they could not have been used as ransom for the lives of those hijackers held on the Air France plane.

Whether we like to admit it or not, police officers and prison guards are being asked to put their lives on the line, with even less protection. Abolitionists are willing to accept those additional risks. They are willing to accept the death of these people because it is inherent in their jobs. I can interpret the view of the abolitionists in no other way. They are quite willing to extend those risks to the point where police officers and prison guards will have to sacrifice their lives, rather than retain the death penalty as at least a measure of protection for a person who is innocent. Innocent people are being asked to put their lives on the line in order to protect those who have already taken a life. That is not in any way compatible with justice.

The major question still facing me on the whole capital punishment issue is that some people say that if we invoke capital punishment, rehabilitation is impossible. From what I have seen, I do not believe that rehabilitation through the prison system works. I know we have had experts of all types in there, including psychiatrists, psychologists, and so on. I do not say this because I am a pessimist. I would love to see rehabilitation take effect. However, the state, by its very nature, does not have the ability to rehabilitate people. The state is impersonal, it depersonalizes everything. We have seen this happen in prisons. The state has no heart.

The only rehabilitation that will take place is in cases where organizations and individuals are willing to work with prisoners in a slow, ongoing process. A person might then be rehabilitated to the degree where he or she accepts the laws of the country, obeys those laws, and recognizes that by breaking a law the very basis of democracy is threatened because democracy can only survive if he or she

respects the rights of others. However, killers take away the basic right of individuals, and that is life.

There are idealists in this House who say that if we do not have capital punishment for premeditated killers, we can work on rehabilitation. The Solicitor General will have to be the first to admit that rehabilitation in our prisons has been a disaster.

Mr. Allmand: I won't admit that.

Mr. Epp: Rather than fewer people being incarcerated, there are larger numbers being incarcerated. The recidivism rate continues at a phenomenal level. Rehabilitation is simply not in place. The Solicitor General would have done a service to Canada if long before this bill, to which I am totally opposed, came into this House he had put in very specific terms the type of rehabilitation he would like to see take place in prisons. Along with that rehabilitation program he should have confirmed to prison officers and policemen across this country that he stands behind them, supports them in their work and will be their advocate in this House and in cabinet. He is not that at the present time. He is not representing their views at all. In fact, they almost look upon him as enemy number one.

Mr. Horner: He is enemy number one.

Mr. Epp: I wonder how the Solicitor General views his role. He said he would resign or seek another portfolio if the bill is defeated. I hope he will have to do that quickly, possibly after tonight. The real question is how he can sit in cabinet and speak on behalf of members of the RCMP and officers in the prison system when they have no confidence in him. They have said so in resolution after resolution. He speaks entirely opposite to what they recommend. He does not listen.

Mr. Paproski: He does not care.

Mr. Horner: He hears a different drummer.

Mr. Epp: He probably has the concept that everybody is out of step but Johnny, and that is him. How does the Solicitor General justify continuing in that portfolio while completely rejecting the ideas, concepts and recommendations of people directly within his charge?

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): It won't be for long.

Mr. Epp: The Solicitor General has a responsibility to stand in this House during the course of this debate and state how he sees his role as being responsible for the prison system and for police officers.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Epp: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my colleagues for this courtesy. I will not take up too much time of the House; however, I do want to put before the Solicitor General this serious question. Does he really feel that as Solicitor General he is fulfilling his mandate and his responsibility to the men and women who are officers and report to him?

Mr. Horner: He knows he is letting them down.

Mr. Epp: The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) says that the Solicitor General knows he is letting them down. I know one thing; the RCMP officers in my riding say he has let them down. They are saying they can have no confidence in the Solicitor General or in the Prime Minister who, I am sure, is the guru to whom he listens.

● (1620)

An hon. Member: Who do you listen to?

Mr. Epp: I listen to my constituents, and I suggest the hon. member should do the same.

An hon. Member: You should try to listen to your leader occasionally.

Mr. Epp: I do that, too.

Mr. Allmand: You should listen to your conscience, also.

Mr. Epp: That is an interesting comment from the Solicitor General. As a matter of fact, my conscience and my constituents are in harmony. I should like to dispel once and for all the idea that a person who votes for retention is listening only to his constituents and does not have a conscience of his own. The Solicitor General is responsible to the House, but he is also responsible for the men and women in his charge. How will he answer them and their families when they are victimized? It is the guards who have to look after a person who has been convicted of murder and who will kill again in order to get out of prison. That is the question the Solicitor General has not answered, and it is one he must answer for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, motion No. 13 which we are now studying is, to my mind, one of the most important motions that have been presented and which is on the order paper of the House in respect of Bill C-84. Indeed, this amendment, motion No. 13, proposes to maintain present Criminal Code section 214 or to delete clause 4 of the bill.

It is not without reason, I think, that many people, organizations and policemen throughout Canada are opposed to the deletion of section 214.

I am satisfied that each member studies carefully this question at the moment. We are studying together what we should do to give society, individuals and families the protection they are entitled to. We want to reach that aim by different means but, nevertheless, I think we must take into account the representations which are made to us and also the fact that policemen are friends of society.

In the past, policemen were often considered as persons to fear, persons that we should not get in touch with. They were not considered as friends. They were considered as people who had the authority to punish. It was in some ways the mentality that prevailed among the population. Fortunately, that mentality has changed. More and more the youth consider policemen as persons that should be

respected because they wield authority. They have the authority, they have been given a mandate to make people respect the laws adopted by parliaments. Therefore, policemen do not simply have the mission to punish; they also have the mission to enforce the law and protect the life and the property of individuals. The greatest proof of that is that when our rights are threatened by bandits, we call on policemen. When we are threatened by people who do not respect the rights and the property of others, we once again call on the police for protection.

If we ask for their protection, we parliamentarians have the obligation to ensure the protection of policemen as well, to place in their hands the weapons to accomplish their mission, and I am not talking about a gun or a revolver because we all know that this is necessary, but I want to say that policemen should be ensured by society that if they lose their life in the course of their duties against those who do not want to obey the law, an example would be made for the benefit of others who would be tempted to do the same. Murderers must be punished. This is what Criminal Code section 214 provides. And this is why I have no hesitation in supporting motion No. 13 because it aims at maintaining in our statutes some protection for our policemen, prison guards, all those employees who work in prisons, who are responsible for guarding and controlling prisoners, so that they may have the required protection, just like we now require on building sites that contractors take all the necessary precautions to prevent accidents to their workers. For instance, wearing a hard hat, using a cable when a roof is too steep, wearing a safety belt, all of which aim at protecting the life of workers. Therefore, the employees who work in prison or the policemen who work on the road are entitled to the same protection.

However, I believe that the question we must consider during the study of this bill is why are we now living in a violent society and why are many individuals now thinking that they must make their own justice. We hear this often nowadays. We say it, we hear it, but there is no order anymore. We are living in a violent society. We are never sure when we go out to the grocery store if we shall come back alive. Therefore, people think of making their own justice.

● (1630)

This is not a healthy society: indeed, the society is ill: it is a society in which there is violence. What are the causes? I think that television, movies and theatres are the main causes of violence. Violence does not exist only in Canada, it exists also elsewhere. But it is also where there is television, movies and theatres where so many things incite to violence.

It is deplorable to find that in Canada, our children are being shown violent films for hours at a time, and that happens every day. They are taught violence, the use of firearms, how to attack people, how to make a hold up, all kinds of violent ways. And our young people are looking at these for hours, and then, in their mind projects develop, so that at a given moment, faced with an economic situation rather difficult in the family, some young people will consider using these means, these weapons, they will take violent action to get a few dollars to do what they please. That is called teaching crime. People were shocked in old times when the Romans made a show of death in the eyes of the public. People were shocked by that and we are also shocked when we read about it. That was done in the arena, just like cock-fighting today. In the end, one of them dies.

Today, it is not done on the stage, it is not done in the same fashion, but through images. Our children are given to see on television all kinds of films inviting to violence and after that we are suprised and wonder what is happening. Young people no longer want to abide by the law, their ideas are different from those of adults and they often cause serious problems in society. If we were in their place, we would perhaps do worse than them, because I think if we had to live in the same atmosphere and had been shown the same things in our young age, we would be even worse. They are not to be blamed; instead we should blame the adults who are responsible for seeing to it that the films shown on television and in cinemas really encourage respect for life, respect for human beings. Those children could still be entertained and shown excellent material, and they would be only too happy to get an education that instills respect for life, for other people's property, and teaches them to use their energy in wholesome entertainment while respecting peace and order.

Mr. Speaker, the League of Human Rights, which puts out a bulletin from which I have an excerpt here that I would like to quote you, is entirely of that opinion. I should like to quote you paragraph 3, on page 6, which says:

> The information given by the press with regard to crime, especially as exploited by some groups . . . is dealt with in such a way as to spread a collective psychosis of dangerous crime and give the wrong impression.

To my mind, there is truly food for thought in that paragraph. To go back to the quotation:

> Contrary to what is being done in other fields, the press is quite content to focus the attention of the public on the most negative aspects, without analyzing them as they often should, while overlooking the positive information related, among other things, to the methods of rehabilitation.

So the negative aspects are exploited with great delight because that is profitable and sensational. But we fail to show the positive side. I continue to quote:

> We think the press could help the population give criminality its proper dimensions if certain efforts were made in this direction.

Parliament and parliamentarians are responsible for passing legislation so that news media are forced to show the good side of things, to give positive information. We should stop going from one sensational piece of information to another to increase sales or the interest which can induce people to go and see things they own in order to get rich with these businesses.

On clause 4—The rate of violence in the programs of our television and cinema networks is obviously the reflection of a society which consumes violence excessively, without measuring the impact of this consumption on the making of criminality.

We really get down to rock bottom when expressing ourselves this way. One wonders about the following question:

Should not we directly face that matter?

So they suggest:

Governments, in cooperation with all competent and concerned associations, should establish school and adult education programs which

would make people ponder over the crime phenomenon and which would be basically oriented towards prevention, information and education.

We especially appeal to teachers and parents for their commitment to fight against the initiation to violence which dominates our society, in all kinds of areas and forms, from the most evident to the slyest.

We believe, among other things, that one of the best means to fight destructive violence is the initiation to positive forms of respect for life, which can be found massively and constantly in the various functions inherent in education.

Whatever measures are taken to fight murder and the most dangerous forms of crime directly, they may prove useless if there is not in Quebec and across Canada a systematic and general effort by the public to substitute patterns of human development for the countless violent patterns generated by our society. There again, we think that the most powerful weapons will come from our investing into social values, to really ensure respect for life and the emphasis of what is positive and beautiful in the development of human beings. What good is it to develop all those communication and information techniques if we cannot use them primarily to propagate life?

This was published by the Human Rights Association which sent us this announcement out of which I have quoted a few passages which I heartily support because I think this association is working for human rights and that it was duty bound to make its position known on such an important bill.

I said earlier that the economic causes must also be eliminated. I am not the only one to think so, for I believe that those who really think about it are convinced that certain economic causes also lead to violence, crime, and sometimes to revenge or to the temptation to take the lives of those who stand in our way. One can see the turn of mind of such people.

The Chief Justice of the Ontario Supreme Court stated, and I quote:

Canada will begin to control crime only by eliminating the economic needs which, in my opinion, prompt thousands of Canadians to break the law.

Therefore, I think that being a judge, he was able to size all the accused who appeared before him, in order to keep an open mind and to determine why such or such accused appeared before the court. And as a judge, he had to hear the evidence to be able to make a sound judgement.

● (1640)

Then, Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that policemen have been murdered recently in the province of New Brunswick, that they were inflicted atrocious pains before being slain. Everybody was shocked by such atrocities and following these unfortunate events, policemen from everywhere in Canada got together to ask once more for the retention of capital punishment. All those people cannot be wrong at the same time.

There must certainly be good reasons prompting them to ask parliamentarians to retain capital punishment. That does not necessarily mean hanging. We could use hanging of course but we can take any kind of capital punishment, the most humane so as to respect the concept of the importance of human life and whenever an execution is to be carried out, it should be done as humanely as possible.

I think it must be considered. We shall also recall that last spring, in the Quebec City area, a policeman was killed in cold blood in the course of his duties and here I wish to quote from an article in the newspaper *La Presse* of Montreal, of March 3, 1976 entitled:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND THE PRINCIPLE OF LIFE

I wish to quote this article, Mr. Speaker, as I think it is time that as parliamentarians we take into consideration representations made by those who are responsible for protecting the life and property of Canada. I quote:

Some 2,000 policemen gathered in Quebec City after the funeral of one of their colleagues were unanimous. When one of their leaders, the director of the Quebec City section of the provincial policemen association said: "The abolition of capital punishment, never.", the policemen rose to applaud. And we can easily understand them.

They had come from several areas of the country to express their sorrow after the death of constable Michel Bédard. He died because of his faithfulness to his duties. A criminal, miserable as every criminal, killed him in his escape. This act is so disgusting that it creates revolt and passion. First the policemen offered their sympathy to the close relatives of the deceased at a touching ceremony. Then they got together. And briefly they enounced the principle that should protect them against the madness of killers: "Abolition of capital punishment, never!" We can understand, but are they right?

Mr. Speaker, I will not read this very interesting article in its totality, but once again parliamentarians are asked to do their duty to ensure those people full protection. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I realize that the clock runs very fast, I wish to quote two extracts from a booklet published by the Solicitor General of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. To do so, the hon. member will need unanimous consent as his allotted time is now expired. Has the hon. member unanimous consent to complete his comments?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I thank my English and French-speaking colleagues of the Parliament of Canada for their kindness. As I said, I wish to quote from a booklet published by the Solicitor General of Canada (Mr. Allmand), in which he says the following in paragraph 6:

6. THE POOR AND MINORITY GROUPS. When capital punishment was in force, it was mostly applied to the poor, non-educated people, minority groups and immigrants. The rich who could afford the best lawyers and were influent had strong chances of being acquitted or getting a reduced sentence.

I know the Solicitor General has much more experience than I do in this area. But when I read that statement, I had doubts about our courts. I often heard people say: There are two justices—one for the rich and one for the poor. But I did not believe that a Crown minister could state it so clearly. Then, in that case, it is again our duty as parliamentarians to see that our laws are the best possible, that they are applied in the fairest way and above all, that judges who are appointed are really qualified, and not selected on the basis of some political patronage but following the recommendation of the Bar because of their knowledge, their occupation, which is really that of protectors of the law and not because of political services rendered.

Mr. Speaker, I would not like to give the impression of accusing judges in any part of Canada or of the province of Quebec, but I wish to take this opportunity to emphasize

that if it is true that the poor have fewer chances than the rich to gain justice before the courts, this demonstrates that society is sicker than I thought, and I wish we did our best to take as many steps as possible to put it back in shape at all levels; not only as regards the poor but as regards the rich as well. And if it is true that justice can be influenced to that extent, it becomes outrageous and this is why it is called a society of violence.

We must really ensure that any segment of society, no matter its financial position, when it is faced to courts, be confident before those courts to obtain justice, whether they can or not pay the high price. Again, I hope we will seriously consider this point and that sooner or later the Solicitor General of Canada will be able to introduce amendments to ensure the best protection possible to all citizens as regards law enforcement, when this law must be adhered to by the courts, when someone has been convicted before society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again as for the help of all my colleagues in Parliament: For God's sake, tonight will see again the end of a memorable day. An extremely serious vote will take place. I, for one, do not take things lightly because tomorrow and in the days and years to come, everything will depend upon the action we will take tonight. I have no judgment to make about any of my colleagues, be they in favour of or against capital punishment. It is a personal matter, but I think, as the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) said a moment ago, that not only we have the right to vote according to our own conscience but it is our duty to vote according to the people's will.

[*English*]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you I will be brief, but I should like to put on the record a few thoughts about this amendment. I, like the hon. member for Comox Alberni (Mr. Anderson), do not particularly like this amendment. I am in favour of the retention of capital punishment for premeditated murder and I believe policemen and prison guards need protection. However, I also believe that housewives, children and everyone else in our society need the protection afforded by capital punishment. Having said that I do not like the amendment, I want to assure the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) that I am going to support it since it is perhaps better than complete abolition. It is better to retain the death penalty for the murderers of policemen and prison guards than abolish it.

I also commend the 38 members of the government party who supported retention on second reading of the bill. I urge those 38 once again to give some thought to supporting this amendment. Even though it is not a good amendment, it is better than complete abolition. It reinstates the situation in which we are today, the five-year trial period. It will be up in December of 1977, at which time we can again make a decision when we have studied the results of the trial periods which existed from 1967 to 1972 and from 1972 to 1976.

Many members have said that this is a vote according to conscience and therefore it should be a free vote. As I said a minute ago, I admire the 38 members on the government side who voted against this bill on second reading. I think it was a free vote for them, but surely the cabinet's and the parliamentary secretaries' votes do not suggest that they were allowed the same freedom given to the backbenchers in that party. Many members have quoted Burke in saying that they have the right to lead their constituents. In 1794 Burke, in a speech made in Bristol, England, said:

● (1650)

Your representative does not use his industry only but his judgment and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

It has not generally been realized that Burke lost the election in 1794. I should like to point out that many hon. members may well lose the next election if they do not pay attention to the wishes of their constituents.

Mr. Railton: That would not stop us. I would hate to think that you are taking that position so that you can be re-elected.

Mr. Horner: No, but I sincerely believe I am in step with my constituents and that a member of parliament must represent his constituents. There may be times when one does not agree with one's constituents, but one has to represent them. I believe that in supporting this amendment we will help make Canada a better place in which to live. That is really why I ran for office, and I hope the hon. member ran for office for the same reason, in an attempt to make this country a better place in which to live. He suggests to me that he is working at it, but he is not doing so when he votes in the manner in which he did on this piece of legislation. The hon. member for Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) made a few interjections in the debate this afternoon. He is in trouble in this riding because his riding is mostly retentionist.

An hon. Member: How do you know?

Mr. Horner: I have many friends in Mississauga.

Mr. Whelan: The Ontario attorney general is in that riding, Mr. McMurtry, and he is a Conservative.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to intervene, but I think the hon. member has been concentrating, since the beginning of his remarks, on passing judgment or reflecting on hon. members, which is not permissible under Standing Order 35. Besides that, I must say that his remarks have not been relevant to the subject matter before us at this time. He should address himself to the amendment or to the bill.

Mr. Horner: I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for coming to my defence. These members were heckling, interrupting and distracting me from the convincing argument that I intend to put forward.

Many hon. members have suggested throughout the debate that capital punishment is not a deterrent. Surely, if 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the people in a country believe that it is a deterrent, then in fact it is a deterrent for those people. To say that it has not been proven conclusively that it is a deterrent is nonsense, because it cannot be proven conclusively either way. Some hon. members have suggested this afternoon that policemen and prison guards, because of fear for their lives, might shoot first and ask questions later. It would be wrong, in my opinion, to create a society which encourages that thought. I urge all

hon. members who sincerely believe in abolition to think about the society they may well be creating.

When asked a question in committee about what will happen if prison guards do not approve what he is doing, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) said that they can quit, he will hire new ones. That is not a very responsible attitude for the minister to take. He is forcing his wishes on people who serve him and in my view that is not a responsible attitude to take. Policemen's associations have spoken out quite clearly in favour of retention of capital punishment for their protection. They believe it is a deterrent. Now we hear of policemen's wives associations being organized. They urge the government to retain capital punishment for the protection of their husbands. They also believe that capital punishment is a deterrent. Surely this minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) cannot turn a deaf ear to public opinion.

This summer many hon. members will be going back to their constituents, I hope very soon.

Mr. Whelan: So do I.

Mr. Horner: They will be listening to their constituents who believe that capital punishment is a deterrent. Their constituents will say to them, "You people in Ottawa don't care what we think". I have often regretted the poor name that politicians have in this country, because I think most members here attempt to serve their country and their constituents in an honourable way, but this governemnt has neglected the wishes of the people and thus are harming all politicians.

In 1967 we went into a trial period during which the killing of a policeman or prison guard called for punishment by death. We were told that that trial period was not conclusive and in 1972 it was extended for another five years. However, the cabinet jumped the gun on this latest five-year trial period and reached a conclusion. Did they reach it by way of logic, by looking at the facts or by looking at statistics? No, they reached the conclusion because the Solicitor General said he could not enforce the act, and so long as he was Solicitor General nobody would hang. He disobeyed the will of parliament. I like the Solicitor General, he is a fine man, but he is in the wrong job. If he cannot do it, let him switch places with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) or somebody who can do it. I know that basically the Minister of Agriculture is a retentionist, but because he is in the cabinet he has to go along with them.

Mr. Whelan: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that a long time before I became a member of this cabinet I voted as an abolitionist. I ran in four elections as an abolitionist.

● (1700)

I made no secret of what my stand was, and I have been elected to public positions for some 30 years. I have been honest with my constituents in whatever position I ever held.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Horner.]

Mr. Horner: I am glad I gave the minister the chance to put that on the record. We in rural Canada have wondered what made him tick. We are slowly sorting it out.

Mr. Whelan: I said the same thing in Alberta last week.

Mr. Horner: This is a serious matter. I hope we will vote on it tonight and that all hon. members can go home tomorrow. I hope they will not have to come back next week at all. If this amendment is passed tonight, we will be back in the trial period we were in before this bill was introduced, and the government will then have to obey the will of parliament on this issue until December of 1977. Then the government can make a decision, but to make a decision before that time, in my opinion—

Mr. Breau: The House already has.

Mr. Horner: —goes against the wishes of parliament when it accepted the trial period from 1972 to 1977. I urge all hon. members to give this a great deal of thought because the reputation of every politician is at stake. We have to obey the will of the people and, if we do not, we are hardly better than anarchists. I do not want to be a party to that kind of society, so I urge all hon. members to support this amendment.

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the report stage debate on Bill C-84, not to reiterate what my colleagues and I have said with regard to the retention of capital punishment—I think we have stated our case very clearly—but rather as a matter of duty to plead with the government to heed the wishes of the majority of Canadians who have stated that they want the retention of capital punishment.

Can the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) tell this House why the bill must be debated now? Could it not have waited until after the Olympics? I feel the timing is insane. To debate the bill now does nothing but cast a shadow of apprehension over and doubt in the minds of those taking part in the Olympics as well as of those responsible for security at the games.

It appears that the government is strongly in favour of pampering criminals. Surely we must have our priorities confused. What are we doing to protect the citizens of Canada? Precious little, I would say, when we are making it harder for those responsible for maintaining law and order to carry out their duties. What we are doing is suggesting to Canadians that if the government does not invoke strong deterrents which will curb the ever increasing crime rate, the citizens of Canada will have to take the law into their own hands.

I have respect for all my colleagues on all sides of this House. However, I feel that the moral responsibility of hon. members is being overshadowed by their own personal feelings, which should not happen when in each constituency some 20,000 Canadians went to the polls to vote for the man or woman they felt would bring to parliament the opinions of the majority in their constituencies.

Some hon. members argue that this is a free vote which gives them the right to vote as they see fit regardless of the feelings of their constituents. What has happened? Has this session lasted too long? Are some hon. members that out of touch with reality?

To bring us back to reality I would like to read just one letter, out of hundreds I have received, from radio station CJOC in Lethbridge, dated June 28, as follows:

Dear Mr. Hurlburt:

This letter has to do with the capital punishment bill that went through second reading on Wednesday, June 23, 1976.

I decided that it was about time that the Government of Canada knew exactly what the people of Southern Alberta felt about the bill.

On Wednesday, June 23 and Thursday, June 24 I opened the phone lines here at CJOC Radio to find out what the residents of Southern Alberta felt about capital punishment. The phone lines were opened between 1:30 and 5:30 p.m. both said days. The final vote read like this:

FOR capital punishment—384 votes

AGAINST capital punishment—18 votes

I also received some mail after the phone line vote was finished with. Enclosed are the letters I received.

I do hope that this will give you a little more backing in Ottawa knowing that 90% or more of Southern Alberta is right behind you as far as the capital punishment bill is concerned.

Adding the letter vote to the phone vote the final tally reads:

399 for capital punishment

18 against capital punishment

We here in Southern Alberta would appreciate it if you were to show this to either Mr. Trudeau himself, or someone that *might* care.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Lethbridge Broadcasting Limited

I would also like to read a telegram from one of my constituents who happens to be an abolitionist, as follows:

Congratulations on your sturdy stand re law and order. Myself, an abolitionist of capital punishment by ideal, consider abolition presently the wrong measure, at the wrong time, in the wrong way, particularly remembering the coming Olympics. Good luck. G. R. C. Palmer, MD.

Dr. Palmer is from the city of Lethbridge.

For the life of me I cannot understand why the government thinks nothing of spending millions and millions of dollars on study group after study group—even study groups studying study groups—but when it comes to Bill C-84 it completely ignores the requests, wishes, and advice of our police forces across the entire country.

In conclusion, I think it behooves all of us to spend a few minutes reflecting on the wishes of our constituents.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, during the debate on Bill C-84, more precisely on May 11, I mentioned that I did not see any difference between the value of the life of a father or mother, a policeman or a prison guard or a defenceless citizen brutally attacked by bandits who are ever increasing in number. I might add that I have not changed my mind on this matter. However, I find that the motion under discussion is designed to give at least some protection needed by those who are responsible for the protection of society.

I know that policemen are better trained and prepared to defend themselves against bandits; on the other hand, they are much more exposed since their role is to try to arrest various types of criminals. And we notice from many examples that criminals are most of the time well armed and do not hesitate much before shooting down policemen on duty. The registration of their weapons is no problem at all for them. They have their own supply sources that are not subject to red tape which often lack flexibility. In view of the actual situation in general, we should at least give law enforcement officers the assurance that the legislators realize the importance of their role and provide them with enough protection through legislation to cause those who are planning, often long in advance, some acts leading to crime, to think twice.

A release from the Public Service Alliance of Canada, dated June 24, 1976, said the following, and I think a few excerpts from that release would be in order. The executive secretary-treasurer referred to certain matters in the second paragraph of his letter, after making reference to the statement made on June 15, 1976, by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) in his speech in the House of Commons. I remember very well the recent reactions of some members opposite when the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) alluded to the speech of the Prime Minister. And yet, that is exactly what he did say. I have the text of his speech right in fromt of me. I am quoting:

I want to make it very clear that, if a majority of hon. members vote against abolition, some people are going to be hanged. Their death would be a direct consequence of the negative decision made by this House on this bill.

I now shall continue to quote from the letter of the executive secretary to the members of the House of Commons. It reads:

As for us, we appeal to your conscience and we take the opposite view of that expressed by Mr. Trudeau by saying that abolitionist would be responsible for all future murders of penitentiary employees and law enforcement officers, and we swear that each time one of these murders is committed, we shall impute them to all those who have supported the abolition of capital punishment.

Here are a few facts that you should consider in our opinon:

● (1710)

1—The irresponsible attitude of penitentiary commissioners and directors before the pressure groups who visit the institutions;

2—The lack of proper management by the authorities of most penal institutions in the country;

3—The shocking convict classification system which endangers the life of penitentiary employees as well as the life of most convicts who only want to obey the rules they must follow during their prison term;

4—The present lack of facilities to guarantee the protection and safety of the staff against habitual criminals who have nothing to lose because of the 25 years of imprisonment they would have to serve under Bill C-83.

For these reasons, the Hon. Warren Allmand, Solicitor General of Canada, who did not have the courage to reveal these facts to the members of the House of Commons, should, in all conscience, resign his ministerial responsibilities since he has lost the confidence of all penitentiary employees and all law enforcement officers in Canada.

We urge you, in your heart of hearts, to consider the safety of your family and that of penitentiary employees and law enforcement officers while reflecting on these words: "We want everyone to clearly understand that if most members of Parliament vote against the retention of the death penalty, people will be murdered. The death of these people would then be a direct result of the negative decision made by the House of Commons on this bill."

What our society needs is not an attitude of tolerance or permissiveness towards criminals but a return of everyone to spiritual and moral values. Let the murderes particularly return to them. Then, it will be easier to forego the death penalty. In the meantime, however, let there be no question of abolishing the right and the duty, through the civil and judicial authority, to take the lives of those who have too little respect for that of others.

We insist on the retention of capital punishment not in a spirit of revenge but of legal reparation for the greatest of crimes, and also to protect the lives of the people in the interest of the public and of order.

I already pointed out that the method of execution could be changed either for the gas chamber or any other method deemed appropriate. Considering the tremendous increase in the number of crimes of various types and the attitude of our leaders regarding the means available to reduce the number of crimes and allow a greater number of people to earn a decent living, a rather severe sentence must be maintained to give cause for reflection to those who, because of their behaviour, are likely to take the lives of others if they feel they stand in the way of their crimes.

It must be kept in mind that any individual who respects the life of his neighbour will never have to fear the death penalty if it is retained. In the part of the brief from the executive director of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police dealing with the attitude expected from the Solicitor General, the following was mentioned, of which I would like to quote two paragraphs:

> Such a philosophy is of deep concern to us, because even if the period proposed in Bill C-84 remains in effect, it involves a much greater threat and danger for our society, and more particularly the prison guards in our institutions.
>
> In view of that attitude, we submit that the minimum sentence of 25 years, as proposed in Bill C-84, is a flagrant hoax since, to all intents and purposes, a convict will have the right to ask for a remission after his first 15 years in prison.

Recently, I read an article published in Quebec City's *Le Soleil* dated July 4, 1976. Take good note of the title:

> U.S.A. Supreme Court Retains Capital Punishment
>
> No fewer than 582 prisoners on death row, of whom 10 are women, from 30 different states, may be executed as a result of a long awaited decision of the Supreme Court.
>
> By a majority of seven votes to two, the Supreme Court has rejected the request filed by the attorneys of six persons who were condemned to death after having been found guilty of murder in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Georgia and North Carolina.
>
> The attorneys did not deny the convicts' guilt, but they argued that the death penalty was a cruel and unusual punishment and therefore that it was unconstitutional. It was actually a test case for which the League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment tried to stir up public opinion.
>
> Only Justices William Brennan and Thurgood Marshall were in disagreement with their seven other colleagues who rendered their decision after studying the files for three months. In their majority judgment, the justices considered that capital punishment was not unconstitutional.

I am surprised at the attitude of the Canadian abolitionists who usually keep abreast with the situation prevailing south of the border. They will probably answer that capital punishment has been abolished in several states. This parallel shows the necessity of retaining capital punishment considering that the majority of the Supreme Court judges after pondering over what has happened in the states where capital punishment has been abolished, are favourable to its retention in the states where it still exists.

From the strictly religious point of view, with respect to the concern of the accused for his fate in the hereafter, the murderer sentenced to death can always rely on the assistance of a religious adviser. If he wishes to, he can always beg for God's mercy and prepare himself to die. But his victims seldom have had such an opportunity. In concluding, let me quote from an article published in *La Presse* of June 2nd, 1976, and written by Mr. Arthur Piché; I may add that I agree with him.

> Man has a right to life. Fine. But this is not equally true for the honest citizen and the murderer. To suggest the opposite would be denying a social and religious tradition which goes back to a thousand years and which has not yet been proved groundless or unfair even if abuses are unfortunately to be deplored. And when we say that capital punishment is not an effective deterrent against crime, we labour under a delusion.
>
> Like anyone else, criminals fear death. It is evidenced by the fact that in order to protect themselves they carry arms and have often a whole stock of guns hidden somewhere.
>
> And it has not been shown that a greater permissiveness and an absolute respect for the lives of murderers do help in curbing criminal activities. Indications would rather be to the contrary. We should therefore be wary of statistics purporting to show that the fear of death is not a deterrent, and that criminals do not value their own lives. If they do not why are we so concerned about saving them, once they are caught?

I also note that various press articles dealing with the subject illustrate on occasion what is going on. They should be food for thought to those who have the responsibility of deciding, because this is a very serious matter we are now discussing. I have here this other article that appeared in *La Presse* of April 17, 1975. It refers to the increasing rate of crime and the decreasing rate of case solving.

We would like some evidence that the government is making real efforts to try and reduce the crime rate in a way acceptable to the prople, to provide jobs and adequate salaries. But no, such evidence is lacking. In this country, we are living under a system that is totally upside-down. We are struggling between inflation and unemployment crises, without any solution whatsoever. It is that kind of situation that provides the ideal conditions under which discouraged people often feel compelled to do things that sometimes lead them to murder.

Clearly, in that kind of situation, over and above trying to improve the economic situation in Canada in general, and until there are more adequate ways of life, we must try and protect those who are paid to maintain law and order in Canada.

● (1720)

[*English*]

Mr. Sean O'Sullivan (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly in support of the amendment before the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'Sullivan: I take cognizance of the endorsement and appreciation for my position shown by two members of the Liberal party. I hope it is reflected in their votes later this day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: They were only applauding because you said you would speak briefly.

Mr. O'Sullivan: On May 22, 1973, I had to make a speech which, while not brief, was the most difficult I ever had to make. Certainly much preparation, thought and soul searching went into it. That speech dealt, as well, with

capital punishment. As you will recall, Your Honour, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) had brought before the House a bill which would abolish capital punishment except in cases where a policeman or prison guard was the victim of murder. On that occasion I said the following:

> For one thing, the minister—and I would predict, almost all of his cabinet colleagues—are abolitionists. Yet they present us with a bill that provides for the death penalty in the case of murder of a prison guard or law enforcement officer. If that alone is not questionable, surely the hypocrisy of this legislation is clear when the government presents us with a proposal it has no intention of carrying out. If a government is unable, or just plain unwilling to carry out legislation, it insults this House by presenting such legislation . . .
>
> The present government would not enforce the penalty provided for in this legislation for the murder of a policeman or prison guard. To suggest it would do so is preposterous; to incorporate that suggestion into legislation is hypocritical.

I do not quote from my previous speech on this subject made when the Solicitor General brought forward the partial abolition bill because I want to claim credit as a prophet. It did not require powers of prophecy to see through the sham of the legislation he was presenting. I quoted my remarks to show that I understood the real designs of the Solicitor General and the government. Now, before the expiry of that experimental legislation which he claimed was so necessary and of paramount importance to the country, the Solicitor General says to us: "Let's wipe out the experiment. Let us forget what we promised with regard to another five-year period in which we would partially abolish capital punishment except in cases involving the murder of a policeman or prison guard. We are going to call the experiment off, abort the experiment in midstream, so to speak, and end capital punishment in this country." I say that the track record and attitude of the Solicitor General in matters concerning parliamentary democracy can only be viewed with deep regret.

It is interesting to note how government supporters proceeded when this bill was before the committee. When any ordinary piece of legislation is being considered, the members of this House, wishing to represent their constituents in the best way possible and not being experts in all fields, find it necessary to call witnesses to appear before a committee and to testify. Members hear what experts say about the application of this or that legislation. As I say, hon. members do not claim to be experts in highly controversial, difficult, and involved fields. We are a collection of commoners. Yet when this bill went to committee for study, the proposal of those opposing the bill to hear representatives of policemen and prison guards was turned down by the government majority on that committee.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That was a bad thing.

Mr. O'Sullivan: As the House leader of my party says, that was a bad thing. It is apparent that the government is not willing to listen except when it suits its own convenience. We believe that those witnesses should have been called and heard. If anyone has his or her life hanging in the balance on the outcome of this debate and this bill, surely it is the men and women who serve on our peace enforcement forces and as guards in the prisons of this country.

● (1730)

Earlier in the debate, speaking on the amendment of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), I discussed the situation of the Canadian penitentiary system as I found it while studying that system as part of a special subcommittee of this House. Little did I know at the time that support for the assessment which I gave of the prison system in Canada would come from Dr. Ezzat A. Fattah, the great friend of the Solicitor General and this government relating to this peace and security legislation, in particular in its proposals to abolish capital punishment. After bringing in his report he wrote an article for Simon Fraser University weekly publication. I quote from that article:

> It is a barbaric act, an act of unusual cruelty, to put people in cage-like cells for a minimum of 25 years without the faintest hope. Anybody who knows the living conditions in our penitentiaries would agree that this amounts to a slow death one hundred times worse than rapid death by execution. It is simply hypocritical to abolish a cruel, barbaric and savage punishment such as the death penalty while replacing it with another punishment even more cruel and more barbaric.

Dr. Fattah does not agree with the stand that I have taken on capital punishment, and I do not agree with his findings. However, we both agree, he an abolitionist and I a retentionist, on the barbaric cruelty that one finds in the prison system and the suggestion of the Solicitor General that we box people in them without offering them any hope, or any reason for maintaining themselves in a manner which would not endanger the lives of others.

The government decided that we should not hear representations from spokesmen for policemen or prison guards whose lives are on the line. Their own proponent, their own so-called expert advancing the cause of the abolition of the death penalty, says that it is a barbaric act to cage people like this. It will obviously create tensions that will endanger the lives of both inmates and prison guards. Somehow the government does not think we should listen to those representations or that side of the story.

I do not look down on public opinion. There seems to be an undercurrent of argument put forward by some in this House that members of parliament who support the maintenance of a strong law and order system through the retention of capital punishment are somehow capitulating to the forces of public pressure.

At no time have I ever suggested that anyone should support capital punishment only on the basis of what his or her constituents suggest should be done. At the same time, however, the same members of parliament who at election time return to their constituents with plaudits and praise for the good common sense of the people, asking for their trust and seeking their support, are not in a position to turn around and say that we who have been sent here by them somehow have a greater wisdom, a more developed social conscience that permits us to block out representations we receive from constituents. That is folly. It undermines democracy.

We serve our constituents best when we do what we believe to be in their best interests, when we do what we believe to be right, and when we do what we believe will bring the maximum possible good to the maximum number of people. However, in our search for putting forward

legislation which reaches that goal, we dare not ignore that same good common sense that we appeal to at election time and perhaps give lip service to all too often.

I accept personal responsibility for the decision I have made in this very difficult debate. When the Solicitor General first introduced his bill in 1973 I said that I had never faced a more difficult decision during my lifetime. I could not conceive of a more difficult decision to make. Nothing has happened in those intervening years to change my mind. It is the most difficult decision that any man or woman could be asked to reach.

I suggest to all hon. members that in reaching such a decision we should not ignore the counsel of the constituents we are honoured to represent. I do not suggest for a moment that it is always possible to say at any given point what the majority wants. That is a subjective thing. However, any member who returns to his constituency as frequently as he should, maintains contact with his constituency, reads his mail and stays in touch with his people, surely knows what that same good common sense is telling him.

When it comes time to consider the most important legislation that perhaps any of us will have to debate at any time, we should listen in open forum to the submissions of those who perhaps have additional insight into the problems of criminology. They spend their lives day in and day out treating both the victims of crime and those who have committed crime to ensure that justice is done and the security of our nation is upheld.

I want to bring to the attention of this House the submission of the Police Association of Metro Toronto. At page 22 of their brief they speak about the situation that would arise if you placed a man into a penitentiary without any hope of getting out. It is along the same lines as suggested by Dr. Fattah. I quote:

> When the only hope becomes one of escape or when additional crimes do not bring about additional penalties, then the lives of prison guards and prison officials and other prisoners will be placed in jeopardy by those who have "nothing to lose".

That is exactly the situation that will develop. According to the Solicitor General we are going to make sure that those people who, in full possession of their mental and physical capabilities commit premeditated cold blooded murder, will be sentenced to first degree murder and the penalty that they pay will be severe. I agree that it will be severe. I do not agree that it will be effective. It will place in further jeopardy some innocent lives. I refer in particular to the lives of prison guards who live in the pressure cookers we call federal institutions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'Sullivan: Tonight we shall be voting, as agreed upon by the House, on a series of amendments. It has been suggested that we should not prolong the debate. In fact it has been suggested that representatives of the official opposition are involved in some kind of conspiracy to filibuster. I am glad that at least one member of the government found it possible for him to break the eerie silence on the other side of the Chamber and entered into the debate earlier this week.

[Mr. O'Sullivan.]

● (1740)

I would draw attention to the fact that if we had proceeded as quickly as the Solicitor General and some of his colleagues had wished, the amendment in the name of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), which the minister is now accepting, would not have been written into the bill. So I would suggest there is great benefit in declining to deal with this controversial and difficult legislation to suit the timetable of some hon. members. Consideration of the value of human life cannot be carried out on the basis of a timetable; there is no reason for trying to speed up debate on the many issues involved in this important measure. Rather, every member has an obligation to his own conscience, if that is the basis upon which he is deciding what his view should be, out of respect for the constituents he represents and the need to protect the lives of innocent Canadian people. Every member has a responsibility to consider as judiciously as he can each amendment, each clause of the legislation, and assess the consequences which would follow from the decisions we take here.

The lives of policemen and prison guards are on the line every day. I should like to see capital punishment enforced across the board for first degree murder. But I realize what happened not so long in this Chamber when we voted on second reading, and I understand that a vote on third reading might very well go the same way, though perhaps by a slimmer margin. I want to ensure that prison guards and police officers who daily face exceptional danger receive the protection which we owe to them. To those who are the champions of decisions according to conscience, I say that this, too, is a matter for the conscience of the House.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to intervene at this point in the debate and address myself to the amendment which is before us, namely, the amendment designed to continue to protect those upon whom we rely whenever our society, or safety, or integrity is threatened by subversive elements from within.

We as a society have the right to establish borders and perimeters in a geographical sense, in the moral sense, and in an ideological sense. Between ourselves and subversive elements we place people who protect us against intruders, against those who threaten to destroy us, disturb our ideological integrity or offend our moral values.

I said in the debate on second reading that I found it exceedingly difficult, as did many of my constituents, to put into context this willingness to abolish capital punishment and the protection which goes with capital punishment while spending up to a billion dollars annually to enable our armed forces to protect us against intruders from outside our borders. We have the right to protect ourselves and sometimes those arms destroy innocent lives, though quite often the intrusion, or the offence, is not against life in our country but against our moral or ideological guidelines.

As long as a threat exists from the outside it is accepted throughout the global community that we have a right to protect ourselves, a right to gear up industry to produce tools of aggression and tools of defence—tools to take lives.

Why is it then that within our society we seem willing to ignore the fact that there is a threat to the established norm? We seem content to ignore the fact that there are people within our society who cannot live in accordance with those norms and who challenge the system we have created for ourselves, the system which has evolved.

I also find it difficult to understand what is happening in the global community. Looking back on the wars, of 200, 300 or 400 years ago and comparing them with the wars of today with all the sophisticated weaponry and tools of destruction we have spread throughout the world, it seems to me that as we have evolved as a global community we have designed tools of destruction more sophisticated and deadly than any formerly used, weapons which can kill 100,000 people at one time. And then, because no one actually chops off a man's head—someone sits in an aeroplane and discharges a bomb and by the time it hits he is far away—nobody seems to worry too much about it. The same is true in a different area.

I cannot put into context the ideas of those of my colleagues who favour abolition. Many of my colleagues are in favour of abolition of capital punishment, yet when they talk about the other great emotional issue, that of abortion, their views seem to be directly opposed to any one might expect—one of the hon. members from the Social Credit party has touched on this point today. He found it difficult to understand why it would be that a person who is so determined to preserve life at all costs, even at the cost of innocent life, would also at the same time be prepared to destroy life that has not even had a chance yet to commit any act.

● (1750)

I make this comparison between those who design these tools of aggression and tools of destruction because they are meant to destroy something we do not really see. The doctor makes an intrusion in a private room or an operating room in the hospital. He reaches in some place with a tool, and it all ends up in a garbage can. Just because we do not see what is being done we do not really have to worry about it. It does not offend us any longer. Yes, there were some pictures published of a garbage can in a hospital in Winnipeg containing the bodies of these human babies, three of them wriggling around as captured by the cameraman. That offended us because that was not very nice. It offended our charitable instincts as it appeared in the newspapers, but it was soon forgotten.

What makes these people tick? What makes them think? We have a right and a responsibility, if we are successfully to perpetuate and preserve what we have achieved in a human and responsible way through a voluntary process in the global community of society. We must have the fortitude to accept the responsibility of recognizing and identifying those who have become subversive, and we must act in a way similar to the way we act in respect of cancer in the human body. We must identify the sickness, and we have the responsibility to find cures. We must work hard and diligently to learn and understand more about the human mind.

When we have identified one of these cancers as incurable, after we have gone through the process of examining all the possible cures, all the possible methods of leniency and mercy and there is no recommendation from any source, and no hope that there is any cure for this particular cancer, then we have the responsibility to remove that cancer from the otherwise healthy body. We must protect the healthy body from the spread of this cancer. This is not something new. It has always been that way. This is part of life, part of our system, and part of the burden that those who have elected us have placed on our shoulders. They have the right to protection, the right to security, the right to enjoy the fruits of their labours, the freedoms of our system, and the sanctuary of their homes. They have the right to feel free, with the security to send their children out on the streets at night.

When this feeling of security erodes, as it has in recent years in our country, our whole society is threatened. We place between ourselves and those who threaten our system from within, people who are paid and equipped to protect us against those who perpetrate crimes against us. As we are confronted by the criminal element in our homes and on the streets we do not take direct action. As a matter of fact it is illegal to take direct action. Even though we do as citizens of Canada have the right to arm ourselves under proper licensing provisions, we do not have the right to take another life. We do have the responsibility to call on the law enforcement agencies to take over from us.

Sometimes we are partially to blame because we have put ourselves into a position that creates the difficulty we face. Then we find ourselves confronted by the criminal element and looking down the barrel of a gun. Perhaps we have left the home unlocked, or maybe we have left some material thing lying around that attracted the eye of the criminal. Perhaps we have offended the criminal and he is seeking revenge. When this does happen we get to the telephone and ask someone to intervene on our behalf. Inevitably a member of the law enforcement agency will come and take over the problem, putting himself between the criminal and us.

A policeman is a public servant and has accepted his responsibility voluntarily. In this country we have people who are members of the armed forces. These people like to think they are providing a service, doing something very special in the carrying out of their duties. The very special thing they are doing is protecting society, protecting the achievements of society, and preserving our moral values against offenders.

In return we have the responsibility to protect those people because we lay down specific guidelines on how they shall conduct themselves in their jobs. We tell them when we give them a pistol or a rifle to be very cautious in the use of that weapon. As a matter of fact when a criminal is confronted and is killed in an attempt to escape, we have a very rigorous procedure through which the policeman is put. He must defend his action in taking the life of another.

As we now renege on this responsibility to protect those we ask to intervene on our behalf, I wonder how they will react. I wonder what will happen after the death penalty is abolished. I can imagine myself being in a back alley some place attempting to arrest a criminal, starting the judicial process, then appearing as a witness in court, with the result that the individual is condemned to 25 years, five years or ten years in prison. I wonder what I might be

thinking because I would have to look ahead and consider my wife, my children, and my position in the community. I would wonder if I might have to confront the same prisoner again in some back alley. I wonder if I would not be tempted to pull the trigger, knowing the ineptness of the judicial process. I might wonder about the final result of my labour, particularly if I had made many arrests. May I call it six o'clock?

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

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, before we allowed ourselves a short recess for dinner I was recounting the difficulty that I have in equating our approach to protecting ourselves against subversive elements from beyond our borders with the apparent failure to recognize the necessity for protecting our society from simmering elements within our borders.

The motion we are debating tonight deals with the retention of capital punishment for certain forms of murder, namely, the murder of prison guards or police or law enforcement officers. I would like to extend this provision to include at least the crime of treason. We spend millions of dollars on arming a very efficient force, as our Canadian armed forces are recognized to be throughout the global community wherever we have a military presence. I have been unable to reconcile why it is that we maintain this kind of safeguard for the protection of our society and, at the same time, make it possible for people to take out visitors' visas, come to Canada and perhaps assassinate our Prime Minister, or our provincial premiers, members of parliament, or other officials.

In other words, such people could come to this country on visitors' visas and take over. If my colleagues in the House of Commons see fit to pass this bill, and if we are able to catch these people, the worst punishment we can give them is to lock them up for 25 years. I should like to know who would be doing the locking up. There are no restrictions on the class of person who can travel to this country and we would have no protection against their activities unless it is to have our law enforcement officers shoot them down on the street.

I am sure that none of my colleagues in this House are naive enough to believe that the government is serious about maintaining in perpetuity a provision in the Criminal Code that incarcerates persons convicted of first degree murder for 25 years. This would indeed be a cruel and unusual punishment, particularly when compared with the punishment given in other countries. I think such a punishment would be more severe than the punishment meted out even by a country such as Russia to balance the ledger of people who attack their system.

In its recent report the Law Reform Commission suggested that we should find ways in which criminals can make restitution and pay for damage done to the victims of their crimes. That is part of the Russian system. It is argued that this is a more humane system than the one we use. Surely no one is naive enough not to believe that after one, two, or at the most three years the government would once again come to the House of Commons and say, "Look, we have had a couple of suicides in prison, we just cannot maintain this kind of inhumane approach on our law books; we will have to go back to the good old days when a person convicted of a major crime can be back out on the street after 7 or 10 years".

The law enforcement officers who protect us against criminals in our society are human too. The average policeman in this country is willing to step between us and the criminal. He is willing to accept his job and the danger that goes with it. But he also wants some protection. He wants some respect for what he is doing, and he wants some recognition. If this bill passes and these amendments are not considered favourably by our colleagues—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

● (2010)

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy extended by my colleagues. It comes as no surprise to me, or to any of us, that many people who are members of our renowned police force should want to leave the force if this kind of approach by parliament were to have a deteriorating effect on the morale of those on whom we call to protect us against subversive elements. They might also act differently in dangerous circumstances.

On the one hand they might use the tools which we give them to carry out the job more effectively; in other words they might point the gun a little lower, they might not fire that warning shot but, looking down the gun barrel themselves, they might point the gun at the person who is pointing the gun at them. On the other hand they might not respond as readily to the call of duty and might avoid future dangerous situations in which they might be placed. Of course it would be no surprise to anyone that the effect would be that citizens in our country would have to take the law into their own hands. We have already experienced that when we went out to dialogue with our constituents on the other portion of the peace and security package, that is, Bill C-83. I know that most of my colleagues have had similar reactions, perhaps not in the larger centres in our country, but in the frontier and the more remote areas of the country the reaction is loud and clear.

People are not altogether as enchanted with the permissive society as we seem to think they are here in Ottawa. They have this feeling of fear, the feeling that they might have to take the law into their own hands as they used to when the more remote areas of our country were being developed and when pioneers had to defend themselves against nature and intruders. That is the very real feeling I experienced when dialoguing with the people I represent. They have experienced this feeling of insecurity, of having to call on the law enforcement agency to protect them

against delinquent juveniles, for instance, and have found that our law does not have the teeth it should have to react to the kind of situation that we have imposed on our system as the result of the permissive society.

I should like to touch briefly on the climate which may exist inside our prisons as a result of the abolition of capital punishment and if the amendment, which would at least protect prison guards and policemen, is not passed tonight. Already we have news of the massive resignations of prison guards who guard some of the institutions in the province of Quebec.

Inside our prisons there will be a massive deterioration in morale and a brand new approach will have to be adopted. We will have to train a new generation of prison officials and we will have to find new ways of handling this new phenomenon. As is the case in countries where capital punishment is no longer in existence, some prison guards will make an unholy alliance with some of the dangerous criminals inside prison to avail themselves of their protection against others. The situation will be very serious. The only person who would really be safe inside the prison will be the prisoner himself.

The Solicitor General has brought before parliament measures to create new facilities for maximum security institutions which are now outmoded and outdated. Certainly the institutions which we need today to isolate criminals from our society are not adequate, never mind the situation that will exist after we bring in this new stage of permissiveness into our system. I fear that it will be indeed a cruel and unusual punishment for a person to join the public service in the service of prison administration because he or she will really be in danger if this amendment is rejected today.

Since I do not wish to abuse the privilege that has been extended to me by yourself and my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude by expressing my concern about the fact that some of our colleagues who favour abolition of capital punishment have attacked those of us who have spoken in favour of retention as appearing to be barbarians. I have not been present during all the debate but I believe that none of my colleagues who have spoken here are really barbarians. Each one of us would much rather have afforded himself the luxury of total abolition if indeed we could offer the people whom we represent some hope of not being afraid to send our children out into the streets after dark, some hope that there is some way of dealing effectively with the criminal element or with the professional killer. None of them are advocating that we should broaden the imposition of capital punishment to persons convicted of first degree murder or premeditated murder.

Most speakers who have expressed their views in support of retention have said they would be happy if the existing law were permanently enshrined. I would like to see the present law extended in the case of treason and one or two other crimes. That is why it is so important that hon. members should support the amendment that capital punishment be retained for the murder of prison guards and policemen. It is the minimum we can settle for now.

If we look at the statistics since capital punishment was suspended in Canada, because it has not been effectively administered since 1961 when the last person was hanged, we find that 18 people should have been hanged, but none has been. Again, let us try to equate that number with the hundreds of people who have been murdered by criminals who have committed a second offence, or by people who have been found guilty of crimes of a lesser degree. When the Solicitor General tells us that we might be making a mistake, we might be hanging the wrong person, let him remember that there is only one chance in a million of this, but it is quite obvious from the statistics that there is a very good chance that one person in three who has been convicted of a capital crime and incarcerated for a limited period of time will go out and do it again, if he has not already done it within the prison.

● (2020)

I appeal to my hon. friends in the House here tonight seriously to consider supporting this very essential and important amendment and to give some protection for a further period of time to those upon whom we call when we find ourselves in difficulty and when we find ourselves confronted by the criminal element, by the organized criminal, by the paid criminal, and by the criminal who shows wanton disregard for any moral or human standards within our society. We should show some concern and commit ourselves to standing behind them when they carry out their duties, and when they often act beyond the call of duty to intervene on our behalf against these elements. We owe it to them because otherwise we cannot expect them to do their work as effectively and as efficiently as we have become accustomed to expect of them up to this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, consideration of amendments to the bill before the House leads us to serious thinking, since we should ask ourselves a good question: how is it that we have reached such an impasse and that Parliament finds it so very difficult to get out of it. The vote of principle taken at the second reading stage of the bill on June 22 last, is a good illustration of this impasse, in the sense that we realized that the House was divided almost exactly in two sections. But, when considering the reasons that have caused a faction of the House to vote in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, we find that the stakes have been altered.

The reason why these stakes have been altered are irrelevant to the basic principles involved when we are discussing whether or not to abolish capital punishment. I say they are independent from the only reasons that should concern us since they are the exclusive result of one man's ambitions and ideology, and that man happens to be the Prime Minister of Canada. As the leader of our party (Mr. Caouette) said this afternoon when he had the opportunity to take part in this debate, we can ask ourselves: who requested the abolition of the death penalty, how is it that while 90 per cent of Canadians openly support the retention of capital punishment, its abolition is being proposed?

Some hon. Members: That is not true!

Mr. Matte: Members opposite are shouting: that is not true. I challenge the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) to make a double investigation in his constituency

and mine; I am sure that both in his constituency of Lapointe and in mine of Champlain 95 per cent of the people, and I am prepared to bet on this, are in favour of the retention of capital punishment.

An hon. Member: That is true!

Mr. Matte: So, Mr. Speaker, when we are faced—

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

I say to my hon. friend that I advised my constituents, all 17,000 of them, that I shall vote for abolition, and I received three replies.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that the people of Lapointe will answer him only when the next election comes.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest to both hon. members that they are getting into a point of debate, and I suggest that the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) get back to motion No. 13.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: As someone already pointed out, and as the hon. member from the government side said, the Social Credit Party members are like dandelions: the more you cut them, the more they grow. Let there be no illusions on that score.

So, Mr. Speaker, to get back to my point, the vast majority of the Canadian people are in favour of keeping the death penalty, that is, they simply want present laws to apply. That is all the people want. So, how is it that we are being presented with bills no one wants, or only a minute part of the population wants, while overlooking the real problems and the solutions for which the people are clamoring? Those bills are being put through.

To wit, for several years now, and especially since the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has come to power as leader of this country, it has been noticed that we have been chasing things that no one wanted, all the while wasting time as we have now been for weeks, if not months, in this House. Why? Because one day we had a Prime Minister who made up his mind that, if he became Prime Minister, the first thing he would do would be to abolish capital punishment. Second, he would repatriate the Constitution. Third—and it has already been done—he would permit abortion and legalize homosexuality. In addition, at one time he even spoke of legalizing some drugs such as marihuana.

When a man is the leader of a country and he has such ideas and thinks that he must absolutely implement them, we come to the dead-end we have now, since we simply cannot go against the people's will expressing itself as clearly, as plainly as in the present circumstances. Moreover, what should we do about this problem of capital punishment? It is still an individual and personal problem of conscience for each hon. member in the House. It amounts to changing the very rules of democracy, since you have the choice of two things:

• (2030)

Either each one of us is here to promote his own little pride or to represent people who want laws pursuant to their principles and ideologies. We have the choice of two things: Either we are democratic representatives or we are not. To my mind, every member prides himself on being democratic. The dictates of my conscience are that even if I were in favour of the abolition of the death penalty, I do have responsibilities to fulfill here because I must reflect the opinion of the majority of the 70,000 people of my riding whom I represent.

I do not think for a moment that it reaches on the borders of my conscience to vote for maintaining the death penalty because, Mr. Speaker, if we want to discuss that point on a philosophical basis, I will not decide, by my vote, to maintain the death penalty or to hang the murderer of John, Jim or Joe. No, Mr. Speaker, it is the murderer himself who decides because he knows that the death penalty will be enforced from now on. The man who commits a reprehensible act knows quite well that his act will bring about the death penalty. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the member for Champlain or his colleagues from the Social Credit Party of Canada or his other colleagues who will decide that that man should be hanged because he will decide by himself. Mr. Speaker, we are defending the principles of individual liberty; consequently, we should give his way to the man who decides so clearly and precisely that he absolutely wants to climb up the gallows.

This may sound like those words of revenge we often hear. Mr. Speaker, if we consider the situation as it is now, we are obliged to recognize that we have had a try with abolition. The law has not been enforced for so many years that we are now able, after a whole decade, to analyze and to come to the necessary conclusions. Consequently, we can say that we have had a try with the abolition of the death penalty. We know the results. I shall not put forward again all the statistics on this matter as we know them fairly well.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Prime Minister who, somewhere in his mind, feels obliged to go to posterity as the one who will have abolished the death penalty, as the one who will have repatriated the constitution from London. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that we will come to that end. Many of my colleagues opposite suffer the blackmail of the Prime Minister. For several weeks, I have not been able to participate in the proceedings of the House but I could verify, in the field, as we say, the consequences, for our Parliament, of the measures he advocated.

Mr. Speaker, in 1970, during the famous October crisis, the Prime Minister went as far as speaking with a demagogy that only his attitude could equal. He said, not only to his friends of the Liberal party but also to all members of the House, that the 11 persons now on death row would be sent simultaneously to the gallows if necessary—

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Matte: —if the death penalty was maintained. I say that such remarks are not worthy of a man who holds such an important office. It is quite obvious that several of my colleagues opposite bowed to that blackmail. And I believe that explains why the House was pretty well divided in

two clans when it came to the question of the principle of the bill on second reading. Were it not for that blackmailing, were it not for that fad the Prime Minister has to absolutely want to have that legislation passed, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the majority of the members of this House because of their personal interest and their role as genuine members of Parliament would truly reflect the thinking of the people in their ridings and consequently would vote for retaining capital punishment. So, Mr. Speaker, the game has been fouled and that is why the second reading did not truly reflect the opinion of my hon. colleagues in this House.

Tonight we have a chance to undo that, and this time, to move with the support of the majority of the people of Canada. Earlier, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) said that he had received only three replies in favour of the bill from his riding; I do not question that, because the people of his riding cannot get over the fact that he is going against the wishes, so they no longer want to have anything to do with him. That is very clear. For those three replies he mentions, I can show him over 8,000 I received from the riding of Champlain. Imagine 8,000 replies out of 16,000 questionnaires sent out! When 50 per cent of the people go to the trouble of writing their representative to indicate clearly and explicitly to him that they are in favour of something I would be very ill advised, Mr. Speaker, with an extremely scrupulous conscience, to say: How I hate to end the life of someone who has killed five or six children, or a poor old man, or a poor old lady! I hate to do it in my own conscience, I am shaking at the thought of that man being sentenced to die.

Mr. Speaker, that is utter ridicule since, as I said earlier, a person in full possession of his faculties who commits a capital murder, who decides at a given moment to kill, automatically decides also to have himself put to death. The decision was taken by him, not society. That is why I think we can therefore accept the principle of being against the fact that society has its revenge against an individual by committing exactly the same act for which the individual is blamed by that society. But this is not the case at all, I think.

From now, on we must say that we are no longer naive. I am not referring to those eleven people now sentenced to death. They were so sentenced in a system under which they were sure of not being hanged. Consequently they cannot be judged in that light, confident as they were because there had been no execution for more than ten or eleven years, I think. As a result, those who are now on death row were sure of not being hanged. We could say that after them, there might be some revision, that they should be sentenced to life imprisonment rather than do what the Prime Minister suggested—giving a show to all Canadians and send them all to the scaffold. No, of course!

Mr. Speaker, we will not give in to this kind of blackmailing on this side of the House, at least not the Social Credit members. We are not at all impressed by that because we consider that those individuals were convicted. Yes, they were convicted, but within a system where, for all practical purposes, abolition had been accepted. Now that it would be reinstated, that it would again take effect in a strict sense, we could say that from now on anyone who hangs would necessarily have decided so himself, and it would not be because society wants to exercise revenge, but simply because he has decided so. There is a distinction.

Therefore in my view the best way to do away with capital punishment is very simple, it is indeed very obvious, Mr. Speaker. Let no one commit murder. If there is no murder, then there is no capital punishment. It is just as easy as that. I have no qualm of conscience when I say to myself: Everybody has been warned; everybody knows what to expect. And I know that if I commit a murder of that kind, a premeditated murder, I deserve to hang. Every one will agree. Anyone who decides to commit murder has only himself to blame, not society, since it is he who has freely elected his course of action. He later will have to bear the consequences.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are completely justified to support the bill before us. This amendment gives all hon. members an opportunity to change their minds, all those who had been misled and blackmailed can straighten their views. Now is the time to review one's decision. I am now addressing myself especially to those who felt some compunction, and I am trying to prove to them that they need not let their conscience bother them. Let them simply say: As for me, I object to anyone being killed, I do not want at all that society take revenge on anyone. In that sense, I am against capital punishment. It is as easy to abolish it as to refrain from committing murders. Some people say: "We are smarter than anybody else". I even heard on the radio one member say that if he is a member of Parliament, it is because he is the most intelligent in his riding.

That is why he was sent here and, therefore, his opinion was worth much more than that of any other person in his riding, with a population of close to 90,000 or 100,000 inhabitants. His opinion is more important than that of his 100,000 constituents. Mr. Speaker, I would not have a clear conscience if I reasoned in this manner. I find that a reasoning which questions the very principle of democracy is worse than one which would restrain by every means someone who wants to be hanged. I find it is a good thing to respect public opinion, and if society is sick and there are murderers, I say that it is because it deserves it. If our present society, which is admittedly decadent and in which the level of morality is getting lower and lower, demands capital punishment, it is because it feels the need for it. I say therefore that it deserves it.

● (2040)

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank all my colleagues.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I do not consider our role in the House to be holy nor do I think that we should take for granted that we want to establish a perfect society

which would therefore allow us to abolish capital punishment. No, we are no angels, and I do not know of any in this House. There is no need to have scrupules, particularly because basic principles prevent us from doing so in view of the moral corruption, the violence as the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) pointed it out today, which is systematically shown on television, from childhood to adolescence to adulthood, in a society that teaches violence to its youngsters. When we finally talk about exercising some control over television, radio and the press, our honorable colleagues of the New Democratic Party are shocked, they rise as offended virgins in defence of the principles of freedom while at the same time taking a contradictory approach in their actions.

Mr. Speaker, once again this goes to show how sick our society is. We intentionally produce violent people and then we want to abolish capital punishment. This is utterly illogical. I repeat that our society needs capital punishment. When it will be proved to me that we have an almost perfect society, then it might be logical to consider the abolition of capital punishment. But in the meantime, we are far from that and whoever pretends that the material advancement which characterizes this phenomenal era of industrial and scientific progress, has improved the moral fibre of our society is all wrong. We have gone back to the Middle Ages and today, as some people would say, capital punishment is something left over from the dark ages.

I am sure that the crimes we are witnessing today are worse than those ever committed in the Middle Ages and with all those movies about violence on television, we are seeing things still worse than what may be described in any historical movie relating events which occurred in 1100 or 1200. This is much worse. Then, society today is worse than it was in the Middle Ages. Then, we can say that if the people are informed that in the future, anyone who commits a crime will be hanged, if someone does it, he will condemn himself.

In concluding, I would like to refute the argument brought about by those who say that the retentionists are motivated by a desire of revenge and some kind of cruelty. I shall tell them that it is even more cruel and inhuman to sentence a person to 25 years in prison. I recall that here in this House, my former colleague for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) had read a letter from Leopold Dion, the murderer of five children who had begged his member to arrange for him to be hanged. He could not bear living in the penitentiary. And this murderer was asking that the law be applied in his case. Who is cruel? I suggest it is those who ignored the desire of this criminal and preferred to have him rot in prison. This kind of Chinese torture is worse than hanging for who knows what to expect. So I think that tonight the majority of the members will have a chance to openly express the views of the vast majority of Canadians who favour the retention of the death penalty.

[*English*]

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on second reading of this bill I said we are embarked on a serious debate which demands sober judgment. Sir, the amendment we are considering will, if passed, provide for the execution of those convicted of murdering prison guards or policemen. This is not a debate between enlightened abolitionists and barbaric retentionists. Sir, this debate concerns the very roots of justice itself.

We speak of prison guards and policeman. Who are they? Who are these guards and policemen to whom we refer so glibly in this House? Sir, they are the fellows next door; I suppose I should add, as well, the gals next door. They are people with hopes and dreams; they experience the same joys and sorrows which you and I experience; their expectations are the same as yours or mine and they want to realize, to fulfil them the same as we do. They love life.

They are the people who protect us from those who would plunder our cities, destroy our freedoms, murder our people, strip us of our liberties, and clothe us with fear. Sir, our prison guards and policemen protect us from these elements, from criminals who act without regard for the historic values Canadians hold dear and the traditions which have been built within our nation, within our very borders, a bastion of strength and liberty. Sir, policemen are symbols of the authority which protects Canadian people. If you want to analyse the protection of the Canadian people, and resolve that these policemen and prison guards are symbolic of this protection, this protection is the will of the Canadian people to do right and to act against those who have no such will. It is the collective determination of Canadians to live free from fear and violence.

● (2050)

Seldom in the history of this parliament has the collective determination of the Canadian people been so clear. I am not refuting that from time to time parliament is called upon by the people of Canada to lead. It is a rightful duty of any parliament and any government to lead. Surely if it is the responsibility for parliament to lead, it is also the responsibility of parliament to reflect this obvious collective will of the people. It is blatantly obvious that the government is not in harmony with the collective will of the people, but the government by gentle reason and sound argument can lead the people until the two wills are a reciprocate echo of a determined direction. But the government is not displaying gentle leading. It is displaying a flagrant violation of its mandate.

Where there is no common will or purpose, there can be no justice. Laws ought to—and I know that often laws passed by this government do not—at least to some degree reflect the common will. The antithesis of courtroom justice is street justice.

It is alarming to me when I hear among the highways and byways of this country, in the coffee shops, on the street corners and in the homes, about Canadians taking justice in their own hands, executing justice on the spot rather than in the courts. It is a sad situation when the government by its inaction to reflect the common will forces Canadians to take this kind of justice, which is the way of anarchy.

Because the time is late and there are other members on this side who want to speak, I will conclude my remarks. However, I first wish to point out that when the government runs contrary to the obvious common will of the Canadian people it threatens to unravel the frail fibre of justice that was so carefully and intricately woven by our forefathers and is now jealously guarded by the courts of our land. This parliament must accept this amendment. I

say to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) that we have not the liberty to do otherwise.

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my intervention in this report stage debate, particularly with regard to motion No. 13, will be very brief. I have not spoken to date, but the letters I have been receiving from my constituents indicate that I should put on record some of my feelings.

The amendment offered by the hon. member for Barnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) deserves the support of all members. Before commenting on that, I want to make a brief statement regarding the speech made by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) just before the dinner hour. I look at this very bright young man and realize that at half my age he has a maturity that belies his years. In my opinion the speech that he made shows a responsiveness that is not felt by members of the cabinet. I came here in 1972 at the same time as this young member. In 1973 we were faced with a vote. The history behind it is well known. It was also supposed to be a trial period in 1967. It was not a trial period. There had been no attempt to use it as a trial period. It was merely a façade.

When it was brought back in the second time in 1973, we were told this would be the second five years of a ten year trial period. We were asked to vote for it. The vote at that time was basically the same vote as we are faced with now. Anyone who voted for that bill was called an abolitionist. Tonight, voting for the same bill, one is termed a retentionist. I find that ironic and difficult.

In 1973, I voted with the cabinet on second reading to support the bill in principle. I did so with some reservation, on the promise by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) that he would provide some protection. Instead what did he do? He tried to bootleg the bill through committee. I was disgusted with what I term a dishonest action on the part of the Solicitor General. On third reading I changed my vote and voted with what was then termed retentionist. The vote at that time carried. Frankly I do not have a great deal of hope that the vote tonight will carry. However, I am convinced more than ever that it is absolutely necessary to curb the growing crime rate in this country and to have something on which the people of Canada can rely. It is now three years since the Solicitor General promised he would carry out that bill. After all, he brought it forward. Now his hair shirt is bothering him.

The Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) brought in a public relations package with a real fanfare. They termed it the peace and security package. Bill C-83 was a ripoff. There were more amendments to that bill than any other bill in the past.

Canada wants protection. I polled my riding, as I am sure many other members did. The figure happened to be 81.4 per cent in favour of retaining capital punishment. That is a little higher than the national average. Nonetheless that is the percentage of those in my constituency who want capital punishment retained.

I do not particularly think that capital punishment is a deterrent, but that does not matter. As far as I am concerned, we need to support the police at a time when crime is rising.

I was a member of the board of police commissioners in the city of Belleville for four years. I was instrumental in enlarging the police force there. After having hired some of those men I can say that it is a police force that stacks up against any other police force, and is finer than many, in any city of comparable size in Canada. I have a tremendous amount of respect for them and a high regard for and faith in their judgment. They, like many others, want to have the protection of capital punishment.

Like the hon. member who preceeded me, I am going to be brief. I would have liked to have gone on at some length. However, there is one question I have to ask. Why does the government want to continue with this confrontation? It recently had a confrontation with the air traffic controllers. Not long ago it started a confrontation with the people of Canada as a result of the Anti-Inflation Board. Now there is the worst confrontation of all, the matter of capital punishment.

Over 75 per cent, possibly 80 per cent, of all Canadians want capital punishment. If between 15 and 20 million Canadians want capital punishment as opposed to the lives of eight, ten or a dozen individuals who are murderers, or maybe something quite a bit worse, our legislative priorities are out of whack. As far as I am concerned, if the people of Hastings will sleep a little better at night should capital punishment be retained, then this member will vote for capital punishment as often as he has a chance to do so.

• (2100)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion is in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made on Tuesday, June 29, a recorded vote on the said motion stands deferred.

We shall now turn to mention Nos. 21 and 22 in the name of the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

[*Translation*]

The House will now consider motions Nos. 21 and 22 standing in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière) moved:

Motion No. 21.

That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 7.

Motion No. 22.

That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Mr. Speaker, with your leave and following a discussion with my colleagues from all the parties represented in the House about motions Nos. 21, 22 and 23.

Since these are technical motions concerning pleas, refusal to plead, allowing time, pleading over, and peremptory challenge, I will simply refrain from any comment on the matter. These subjects are very clear to the House, and I would rather hope the House would vote on motions 21, 22 and 23 in order to speed up the business of the House. We should prevent any unnecessary debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière) moved:

That Bill C-84, and act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting clause 7.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.
And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made on Tuesday, June 29, 1976, a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. This also applies to motion No. 22, since it has been suggested that a negative vote on one of these two motions will dispose of the other. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As suggested by the hon. member, is the House also ready for the question on motion No. 23, in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière? Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière) moved:

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting clause 10.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those against will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.
And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made on Tuesday June 29, 1976, a recorded vote on the proposed motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

Mr. Reynolds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe there has been some agreement in the House that having reached motion No. 23 we should skip to motion No. 36 in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) and forgo discussion of the other motions until tomorrow.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, there is agreement on that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, we also agree to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds).

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I still have to ask hon. members whether there is unanimous consent that we do not proceed in the order which has been set out but that we go directly to motions Nos. 36 and 37.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe) moved:

Motion No. 36.

That Bill C-84 be amended in clause 21 by inserting in line 18 at page 12 immediately after the word "Act" the following words:

"in the absence of a judge's order,"

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I shall also put motion No. 37 appearing in the name of the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Fortin) as follows:

Motion No. 37.

That Bill C-84 be amended in clause 21 by

(*a*) striking out lines 22 to 43 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"669. The sentence to be pronounced against a person

(*a*) whose sentence of death is commuted to imprisonment for life or who is to be sentenced to imprisonment for life for an offence under subsection 214(3) or paragraphs 214(5)(*b*) or (c) shall be that he be sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole until he has served twenty-five years of his sentence;

(*b*) who is to be sentenced to imprisonment for life for second degree murder, shall be that he be sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole until he has served at least ten

years of his sentence or such greater number of years, not being more than twenty-five years, as has been substituted therefor pursuant to section 671; and

(*c*) who is to be sentenced to imprisonment for life for any other offence, shall be that he be sentenced to imprisonment for life with normal eligibility for parole.";

(*b*) striking out lines 35 to 44 at page 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"672.(1) Where a person has served at least fifteen years of his sentence, where he has been sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole until he has served more than fifteen years of his sentence,".

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, with regard to motion No. 36 perhaps I might first of all deal with the proposed change in the wording now on the Order Paper. Hopefully I shall get the unanimous consent of the House. This motion was prepared in some haste. Our object was to ensure that the granting of temporary absences to convicts sentenced to life imprisonment should be accorded stricter scrutiny. My first thought was that this might be secured by way of a judicial review—a judge would review the proposal to allow a temporary absence. However, upon reflection it is generally felt that it would be preferable to have the National Parole Board review these cases.

● (2110)

If it is in order I should like to suggest that the amendment now before us be changed to read, "by striking out the words after the word "offences" and substituting the following therefor:". It would then read:

"be amended in Clause 21 by striking out line 20 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

'under the Penitentiary Act, and no absence with escort for humanitarian and rehabilitative reasons may be authorized under the Penitentiary Act without the approval of the National Parole Board and no day' "

Perhaps I may explain the procedure as I understand it. It is possible for me, with the unanimous consent of hon. members, to change the wording of the motion I now have before the House to the new wording, and that is what I hope to do. The thought is not changed, this is simply to make the clause more readable, making it clear that it is the National Parole Board that must give approval. I understand the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) would like to speak on the matter.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) and, because he merely wants to change the wording of his amendment, I am agreeable to asking for unanimous consent, or agreeing to unanimous consent for him to do that. We all know he had to prepare these amendments rather quickly for the report stage, and I think it is only right that we give him the opportunity to have his amendment debated in a proper fashion. I would ask the House to give him unanimous consent to change the wording of his amendment as proposed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Of course the House is the master of its own rules, but I would want at least to have a copy of the proposed changes to the motion that has been moved and of which notice has been given by the hon. member.

I feel the best way to accomplish what the hon. member seeks to do is not by way of an amendment but, as the hon. member requested, with the unanimous consent of the House allowing the hon. member to modify wording of the motion. Otherwise I do not see how this can be attached to the motion as an amendment. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) to make the modification or changes he has just suggested to the House, taking into account the fact that this would attempt to reach the same objective?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will read the new motion. It is moved by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan):

That Motion No. 36 be amended by striking out the words after the word "offences" and substituting the following therefor:

"be amended in Clause 21 by striking out line 20 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

'under the Penitentiary Act, and no absence with escort for humanitarian and rehabilitative reasons may be authorized under the Penitentiary Act without the approval of the National Parole Board and no day' "

Mr. Stevens: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank hon. members for unanimous consent in accepting the new wording. Perhaps I might explain the motion we now have before us.

I would refer hon. members to Clause 21 of Bill C-84 at page 12. At the present time Bill C-84 proposes that:

Notwithstanding the Penitentiary Act and the Parole Act, in the case of any person sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility for parole for a specified number of years pursuant to this act, no absence without escort may be authorized under the Penitentiary Act—

It goes on to say certain other things. I feel first of all that the clause as it is now worded is not clear that it is only an absence with an escort that may be permitted under any circumstances in the event somebody has been jailed for life. Secondly, I feel it was too easy, if you like, to permit even an absence with an escort on the say so, as it now is, of the commissioner of the penitentiary, or on the say so of the director of the jail where the man has been imprisoned, or in the case of a person who has been referred to a provincial mental hospital, on the say so of the director of that provincial mental hospital.

If accepted, the proposed amendment would simply make it clear that, first of all, in the case of those who have been convicted for murder and sentenced to life imprisonment they may not obtain an absence without an escort under any circumstances. The amendment would also make it clear that in the case of an absence having been granted with an escort, if it is for medical reasons that is one thing and the local jailer or Commissioner of Penitentiaries can permit that absence with an escort, but in the case of an absence for humanitarian reasons or on the grounds of rehabilitation, under the proposed wording such absence would not be permitted without the approval of the National Parole Board.

In short, it is time to ensure that if the death penalty does not apply to convicted murderers and they are sentenced to life imprisonment, that life imprisonment will in fact mean there will be a minimum incidence of convicts being released even with an escort.

In drawing attention to this amendment I would mention to hon. members various statistical information and points in the brief presented by the Solicitor General on this subject in March, 1976. Under Question No. 28, dealing with parole eligibility, release and violation, and temporary absence, there is an interesting review of the whole question and what has been the record of those who have been allowed this or some other type of freedom under the Parole Board. If I may, I should like to quote from Question No. 28 as follows:

> The responsibility for temporary absences has been shifted from the Penitentiary Service to the Parole Board.

That is under Bill C-83. This is the Solicitor General's own submission. Let me point out in respect of that reference that it is not totally correct. If we read Bill C-83 we find that while absences without an escort have been referred to the Parole Board under Bill C-83, oddly enough absences with an escort have not been referred to the Parole Board. Consequently you have a rather odd situation in which a man may be sentenced to prison for life and, if released with an escort, does not need Parole Board approval.

Based on the minister's own submission, what I am suggesting is that it would be wise and responsible for this House to ensure that if a person is to be released with an escort, and I emphasize that, he should only be released for humanitarian or rehabilitative reasons with the approval of the Parole Board. Hopefully it will only act under very, very special circumstances.

It would be natural for hon. members to ask to what extent this is a problem. Again I would refer hon. members to the Solicitor General's submission to this House of March, 1976, and specifically to Question No. 54 which deals with the simple question:

> What is the performance on temporary absence of inmates convicted of murder?

If I may, I should like to read the response, and again I emphasize that this is the Solicitor General's own information. It states:

> Preliminary statistics indicate that during 1974, a total of 275 individual murderers were released on 2,703 temporary absence permits.

It is also pointed out that:

> —8 inmates failed to return from temporary absence, but all were subsequently returned to custody.

The point I want to make is based on the 1974 figures. You can see that it was not an unusual thing in the past to give temporary absence permits, 275 individual murderers having received them in 1974 alone, not only for one time but in 2,703 different instances.

● (2120)

I also refer hon. members to question No. 58 in the same submission of the Solicitor General's Department. It deals with how many persons convicted of murder have murdered a second time while on parole, while on temporary absence, while incarcerated, and after escape from an institution. The response in this case is as follows:

> With the exception of one case, our knowledge of murderers who murdered again is limited to cases since 1963. The study is based on a review of CPS case files. This study excludes cases where the charge was originally for murder but the conviction was manslaughter, or the original charge was for manslaughter.
>
> *While on Parole*:
>
> 3 persons.
>
> One person committed both murders in Canada (executed in 1944). The other 2 persons were involved in the same first murder which was committed in the United States; they jointly committed their second murder in Canada.

The next heading deals with persons who have been in jail but were unlawfully at large following a temporary absence. Presumably these are people on legal temporary absence and who, for their own reasons, failed to return. One person is listed who committed first and second murders in Canada. In the "While Incarcerated" category there was one person who committed first and second murders in Canada. In the "After Escape" category there were two persons. One committed his first murder in Canada, escaped from the B.C. pentitentiary to the United States and committed his second and third murders there. The other person committed his first murder in a prison in the United States, escaped to Canada and murdered a policeman.

I hope that will summarize what I am attempting to achieve in the amendment now before the House. In short, if the government wishes to do away with the death penalty for the ordinary crime of murder, I believe it absolutely imperative that the members of this House ensure that life imprisonment means life imprisonment, and that absences from prison on the part of convicted murderers should be kept to a minimum.

As we know, Bill C-84 proposes that people who are convicted of murder and jailed for life may not get leave from prison without an escort. My point is that even with an escort there has to be more scrutiny of any application for leave. In the absence of the death penalty surely even abolitionists agree that life imprisonment must mean life imprisonment.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is comparatively easy to escape from an escort. You cannot keep a man shackled indefinitely. Leaves are granted for periods of five days, 15 days, even longer. Even though a man is out of jail on leave and is escorted, he can easily escape and perhaps commit another crime or a murder. This is why I believe any application should not be left to the local jailer, or to the provincial medical institution if the inmate is in a mental institution, or even to the commissioner to decide; the deicsion should be for the National Parole Board to make. This is what my amendment provides, or will provide if hon. members see fit to vote for it.

I see it is almost 9.30, Mr. Speaker, and there is a House order that we vote at 9.30. I should like my proposed motion No. 36 to be voted on at that time, so let me conclude my remarks by saying that if we are to do away with the death penalty, let us make sure there are as few cases as possible where leave is granted even with an escort. One safeguard would be to insist, as this amendment does, that any application for leave is subject to National Parole Board review.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with the penitentiary service about this amendment. The principal problem with it is that it

would prevent the penitentiary authorities from taking an inmate who is sick, or who suddenly becomes ill, to hospital with an escort for emergency treatment. At the moment, when an inmate becomes ill—let us say he has a heart attack in prison—he is taken to the hospital under escort pursuant to section 26 of the Penitentiary Act. If on each occasion we had to go to the parole board for permission to take him to the hospital, the man could die as a result of not getting the medical treatment he required.

I agree with the hon. member that we should do everything possible to tighten up our scrutiny of temporary absences, both escorted and non-escorted, and I am committed to doing that. But I do not see how we can accept this amendment if it means that we cannot take an inmate to hospital with an escort unless we get the approval of the National Parole Board. If he made a distinction in his amendment so as to require this to be done in the case of escorted temporary absence for rehabilitative or for humanitarian reasons, perhaps I could accept it.

Mr. Fortin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Allmand: But in the circumstances, since this is done principally for medical reasons, I do not think I can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) is seeking the floor on a point of order.

● (2130)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) suggests sending an escort with criminals who suffer a heart attack. Does he suggest the same thing for innocent people who have to put up with strikes in hospitals and can die because of that?

[*English*]

Mr. Allmand: They have that right now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I know the Solicitor General's point, but perhaps he was unaware that I included that exception in my proposal. I propose that an absence with an escort for humanitarian or rehabilitative reasons may be authorized. I added those words so that medical cases would not be restricted by my proposed amendment.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, when the amendment was given to me this afternoon it did not contain that provision. I have not had a chance to discuss it with the penitentiary service, and when I will get the chance to discuss it it may be possible to agree with it. If it is voted on tonight I am afraid that I would have to vote against it, since I want to make sure that this can be administered properly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I guess we had better follow the procedure stated in the order. It being 9.30 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, July 5, 1976, it is my duty at this time to interrupt proceedings and to put forthwith all questions necessary to dispose of deferred divisions at the report stage of Bill C-84. Call in the members.

● (2140)

Mr. Speaker: Order. The House will proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on motions Nos. 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18 and 38. There has been a grouping, for the purposes of discussion, of motions Nos. 4, 9, 18 and 38. I think it is clear that motion No. 38 joins itself with another motion which is yet to be discussed and is in a certain respect consequential upon the passage of some other motions, and therefore it ought to be deferred for voting purposes at least until after all of the motions this evening have been put. That may depend on the result of the vote. Perhaps it would be out of order, or in any case not sensible, to vote on motion No. 38 before the rest are voted upon.

● (2150)

Motions Nos. 4, 9 and 18 have been grouped for discussion and it would be the intention of the Chair to take a vote on motion No. 4 and then, because the principle that is involved in that motion is common to motions Nos. 9 and 18, to see if the House gives its unanimous consent to the registration of the same result on those two motions. If there is not unanimous consent then a separate vote must be taken on motions Nos. 9 and 18. If that is agreed, the question before the House at this time is motion No. 4.

The House divided on motion No. 4 (Mr. Halliday) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 146*)

YEAS
Messrs.

Allard	Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)	Masniuk
Andre (Calgary Centre)	Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)	Matte
Bawden	Hargrave	McCain
Beaudoin	Howie	McKinnon
Brisco	Huntington	Mitges
Cadieu	Hurlburt	Muir
Caouette (Villeneuve)	Jarvis	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)	Jelinek	Neil
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)	Jones	O'Sullivan
Coates	Kempling	Patterson
Crouse	Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	Peters
Dick	Korchinski	Reynolds
Dinsdale	Lambert (Bellechasse)	Rondeau
Dionne (Kamouraska)	Lambert (Edmonton West)	Rynard
Elzinga	Laprise	Scott
Fortin	La Salle	Skoreyko
Gauthier (Roberval)	Lawrence	Stevens
Halliday	MacLean	Stewart (Marquette)
		Towers
		Wenman
		Whiteway
		Whittaker
		Yewchuk—59

NAYS
Messrs.

Abbott	Beatty	Bussières
Allmand	Béchard	Caccia
Anderson	Bégin (Miss)	Cafik
Andras (Port Arthur)	Benjamin	Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Andres (Lincoln)	Blackburn	Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Blais	Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Blaker	Caron
Baldwin	Blouin	Chrétien
Balfour	Boulanger	Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Basford	Breau	
	Brewin	
	Broadbent	
	Buchanan	

Capital Punishment

Messrs.

Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Cossitt
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Duquet
Epp
Ethier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Francis
Friesen
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Hees
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Lavoie
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
Maine
Malone
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McGrath
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Roche
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schellenberger
Sharp
Smith
(Churchill)
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—177

● (2200)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I declare the motion lost.

With the unanimous consent of the House may it be recorded that the same result obtains for motion No. 9 and motion No. 18?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 9 (Mr. Halliday) negatived.

Motion No. 18 (Mr. Halliday) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 38, which is in that same grouping, has been deferred for later voting. The question therefore is on motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds).

The House divided on motion No. 7 (Mr. Reynolds) which was negatived on the following division:

[Mr. Speaker.]

(Division No. 147)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allard
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Caron
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Clermont
Coates
Comtois
Condon
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fortin
Francis
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hargrave
Hees
Hopkins
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lajoie
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Langlois
Laprise
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
MacKay
MacLean
Maine
Malone
Masniuk
Matte
Mazankowski
McCain
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pearsall
Portelance
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Roy
(Laval)
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Trudel
Turner
Wagner
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk
Young—107

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baldwin
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Collenette
Corbin
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Ethier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Holt (Mrs.)
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McGrath
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow

Messrs.

Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudeau
Watson
Wenman
Whelan
Yanakis—143

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 7 lost.

The question is on motion No. 10. Motion No. 11 is identical to it and the vote will therefore be taken as also being a vote upon Motion No. 11. Motion No. 10 is in the name of Mr. Fortin and Motion No. 11 is in the name of Mr. Reynolds.

The House divided on Motion No. 10 (Mr. Fortin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 148*)

YEAS
Messrs.

Allard
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Condon
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fortin
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Langlois
Laprise
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
MacKay
MacLean
Maine
Malone
Masniuk
Matte
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Roy
(Laval)
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Trudel
Turner
Wagner
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk
Young—97

NAYS
Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baldwin
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Duquet
Ethier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Hees
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McGrath
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudeau
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis—153

● (2210)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motions Nos. 10 and 11 lost.

Motion No. 11 (Mr. Reynolds) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question therefore is on motion No. 12.

The House divided on motion No. 12 (Mr. Lawrence) which was agreed to on the following division:

● (2220)

(*Division No. 149*)

YEAS
Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Balfour
Basford
Bawden
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Brisco
Broadbent
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieu
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Clermont
Coates
Collenette

Messrs.

Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Cossitt
Côté
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Hopkins
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Jones
Kaplan
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacKay
MacLean
Macquarrie
Maine
Malone
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marshall
Martin
Masniuk
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McIsaac
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
McRae
Milne
Mitges
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
O'Connell
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reynolds
Richardson
Ritchie
Robinson
Roche
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Roy
(Timmins)
Roy
(Laval)
Rynard
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Sharp
Smith
(Churchill)
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Wagner
Watson
Wenman
Whelan
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yanakis
Yewchuk
Young—208

NAYS

Messrs.

Allard
Anderson
Beaudoin
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Dupont
Ethier
Fortin
Fox
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Guay
(Lévis)
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Joyal
Lachance
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Landers
Lapointe
Laprise
Leblanc
(Laurier)
Lee
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Marceau
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Matte
Olivier
Ouellet
Pearsall
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Reid
Roberts
Rondeau
Rooney
Skoreyko
Stanbury
Tessier—41

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: I declare motion No. 12 carried.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members may be aware that one of the members of the House who is a physician has been asked to step outside the Chamber for a moment because of a possible emergency in the lobby. Under the circumstances it does not seem sensible to proceed with the taking of such an important vote as the next one in the hon. member's absence. Perhaps hon. members might simply extend their indulgence for a moment or two. I would not suggest that hon. members leave the Chamber. The doctor apparently is prepared to return momentarily.

Order, please. The question is now on motion No. 13.

The House divided on motion No. 13 (Mr. Reynolds) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 150*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allard
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beaudoin
Blouin
Brisco
Cadieu
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Caron
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Clermont
Coates
Comtois
Condon
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Demers
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fortin
Francis
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hees
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lajoie
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Landers
Langlois
Laprise
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
Lee
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
MacKay
MacLean
Malone
Marshall
Masniuk
Matte
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Portelance
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Roy
(Laval)
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Trudel
Turner
Wagner
Watson
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk
Young—117

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baldwin
Basford
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Collenette

Messrs.

Corbin	Jamieson	McGrath
Côté	Johnston	McIsaac
Cullen	Joyal	McRae
Cyr	Kaplan	Milne
Danson	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Munro (Hamilton East)
Daudlin	Lachance	Nicholson (Miss)
De Bané	Lalonde	Nystrom
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)	Lang	O'Connell
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Laniel	Olivier
Drury	Lapointe	Orlikow
Duclos	Leblanc (Laurier)	Ouellet
Dupont	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)	Pearsall
Ethier	Lefebvre	Pelletier
Fairweather	Leggatt	Penner
Faulkner	Lessard	Peters
Firth	Loiselle (Chambly)	Philbrook
Fleming	Lumley	Pinard
Flynn	MacDonald (Cardigan)	Poulin
Forrestall	MacDonald (Egmont)	Prud'homme
Foster	Macdonald (Rosedale)	Railton
Fox	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Raines
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	MacFarlane	Reid
Gendron	MacGuigan	Richardson
Gilbert	Mackasey	Roberts
Gillespie	Macquarrie	Robinson
Gillies	Maine	Rodriguez
Goodale	Marceau	Rompkey
Goyer	Marchand (Langelier)	Rooney
Grafftey	Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)	Roy (Timmins)
Gray	Martin	Saltsman
Guilbault		Sauvé (Mrs.)
Halliday		Sharp
Harquail		Stanbury
Herbert		Stanfield
Hnatyshyn		Stewart (Cochrane)
Hogan		Symes
Holmes		Trudeau
		Whelan
		Yanakis—132

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 13 lost.

● (2250)

The result would obviate the necessity of taking a vote at this time on motion No. 38. However, there is some difficulty in a further deferral of the vote unless the House gives unanimous consent because we are operating under an order of the House that deferred motions have to be voted on within a certain period of time. It would seem better to leave motion No. 38 to another occasion when the result of the voting tonight might be taken into account in assessing what should be done with regard to the remaining motions. A recorded division will be further deferred, at least until remarks have been made in the House tomorrow at 12 o'clock to see what ought to be done, and this would allow for time for discussion tomorrow morning.

As a result of discussion this day divisions were deferred as well on motions Nos. 21 and 22. The question therefore is upon motion No. 21 in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin). This motion ought to be taken together with motion No. 22.

Capital Punishment

The question is upon motion No. 21. All those in favour of motion No. 21 will please rise.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that motion No. 21 should carry?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Shall it be recorded that motion No. 21 was negatived on division?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 21 (Mr. Fortin) negatived on division.

Mr. Speaker: The question is therefore on motion No. 22 in the name of Mr. Fortin. Is it pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Shall it be entered that the motion was lost upon division?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 22 (Mr. Fortin) negatived on division.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 23 has also been deferred for division at this time. Those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Shall it be recorded that motion No. 23 has been lost on division?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 23 (Mr. Fortin) negatived on division.

Translation]

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

To accelerate the business of the House and because of the votes that have taken place this evening, without wishing to interpret them, I would like to suggest, if I have the unanimous consent of the House, to proceed in the same manner with motions Nos. 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 37 and 43, and in this way, we shall have disposed of the amendments that I have moved.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is an excellent suggestion by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

[*English*]

But as I have indicated earlier, perhaps the remaining motions, many of which will have to be given consideration, might be held off pending consideration to determine whether they might be grouped or withdrawn.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock!

Some hon. Members: Carry on!

Mr. Speaker: If it is the pleasure of the House to proceed I would think the only process to be followed would be for the Chair to continue to call motions consecutively and dispose of them by voice votes.

The question is therefore upon Motion 24.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) moved:

Motion No. 24.

That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 12.

[*English*]

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: Shall it be recorded that Motion No. 24 was defeated upon division?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 24 (Mr. Fortin) negatived on division.

Mr. Speaker: Motion No. 25 in the name of Mr. Lawrence—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. To prevent this ridiculous procedure, could I suggest, with unanimous consent, that these motions be simply withdrawn?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is indeed a very co-operative suggestion and an orderly way of doing this. It would take only a minute to separate these motions that stand. Perhaps as we call the motions seriatim for votes, those that stand in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) could be dealt with. In each case where the hon. member seeks the consent of the House perhaps he should do so as the motion is called. The question, therefore, is on Motion No. 25 in the name of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). Shall the same result that has already been recorded for the other motions be applied to this amendment to Clause 12?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member for Lotbinière have the consent of the House to withdraw Motion No. 26?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) moved:

Motion No. 26.

That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended by deleting Clause 14.

[*English*]

Is there unanimous consent that the House proceed to the taking of the division at this time on Motion No. 26.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there unanimous consent to the taking of the division on motion No. 26 at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There not being unanimous consent, the House is not in the position to proceed to the taking of a division on any of the remaining motions until such time as they have been dealt with and deferred by the House. Therefore, it being after ten o'clock, this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At 11 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 9, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT INTRODUCE A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF NON-SMOKERS IN TRANSIT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the official opposition's outstanding record of constructive suggestions, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That the government forthwith bring forth legislation similar to Bill C-242, an act for the relief of non-smokers in transit to ensure reasonable and expeditious attention thereto.

Mr. Speaker: The motion can only be debated with unanimous consent of the House. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

PROPOSED DENIAL OF LANDING RIGHTS TO AIRCRAFT OF COUNTRIES HARBOURING AIRCRAFT HIJACKERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I raise, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, a matter that is urgent and pressing. It concerns the problem of international hijacking and terrorism. In view of the fact that several countries in the world continue to provide hospitality and landing facilities to hijackers and terrorists, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That Canada deny all landing rights at Canadian airports to aircraft of any country which provides aid, hospitality or landing facilities to aircraft hijackers and use its influence at the United Nations and in the world to encourage all other countries in the world to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED MORATORIUM ON GARRISON DIVERSION PENDING REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that the government operations committee of the United States House of Representatives has released a report which has sharply criticized the planning and construction of the Garrison irrigation project in North Dakota because of the environmental damage that could be caused to Manitoba rivers and in light of the fact that the International Joint Commission is still studying the Garrison project, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp):

● (1110)

That this House instruct the government of Canada to call for an immediate moratorium on the Garrison project until the International Joint Committee presents a report on the Garrison project.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTION MINISTER OF TRANSPORT DISAVOW AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS AND MAKE PUBLIC APOLOGY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on an important and urgent matter.

Given the situation resulting from the government's surrender to CALPA and CATCA regarding bilingual communications over the Quebec territory; considering that the decision of the Minister of Transport is at best an alarming commitment which contradicts the very principles of the bilingualism act, besides further breaking the ties between Quebec and the rest of Canada; and considering that this protocol insults all members of parliament and particularly upsets French-speaking representatives, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau):

That the House instruct the Minister of Transport to disavow the agreement he has signed and to apologize publicly for the offensive action he has taken.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

MINISTER'S INTENTIONS WITH REGARD TO STATEMENT ON DAIRY POLICY

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I intended to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence I will ask the question of the Acting Prime Minister, who probably knows less, if that is possible, about dairy policy than the Minister of Agriculture.

On Wednesday, June 30, the Minister of Agriculture in answer to questions regarding dairy policy—and Lord knows we need a new dairy policy—indicated that if he is going to make an announcement, it would be made next week some time. Remembering that last year the Minister of Agriculture made an announcement during the Easter recess when we could not rebut it and then six months later changed it, can the Acting Prime Minister tell me if the minister intends to make some statement on dairy policy today, or will there not be the required change in the dairy policy?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the minister is not in a position to make a statement on dairy policy as yet.

Some hon. Members: Why?

Mr. Sharp: Because consideration of the matter has not been concluded in cabinet.

Mr. Ellis: I wonder, then, if I might ask a general question of the Acting Prime Minister. Is it the policy of this government to have confrontations with the people of Canada? There have been confrontations with air traffic controllers, with labour, and recently in the matter of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a supplementary question, would he ask it.

Mr. Ellis: If we are not going to have confrontation, will the Acting Prime Minister please ask the Minister of Agriculture to come up with a policy some time between now and next Wednesday which will satisfy the dairy farmers in Canada?

Mr. Sharp: I think we have probably had the most successful agricultural policy this country has seen because we have the present Minister of Agriculture.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp: Moreover, as I look around the world, I see no other country which has had an agricultural policy which has been more satisfactory to producers and consumers.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

DAIRY POLICY—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES—REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I address my question to the Acting Prime Minister. The simple statement that we have a good agricultural and dairy policy indicates that the Acting Prime Minister obviously has not been talking to farmers lately.

In view of the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture in this House on June 30, as reported at page 14976 of *Hansard*, in which he stated, and I quote: "Before we make any change we have to notify and discuss this with every province concerned with the dairy issue," I would like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether this consultation with all provinces has taken place, has the Minister of Agriculture received agreement from all provinces and has he conveyed that agreement, or lack of it, to cabinet?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that consultation is now proceeding.

DAIRY POLICY—FINANCIAL LOSSES OF PRODUCERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the statement made yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture at a public meeting that Canadian industrial milk producers are the highest paid milk producers in the world, and in view of the fact that a number of milk producers have had part or complete cheques held back by the Canadian Dairy Commission, was the Minister of Agriculture expressing government policy that these producers, having been encouraged to produce by the Canadian Dairy Commission, will have nothing to worry about and the financial losses they are now facing are of no consequence?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is a very argumentative question.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

SUGGESTION PROGRAM END IN VIEW OF LOW CANADIAN UNIT LABOUR COST INCREASES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. At the outset of the government's so-called anti-inflation program the New Democratic Party pointed out that factual support for it simply did not exist. Once again, in figures provided this time by the United States Bureau of Labour and published in today's press, it is documented that Canadian unit labour cost increases during the past eight years have been the lowest among the top eight industrial nations. Given the fact that the unit labour costs have not been pricing us out of our competitive markets and the fact that prices are continuing to rise, will the minister finally come to his senses about this program and bring it to an end?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out to the hon. gentleman many times in the past and I am glad to repeat it, that we are not blaming labour for the inflation that we encountered nationally and internationally in 1973-74. What we are saying is that if the settlements being claimed for the year 1975 were carried forward into 1976, that is 20 per cent or 30 per cent increases in our unit labour cost, we would, over time, prejudice our economic position. That is the position we have taken in the past and I shall be glad to repeat the answer, again and again, I am sure, to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I should like to outline the facts for the minister. In 1975, in the figures that were published today, and contrary to what the minister has just asserted, Canada had the lowest increases amongst the same eight countries in 1975 in its unit labour costs. So the minister is wrong in precisely the year he says was used to justify the program brought in last fall. Will the minister now concede that he was wrong and concede that the program has no intellectual justification and is morally offensive to working Canadians?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. gentleman to read my answer. As in previous ones I pointed out it was the anticipation of increased settlements of 20 per cent to 30 per cent which would have had this impact on Canadian business. We were not looking back over our shoulder and pointing a finger at what Canadian business and labour had done in the past; we were looking ahead and saying if they get this kind of settlement in the future then we will not be in a position to compete. It was for that reason we made efforts to restrain the increase, among other things, of wage rates in 1975. The fact that we were able to restrain them is some credit to the program.

REQUEST FOR FIRST QUARTER FIGURES SHOWING WAGE INCREASES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, what the minister has said is just rubbish. He knows very well the government had no program in operation until the end of 1975. He shifted from 1975 in his argument which was of his first answer, to "anticipated" increases in 1976. I should like to ask the minister if he could provide us with first quarter figures comparing wages and salary increases in Canada with other countries to document in some way support for the argument he has just recently provided in that answer?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said I shifted. I would repeat for the third time: we were talking about anticipated labour costs. The hon. member has talked about things being morally offensive. I find it morally offensive when I have said one thing and the hon. member keeps pretending I have said another.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

SUGGESTED REDRESS OF INSULT TO FRANCOPHONES AS RESULT OF AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. I am sorry to repeat it, Mr. Speaker, but there is interference in the unilingual communications.

In view of the many protests provoked by the action taken by the Minister of Transport in the conflict opposing him to CALPA and CATCA, and as even the right hon. Prime Minister seems to have recognized the gross error the infamous protocol of agreement constitutes by accepting the resignation of the Minister of the Environment, can the minister tell the House what steps he intends to take to make up for the affront he made to all French-Canadians generally and Quebecers in particular?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, since it has been asked in those completely inappropriate terms it would be impossible to grapple with the question.

[*Translation*]

PROTESTS AGAINST AGREEMENT WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I think the minister is entirely mistaken when he answers this way, since the words I have just spoken are far from being of the same sort as those he used in his agreement.

In any case, I should like to ask him whether he is aware of all the protests and if he received some, particularly from Quebec. Would he then be prepared to tell the House what he intends to do in the light of these events?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, of course I am conscious of the concern expressed, particularly in Quebec, following the memorandum of understanding with CATCA and CALPA. It was obvious to me that a good deal of the concern was based on a fundamental misunderstanding of that memorandum and I have been endeavouring in every way I know to reassure the people in Quebec by restating that there is no move by

this government in any way away from our fundamental commitment to the official languages policy and bilingualism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: Indeed, the whole purpose of our efforts with the simulation study and the commission of inquiry is to implement safe procedures for air traffic services bilingually throughout the province of Quebec. That is the whole purpose of what we are doing, what we intend to accomplish and what I am still confident we shall accomplish.

* * *

● (1120)

OLYMPIC GAMES

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING ADMISSION OF TAIWAN

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, may I direct my question to the government House leader in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister? Because of the preponderant views of most Canadians, that is most Canadians outside the cabinet and the Department of External Affairs, that the Olympic Games should proceed on schedule no matter what any international group may want to call itself, I wonder if the Acting Prime Minister would condescend to let the House and public know the result of the latest negotiations and consultations which are proceeding between the government and the International Olympic Committee?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, discussions have been going on at various levels between the International Olympic Committee and representatives of the government in an endeavour to reach a settlement or compromise on the question of the participation of athletes from Taiwan. These discussions are not completed and I would urge on all in the House the desirability of not creating unnecessary difficulties by anything which may be said in the House today.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, that was hardly a breathtaking answer. I was asking the Acting Prime Minister to tell us what stage the negotiations have reached. Has the government made a proposal to the IOC and has the IOC made a compromise proposal to the government? Surely, the Acting Prime Minister can tell us what is going on and who is taking the initiative.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I do not know about taking the initiative: we took the initiative one year ago with the IOC, when we asked them to consider the implications of this situation; then, when nothing happened, we had to call in the representatives to clarify the Canadian position which we had indicated a year before and on which they had taken no action. We are having the discussions today. There are proposals being made from both sides. We are all hoping that within the next short time a settlement will be reached.

[Mr. Lang.]

POSSIBILITY OF DECLARING SITE OF GAMES INTERNATIONAL TERRITORY TO FACILITATE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWANESE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Acting Prime Minister. When Queen Juliana was in Canada and her second child was being born, in order to ensure that she would have Dutch ancestry, a section of Canada was declared as being Dutch territory. This facilitated the establishment of the required nationality of the child born to Queen Juliana. Will the Acting Prime Minister give consideration to declaring the Montreal olympic site as being international territory belonging to the IOC in order to get around what obviously is a problem that cannot be resolved by the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I strongly advise the hon. member not to make that a plank in his election platform.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

PROPOSED TEACHING OF LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH AND FRENCH IN SCHOOLS—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES—POSSIBLE FEDERAL SUPPORT

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister responsible for multiculturalism, I will direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the report of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism recommends that federal funds be made available for the teaching of languages other than English and French, and in view of the fact that the recent non-official languages study indicated support for the teaching of such languages in the public schools, has the federal government undertaken any discussion with the provinces on this matter in order to encourage the setting up of such a program and to discuss in what form federal support can be provided?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows education is in the hands of the provinces. Representations of that kind ought to be made more directly to the provinces concerned. As far as the federal government is concerned, it may be a useful way of maintaining the cultures of the various groups that make up the Canadian population to give support to the teaching of those languages within or without the educational system. As far as the federal government is concerned, we are giving some consideration to the matter.

* * *

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

USE TO BE MADE OF EAST BLOCK FOLLOWING RENOVATIONS—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO EXTERIOR CHANGES WILL BE MADE

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the quiescent Minister of Public

Works. I understand that the East Block is now included within the buildings of parliament and that extensive renovations are being carried out. Can the minister advise this House or this member what is contemplated with regard to the use of the East Block now that the extensive political machine, the PMO, is being removed? Who will move in? All Canadians would like to know what is being done and what the cost will be in this period of restraint.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, as yet no definitive decision has been taken in relation—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Drury: Ask a stupid question. A committee has been appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Abbott to define the needs of the parliamentary precinct. In anticipation of that report, we are not taking decisions as to the ultimate disposition of various elements of the parliamentary precinct.

Mr. Nowlan: I prefaced my question by directing it "to the quiescent Minister of Public Works". The fact that no definitive decision has been taken illustrates my preface. My supplementary question relates to history. I know the minister, in another capacity, was on Parliament Hill at the time of the last change in government. It was only the change in government that saved the West Block from the intentions of the cabinet under Mr. St. Laurent. Will the minister assure the House that as far as the exterior of the East Block is concerned nothing definitive, like demolition, will take place?

● (1130)

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Nowlan: You may laugh, but that was what Mr. St. Laurent was going to do with the West Block. Can the minister assure us that when definite plans are made any work to be done will be done to the interior and that the exterior will remain as it is?

Mr. Drury: I think I can reassure the hon. gentleman that there will be no demolition carried out by this government. I wish I could feel as confident with regard to the alternative government.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We shall soon have a chance to say no.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO PROVINCE WILL RECEIVE LESS UNDER NEW PROPOSAL

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Two days ago, referring to the new equalization formula presently being negotiated, the hon. gentleman gave an assurance that overall equalization payments would not be less than the present figure of $2.2 billion. Since each of the options presented by the federal government involves less than that amount, and since the minister has stated that these proposals were for demonstration purposes only, could he say what increase he is prepared to consider in total equalization payments so that no province would be worse off under any new scheme than it is at present?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As I have indicated both to the conference and in responses in the House, the overall impact of equalization would not, in general, be less. The impact varies, of course, from province to province and I am not sure I can give the guarantee the hon. lady is seeking. Very often, particularly if there is a shift in provincial earnings, there would be a change. However, the overall impact would be the same. I suppose the best example of what I mean would be Saskatchewan. That province might well, through economic progress, move into the category of being a "have" rather than a "have not" province. If that were to happen it would, of course, be receiving no equalization payments at all.

Miss MacDonald: I realize the minister may not be prepared to give a dollar figure in relation to his commitment, but since his objection in April to the present rate of growth of equalization payments was that it was outstripping such indicators as the growth in federal revenue and the growth of the gross national product, would he be prepared, for instance, to consider a growth rate in equalization payments at least in line with one of those two indicators?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): In general terms, we set out the view that these transfer payments should grow at a rate not greater than the growth in the gross national product. That would be the trend.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVESTIGATION BY UNITED STATES ANTI-TRUST AUTHORITIES OF CANADIAN URANIUM PRODUCERS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources—

Some hon. Members: And others.

Mr. Gray: —I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the fact that Canadian production, sale and export of uranium are under federal jurisdiction and regulation and that two of the Canadian producers are federal Crown corporations, what is the government doing to prevent possible extra-territorial application of United States law within Canada arising out of the current investigation by U.S. anti-trust authorities into the affairs of uranium producers both inside and outside the United States? In addition, could he or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs tell us whether the government was formally notified by U.S. authorities in advance of their investigation as is provided for in several agreements between the United States and Canada?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Perhaps I can reply on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I would simply confirm his viewpoint and mine, as expressed by the hon. gentleman, that the United States anti-trust administration should in no sense seek to export its anti-trust law into Canada and that an attempt to do so will be an unacceptable course of action. In this context, the government of Canada recently had an opportunity to make its views known in Washington, and I would be glad to confirm with the Secretary of State for External Affairs that he has been in communication with Washington as well in relation to uranium.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED DENIAL OF LANDING RIGHTS TO AIRCRAFT OF COUNTRIES HARBOURING AIRCRAFT HIJACKERS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the government House leader in his capacity as Acting Prime Minister. It concerns the recent hijacking incident in Uganda. Can he advise us whether the government is now giving consideration to imposing sanctions against Uganda or, for that matter, against any other country which shelters and assists hijackers? I am particularly interested in ascertaining whether this country is considering the cancellation of landing rights to governments such as Uganda so that the Canadian people can do something more than express pious statements at the United Nations on this subject.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): The hon. gentleman will recall that Canada took the lead in the international civil aviation organisation and at the United Nations in trying to get a universal rule which meant there would be no harbouring of aircraft hijackers. Unfortunately, the rest of the world did not agree with our position. We have not, however, felt it desirable to apply the kind of sanction the hon. member has mentioned. I would remind him that far more than Uganda is involved; a great many countries in the world are involved. It is our view, however, that as a result of the tragic events which took place in Uganda there will be some change in world opinion in favour of our approach.

Mr. Leggatt: I thank the hon. gentleman for another pious statement on the subject. I would draw attention to the importance of providing leadership rather than waiting for the rest of the world. There are two other countries closely concerned: Libya continues to violate world opinion in this area and so does Algeria. I am asking the minister whether consideration is being given to acting alone so that Canada can show some leadership instead of waiting for some international agreement, which at present seems far from likely, or at least acting in concert with other like-minded nations.

Mr. Sharp: We did explore the possibility of acting in concert with other like-minded countries and we did not receive support.

[Mr. Gray.]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ALLEGED PROPOSAL FOR DECENTRALIZATION—REQUEST FOR DETAILS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. Can he confirm reports appearing in the press today that in a fortnight the President of the Treasury Board will be presenting to cabinet a longer list with a projection in stages of how a thorough-going decentralization of the Public Service by department and agency will be carried out, the purpose being to decentralize the larger agencies in Ottawa? Can the minister confirm that report and give us some details as to the phasing of such a program?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): I neither confirm nor deny reports about what is going on in cabinet.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In the event that at some time the minister and his colleagues are presented with a report recommending decentralization under a program which is really, as outlined by the President of the Treasury Board, intended basically for the purpose of job creation—something which is, in principle, not an unlaudable motive—will the hon. gentleman assure the House that when considering such a report it would be in the mind of the government that it ought not in all cases to be creating yet another level of bureaucracy through which action would need to be taken by the public and that if this is basically a regional employment scheme special attention should be paid to the problems of those public servants who are employed in agencies in the National Capital and elsewhere which are to be transferred and who are remaining here? There is a great deal of concern in the public service not only with respect to the move but with respect to what will happen to those who choose not to move.

Mr. Sharp: The government is motivated in its decentralization program not only by considerations of employment but by the principle that it is desirable to have federal representation throughout the country as distributed as extensively as possible. That is one of the main reasons for considering, as we have, the question of decentralization and taking some steps in that direction. I can assure the hon. member that when it does consider these moves the government is very conscious of problems which may be created here in Ottawa.

* * *

● (1140)

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GARRISON DIVERSION—INCLUSION OF FLOOD CONTROL ON SOURIS RIVER IN INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION STUDY

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of the Environment but in his absence perhaps the parliamentary secretary would answer. In view of the continuing controversy over the Garrison diversion project, would the hon. gentleman give an up to date report of the IJC study on the matter,

particularly as to whether flood control on the Souris River was now included in the terms of reference?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm to the hon. gentleman that the report is due on October 25, and I think the important thing to remember is that the report can recommend the abandonment of any portion of this project if it adversely affects Canada. As far as flood control measures are concerned, I can report to the hon. gentleman that we are in the process of negotiating three agreements with the province of Manitoba, one being a flood damage reduction agreement, the second a supplementary flood mapping agreement, and the third a study agreement. These agreements should be signed within 30 days.

Mr. Dinsdale: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The parliamentary secretary missed my essential point, the IJC consideration of this important boundary water matter. In view of the extensive flood damage this spring amounting to millions of dollars and the support of the government of the state of North Dakota for having the IJC investigate this matter, is Canada also pressing this viewpoint?

Mr. Baker (Gander-Twillingate): Yes, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the representation made by the hon. gentleman about a month ago, I was personally in touch with our two representatives on the IJC and the board was considering that very point.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT ON PURCHASE OF LOCKHEED ORION—POSSIBILITY CANADA WILL PURCHASE REFITTED UNITED STATES NAVY AIRCRAFT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Would the minister bring us up to date on whether Canada will be purchasing the 18 Lockheed Orions, and would he inform the House whether there is a plan under which the United States navy will buy the Orions now in their reduced form as Lockheed P-3's, and a year from now Lockheed will take them back, fit them out as Orions, sell them to Canada and make new P-3's for the U.S. navy?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, the Lockheed proposal is before cabinet, as the hon. member knows. With regard to the second question, I have heard nothing about an arrangement of that kind.

INQUIRY AS TO CONSIDERATION OF PURCHASE OF AIRCRAFT FROM COMPANIES OTHER THAN LOCKHEED

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would point out to the minister that there have been newscasts today on the subject to which I referred. The minister said he is concerned that a number of other aircraft firms have just submitted bids two days before he was going to make a final decision. Will this make any difference to the plans for purchases, will there be further delays, or has the minister any idea from whom he will consider purchasing the aircraft?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there have been no other bids or firm bids. There have been some very vague proposals but we do not have any other firm bids before us at the present time.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

DORCHESTER—ALLEGED ESCAPE PLAN FOR HUTCHISON AND AMBROSE—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Solicitor General. Further to the questions which I put to the Solicitor General on July 6 at which time I inquired whether he would report to the House of Commons details of an escape plan for Hutchison and Ambrose and the existence of a cache of arms in Dorchester penitentiary—I understand now that the dynamite information was incorrect—is the minister now in a position to report the details to the House, or will he table the report which was sent to the commissioner of penitentiaries, particularly in relation to the comments of Mr. Ambrose when at approximately 2.20 p.m. on June 22, following the bulletin concerning Bill C-84 passing second reading, he said: "Now, we can get all the pigs we want"?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): When I replied to the hon. member on the last occasion I said that I could not recall all the details of the incident, but I have the report now for the question period.

On April 27, several rounds of ammunition were found at Dorchester as well as a homemade gun and some homemade knives. These weapons were found in the kitchen area and there was no evidence that they were related in any way to the two inmates referred to by hon. member, Hutchison and Ambrose. On June 11, another gun and some more ammunition was found in another cell block, but again no evidence was found to relate that to Hutchison and Ambrose. In both cases, the penitentiary service was able to stop whatever was being planned.

Mr. Dick: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister confirm or otherwise that in fact, as a result of a tip to the officials, a softball which was thrown over the wall with an inscription on it of the escape plan for Hutchison and Ambrose was picked up, that extra duty guards had been put on, and that a 32 revolver along with 15 rounds of ammunition had been found subsequent to the softball being thrown over the wall from the farm annex side of the prison?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I have no information with regard to the softball, but it is correct that a gun and 15 rounds of ammunition were found near the entrance to cell block seven. I might say that Ambrose and Hutchison are being kept in a special wing of the penitentiary apart from all other inmates.

Oral Questions

DORCHESTER—ALLEGATION SPECIAL GUARDS FOR AMBROSE AND HUTCHISON BEING PAID BY PROVINCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Solicitor General confirm that there are seven guards who have been taken off their regular duties to secure the area Ambrose and Hutchison are in, that these are being paid by the province under a special arrangement, but that since they have been taken from the regular contingent, the regular contingent is now light these seven guards; and that as of July 1 two posts were cut by the penitentiary service and there are seven posts short this weekend, a crucial weekend?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not have those details. However, I am told that everything is under control at Dorchester penitentiary. The hon. member is quite correct in stating that Ambrose and Hutchison were being guarded by provincial employees. Under ordinary circumstances inmates on death row are in provincial prisons. Because of the special security problems in New Brunswick, and the fact that they had no institution which they felt was suitable for these inmates, they made a special arrangement with us to keep these two fellows at Dorchester pending the outcome of their appeals.

* * *

INDUSTRY

BELLEDUNE FERTILIZER CORPORATION—THREATENED LAY-OFF OF EMPLOYEES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. In view of plans by the Noranda group to close its subsidiary company, Belledune Fertilizer Corporation, shortly, I wonder whether the Acting Prime Minister would take up the matter with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce as well as the Secretary of State for External Affairs and arrange discussions to see whether some solution might be found to this problem to avoid laying off some 200 people in that area already bothered by high unemployment?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): I am prepared to do so, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO DEAL WITH POST-CONTROL PERIOD

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister I will direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. The chairman of the Economic Council of Canada was quoted recently as saying that he supports the Canadian Labour Congress in the belief that, and I quote, "a system of national, social and economic planning is indispensable" for Canada. Does the Acting Prime Minister agree with Dr. Raynauld and, if so, can we soon expect position papers by the government on this part of the government's policy when the present ill-conceived controls are lifted?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the government has been giving urgent consideration to the policies that would be appropriate following the end of the anti-inflation program. It has been having some discussions with various parties, including the leading representatives of the trade union movement, with the Economic Council and with a number of other agencies. However, the problem is of such complexity that I would not think it would be possible to put these plans before the House before it adjourns for the summer break. It would be our hope, however, that in the new speech from the Throne some indication could be given of the government's approach.

● (1150)

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, I should like a confirmation from the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the very high unemployment in Canada, the second highest in the western world outside the United States, with the lowest per capita growth rate of any western country, will the minister confirm that this planning mechanism that Dr. Raynauld advocates will be in the speech from the throne?

* * *

FISHERIES

SUGGESTED RETENTION OF RIVER GUARDIANS TO PROTECT SALMON RIVERS IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of the Environment and Fisheries, I would direct my question to the parliamentary secretary. In view of the fact that river guardians patrolling our salmon rivers are getting lay-off notices this month and the salmon season does not close until September 15, has the minister been made aware of the existing emergency? What action is being taken by the Department of Fisheries with regard to extending the time of the river guardians so our salmon rivers will not face the danger of depletion of salmon stocks, providing poachers with a paradise?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that we have received several representations on this matter, and also confirm that notices were sent out for terminations I believe for the 24th of this month and the 15th of next month. I can also assure the hon. gentleman that the matter is presently being re-examined.

REQUEST FOR IMPROVED WEATHER FORECASTING SYSTEM FOR FISHERMEN

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, turning to another dangerous situation having to do with weather forecasting, which is causing a danger situation for fishermen and the loss of gear, specifically with reference to the timing between the weather forecasting and the time the fishermen get the informa-

tion. Does the parliamentary secretary have any information in respect of improving the weather forecasting system and an expansion of the program? What action is being taken to overcome this situation.

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, we have received representations from two provinces on this matter. We are attacking the problem from two fronts: Number one, a continuation and possible expanding of the special in-shore ice and storm reporting that was begun this spring and, secondly, a re-examination with the hope of increasing the number of spot coastal stations reporting to weather offices. I can also tell the hon. gentleman that we are opening a new weather office, the first one in Prince Edward Island, next month, and one is scheduled to go into the hon. gentleman's riding in western Newfoundland next spring.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

URBAN AFFAIRS

TRILEVEL CONFERENCE ON MUNICIPAL FINANCING—POSSIBILITY OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Urban Affairs. Will he indicate the present status of the proposed Montebello trilevel conference to discuss municipal financing? Is it going ahead and has the Minister of Finance given the minister any assurance that he may offer additional financing at the federal level to municipalities at the conference?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, there have been no pre-commitments. The meeting is to discuss the first and, presumably, the only report of the trilevel task force on public financing. This will be the first time that others, other than the three chairmen, have met to discuss this matter, to develop a common data base and to exchange our views in relation to it. There are no commitments anticipated as a result of these discussions. The meetings are intended to clarify some of the concerns that each level has with reference to the report itself.

* * *

FINANCE

ALLEGED REJECTION BY MINISTER OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Bearing in mind that federal revenues continue to soar, will the minister confirm or otherwise his reported statement at the finance minister's conference this week that the Urban Affairs Minister may go ahead with his Montebello meeting, but the Minister of Finance hoped it was understood that there would be no federal assistance offered directly or indirectly to the municipalities, which could mean that the conference might well be pointless?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I made no such statement at the finance ministers' meeting. I did canvass the provincial finance ministers as to whether they proposed to attend, and whether they would like the federal finance minister to attend. The unanimous feeling was that the finance ministers should not attend the meeting.

* * *

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

EFFECT ON QUADRA MANUFACTURING OF TRAIL OF ACTION BY HELLER INC.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who I am delighted to see back in the House after some absence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brisco: I wonder whether the minister would be good enough to familiarize himself with the conduct and ruthless business practices of the United States firm called Heller Inc., particularly in view of the fact that a DREE established industry, Quadra Manufacturing of Trail, has been driven to its knees and shut down, with a resultant 50 unemployed, by Heller Inc. of Toronto holding back nearly 50 per cent of the cash flow of this company?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am always absent from the House of Commons on July 1.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: And on December 25. I think, if possible, this question would be better directed to the Minister of Finance. If the hon. gentleman is really concerned about the problem I should think he would have sent the documentation to my department instead of waiting and trying to make capital out of it, perhaps to the detriment of the firm affected.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the minister is trying to make capital of the fact that he has been absent from the House for some time. My appeal was genuine and had the minister been here I would have sent him—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Oral Questions

AGRICULTURE

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO AID BRITISH COLUMBIA PRODUCERS MARKET CATTLE QUARANTINED FOR BLUE TONGUE

Mr. G. H. Whittaker (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the serious situation in which some ranchers in central British Columbia find themselves due to the quarantine in that area by the federal Department of Agriculture because of blue tongue, has the minister any plan or is he taking any steps to help them market the 15,000-odd head of cattle which they usually market in the fall?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member is not intimating that the total cattle population in that area is infected with blue tongue, because we are quite certain it is not. We want to make sure that the rest of the cattle population in Canada is protected. We have a full-time, top CDA veterinarian stationed in that area. We intend to be as fair as possible in co-operation with these people, and they are co-operating with us 100 per cent at the present time in testing the cattle, rounding them up, and so on. We are sure that with the full co-operation of everyone, including the hon. member, we can have this settled in a harmonious fashion, and that everybody will be treated fairly and squarely.

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, it is well recognized that there are many ramifications of a quarantine of this nature. I would specifically ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he is ready to move, and move quickly, this fall if there are no buyers for these cattle, especially if the buyers that do come attempt to take advantage of the ranchers because of the situation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In view of the large hypothetical element in that question I would hesitate to allow it.

* * *

HEALTH

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL MEETING ON MERCURY POISONING—REASON FOR EXCLUSION OF NATIVE REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare why it was that at this morning's meeting between the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the ministers of the provincial governments regarding mercury poisoning the native Indians of the area were not included in the decision-making portion?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it there was a meeting this morning with the very Indians about which the hon. member expresses concern. I have no report on the actual way the meeting took place this morning. Perhaps after the meeting has concluded, which should be in the next half hour or so, the minister might be available to answer that question.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I would direct this supplementary question to the Government House Leader. Could he indicate what was so sensitive about this morning's meeting that card-carrying press people were barred from the hallways of the Confederation Building where the meeting was taking place?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer the question because I was unaware of the event.

● (1200)

REASON DEPARTMENT REFUSED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE CONTENTS OF PILLS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I understand that in the minister's absence he is prepared to answer a question I asked the minister on June 28 as to the reason the department refused to provide to members of the general public information as to the content of drugs, including in this instance the birth control pill.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have a report now from the department about that inquiry. What seems to have happened was that the inquiry was directed to the family planning branch which does not have scientists with the technical expertise to give information about the content of birth control pills. They give information about the pill in general but not about the content. The practice of that division is to refer technical inquiries of the sort to which the hon. member refers to the health protection branch where that information is available. In fact, the active ingredients of pills are a matter of public record published annually in the condominium—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You mean compendium.

Mr. Kaplan: The information is published in the pharmaceutical and specialties compendium. As I said, the practice of the branch is to refer such inquiries either to the health protection branch or to the physician who prescribed the pill in question. I cannot tell in this particular case whether the person who inquired was or was not referred, but that is the general practice of the branch. Apparently she telephoned again a few days later and she was referred to the health protection branch or to her physician for that information.

An hon. Member: I hope it was on time.

Mr. Baldwin: Following that penetrating answer—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: —I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he could confirm that it is not the policy of the department to refuse information to members of the general public who inquire as to the contents of drugs.

Mr. Kaplan: That is correct. They are referred to the branches of the departments which have the information.

AIR TRANSPORT

MEASURES TO ENSURE PROCESSING OF PILOTS' LICENCE RENEWALS IN VIEW OF AIR INSPECTORS' STRIKE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport and it is supplementary to a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Wellington. About two weeks or more ago a question was asked also by the hon. member for Huron-Middlesex regarding the licensing of civil aviators. My question relates to the fact that when the minister replied to the hon. member for Huron-Middlesex he said the following, as recorded at page 14802 of *Hansard:*

Nevertheless, some steps are being taken to deal with the situation.

In view of the backlog of some thousands of applications, can the minister indicate specifically what steps have been taken and would he consider reinstituting the old mechanism which was simple and practical whereby licences could be granted by approved instructors?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, certain steps have been taken in the difficult situation of serious backlogs, including the additional extension of 30 days validity of licences pending receipt of a valid medical update. There are serious limitations, however, to any further steps which we can take because of the impact upon the whole air safety system. We are looking at one or two other items in the licensing system, but I can hold out no real promise for those affected by the current strike in the absence of a return to work.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order may I address a question to the Minister of National Defence. I asked him if there would be any new firm proposals and he said there had been none. I am in receipt of a telex that was sent by General Dextraze, chief of defence staff, to Mr. K. Patrick, president of Patrick Consultants Limited. The telex reads:

To confirm our conversation of yesterday, I would like you to present a new proposal for an Argus replacement next Thursday at National Defence headquarters. Your proposal should have the following features:

Then, General Dextraze goes on to list the features that Mr. Patrick is to present to him next Thursday. Is the minister aware of this or is this not a firm proposal?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I do not question the right of the chair to deny me a supplementary question—that is not my point of order although it did follow upon a sequence of events on which my question was based—but I think that because a member remarks on the absence of a minister, which in this day and age is frequently necessary, and the minister then alludes to the fact that the particular member has not done his homework and has not provided the minister with prior notice, requires the answer that there is little point in providing the minister with prior notice when he is not in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The difficulty in which the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) found himself was that he was not asking a question but rather making a representation on behalf of an individual constituent. It is difficult to permit the question period to be used for that purpose, although this is done from time to time, and therefore the question was put on the record. The reason for cutting the hon. member short was that—and this happens often—he got into an argument and others were waiting to ask questions of a more general scope. The question was put on the record, and in the circumstances this was sufficient since it was a representation on behalf of a constituent.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I realize that the question period has ended, but in view of the question which was asked, I simply want to say that of course I was aware of the letter from General Dextraze but it does not alter in any way the answer I gave. We have not received a firm bid.

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is with regard to the ruling that you made on the question I asked the Minister of Agriculture which you said was hypothetical. This is a matter of real concern and it is being discussed. The question which I asked was, whether or not, because of the quarantine in this area for blue tongue—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Whether or not the hon. member agrees, the question was whether the minister would be prepared to move quickly if one of two things happened. In its very terms and essence it is hypothetical, and I do not see how else the chair could have ruled. In any event the question period is terminated.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

TABLING OF ORDERS OF ADMINISTRATOR RESPECTING WENTWORTH COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SUDBURY DISTRICT ROMAN CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I wish to table copies, in both official languages, of two orders of the administrator under the Anti-Inflation Act. One is a disposition of the matter involving the Wentworth County Board of Education in Hamilton, Ontario, under the clerical and secretarial group, and the other concerns the Sudbury District Roman Catholic Separate School Board custodial and maintenance staff.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUMMER RECESS

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, there have been quite extensive discussions among the House leaders and with various leading members in the debate on Bill C-84 as to the disposal of the remaining stages of this bill. From these discussions we have reached certain conclusions. The first is that because of the nature of the remaining motions at the report stage, the report stage could be finished today and we could then proceed to third reading this afternoon, if there was unanimous consent, or if there was not, at

least on Monday. It has also been concluded from these discussions that there would be time to debate third reading of this bill before the end of Tuesday. In order to provide some additional time, if that is required, we also discussed the desirability of adding a couple of extra hours on Monday morning just as a precaution to help us to reach this goal, if it is attainable.

● (1210)

Taking all these facts, as we could ascertain them, into account the House leaders have encouraged me to seek unanimous consent today for a motion which would enable us to take a vote on third reading of Bill C-84 on Wednesday, after prayers, without any other routine proceedings, and to adjourn, subject to the usual provisions about recall for royal assent and for emergencies, until October 12.

I therefore seek unanimous consent to move the following motion:

That the House shall sit from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Monday, July 12, 1976 for the purpose of considering Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences;

That if the debate on all stages of Bill C-84 is concluded not later than Tuesday, July 13, any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading and passage stage of the said bill shall be taken on Wednesday, July 14, 1976, immediately following proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 15(1);

That immediately following the disposal of the third reading and passage stage of the said bill, the House shall adjourn and shall stand adjourned until a time to be fixed by Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the government, when the House may meet for the purpose of dealing with any subsequent proceeding or the giving of royal assent to any bill or bills that have been passed by the House at the time of the said adjournment;

That, after the giving of royal assent to the said bill or bills or in the event the House does not meet for that purpose, the House shall be adjourned or stand adjourned, as the case may be until October 12, 1976, provided that at any time prior to that date if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time;

And that, in the event of Mr. Speaker's being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for the purpose of reconvening the House.

That is the motion which I seek unanimous consent to introduce, and I believe it has the approval of the House leaders. However, as this is a matter which concerns more than just the House leaders, and since it concerns, mainly, a bill which is not a matter of confidence, I felt I should give the explanation of the background of this motion and the reason it is being moved at this time.

Apart from the special provisions dealing with sitting for a couple of extra hours on Monday and the taking of the vote on third reading of Bill C-84, the remaining adjournment motion follows the usual pattern.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as the government House leader has indicated, there is general agreement among House leaders, and I trust with other hon. members of the House, although in this situation they can, of course, speak if they have any questions about the matter. I have one question I would like to raise for the purposes of this discussion, and that is the question of what might happen today. As the government House leader knows, the debate ended last evening, to all intents and purposes, in terms of substantive amendments, and we met early this morning to set a time which is somewhat short.

I do not know whether all speakers on either side of the House will be here to carry on the report stage or third reading stage today. That is not to say that consent could not be given later to move into third reading stage, but there may be one or two speakers who might not be here. Is there an understanding amongst all of us that, in the event we have moved into third reading or are still at report stage and run out of speakers, in terms of the business then before the House, the House would adjourn today at that time and the debate would commence again on Monday at eleven o'clock in the morning? It is really a question, but not a question with regard to the terms of the motion. I would just like some clarification.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, when this motion was being discussed amongst the House leaders this morning, our view at that time was that apart from getting unanimous consent to deal with this motion today we would be able to deal with the remaining stages without varying the orders and rules of the House. The only complication I see is the possibility that if we do not conclude the report stage today, could we then carry out this program? It had been premised on what we thought was a fact, namely, that the remaining debate at report stage would be concluded today so that we would have the ordinary notice to proceed to third reading on Monday. So it would require, perhaps, some amendment to the House order if we do intend to move toward the target of Wednesday because there might not be sufficient time, if we were at the report stage on Monday, to finish third reading stage on Tuesday and conclude debate on the bill. I hoped there would be agreement on this order—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is agreement.

Mr. Sharp: —and that if the hon. gentleman feels there may be some speakers at the report stage who want to be heard before we move to third reading, there would also be unanimous consent now to move to third reading as soon as the report stage is concluded.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think we understand that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I indicate quite clearly that so far as my colleagues and I are concerned, we are happy to support the motion which has been presented by the government House leader after consultation with all the House leaders.

If I may address myself to the point which has just been discussed between the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton and the President of the Privy Council, it seems to me that we do not need to write anything more into the order. As I understand it, if the report stage concludes some time today, then it is a question of whether there is unanimous consent to move into third reading. If there is not, then we just adjourn.

If there is unanimous consent to move into third reading, then I think it would be reasonable, if some time later this

afternoon the House decides to adjourn, to take the rest of the debate on Monday and Tuesday. As I say, I think there is enough understanding among us that we do not need to amend the order with respect to this phase of the matter. In fact, I point out that although the proposed motion is a lengthy one, it really does only two things in so far as the present debate is concerned. It provides for two extra hours on Monday morning and then it provides—in other words, there is no closure on this motion—that if the debate is ended by some time Tuesday night, the time for the vote on third reading will be just after prayers on Wednesday next. It seems to me this is a sensible proposal that has been worked out by consultation, and we are happy to support it.

● (1220)

Although I said that all the motion does with regard to the present debate is the two things I have indicated, it does, of course, do other things that are quite usual at this point in a session. It provides for a few days off for the other place to consider Bill C-84 before we meet for royal assent and then adjournment of the session until October 12. I note, in that connection, that the government House leader has not indicated when a new session will start, whether on October 13 or later. I suppose the government wants to keep its options open on that point. By that time, however, this first session of the thirtieth parliament will have lasted for two years and 13 days so I would hope that a second session would start fairly soon.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, and while we are discussing matters of the remaining day or two, may I raise one other point. Many references have been made in recent weeks to Bill C-242, a bill having to do with prohibiting smoking in—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. President of the Privy Council has sought unanimous consent to put a motion at this time. Other points of order can certainly be raised, but I am anxious to get some sort of comment on this matter and I should like to keep discussion confined to this area. I do not want to get into debate on the motion itself, which can be debated later.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Your Honour, I do not think I was as far afield as you might have imagined as, after all, you could not be at our House leaders' meeting. One of the points we agreed upon this morning was that no other business would be brought forward, but there was discussion about Bill C-242 and whether it could be dealt with unanimously and without debate. It seems to me the government has some justification for not wanting to bring in its own bill, but I hope that the option might be kept open for a few moments, by unanimous consent, between now and Tuesday night just to conclude third reading of Bill C-242 as it stands. As I say, this was part of the discussion this morning. It was agreed by the government House leader that no other business would be attempted between now and next Wednesday, but there was this discussion about Bill C-242.

As far as the motion itself is concerned, my colleagues and I join in giving unanimous consent for putting the motion, and we are prepared to vote for it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order raised by the House leader, I would like to point out that we took part in the discussions with the leaders of the other parties and we want to confirm that we agree on the motion moved by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp). Since the votes taken last night, everyone realizes that we cannot amend Bill C-84 at this stage, and it has become an established fact. Therefore the most important stage becomes third reading. As far as we are concerned, it would desirable that the debate on third reading begin as soon as possible to save the time of the House and allow the greatest number of members who want to take part in this debate to express their views on third reading.

Mr. Speaker, this could be done easily since I personally maintain the same position I took in the House last night concerning motions considered at the report stage, that is motions Nos. 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 37 and 43. Therefore we could proceed very shortly with the third reading.

[*English*]

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, although I was in the building until midnight last night and have been here for some time today, it was not until the government House leader rose on his motion that I was aware of the plans he announced. I am not saying that critically, but merely to explain that I am not quite clear exactly what it is that is being proposed; but more so, I am not at all clear why it should be necessary to change what, over the years I have been here, I find to be adequate procedures for dealing with legislation in this House. It is only because of the government's headstrong attitude in wanting to rush this vote through that this proposal is being made, and any urgency that exists to get this vote passed soon escapes me. I cannot understand why the government House leader wishes to get this vote through so early.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With all due respect, the hon. member is entering upon debate. I may say it is very clear and I think it should be understood that it is not a provision of the motion that in any event the vote will take place on Wednesday. The provision is that if the debate is concluded on Tuesday, the vote will take place on Wednesday afternoon. It does not say the vote will take place in any event and therefore terminate the debate. It is simply an arrangement for the convenience of members to know that if the vote is finalized on third reading by Tuesday evening, the vote will take place on Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. Clarke: I am not certain about that, Mr. Speaker. I thought it might be appropriate to explain my thinking on this. I have no objection whatever to the government adjourning this House at whatever date it wishes, but it is not my intention to give unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: The unanimous consent that is sought is simply for the introduction of the motion. The motion itself is debatable, and in fact votable, and opposition can be registered in that way. The motion cannot be put at this time without unanimous consent. The President of the Privy Council has requested unanimous consent for putting forward this motion. Is there unanimous consent for putting this motion at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,376, 4,453 to 4,456 inclusive, 4,926 and 5,751.

[*Text*]

PSYCHOLOGISTS—SASKATCHEWAN FARM ANNEX

Question No. 4,376—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychologists at Saskatchewan Farm Annex and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada (iii) individual salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil. Psychological services are provided by Saskatchewan Penitentiary.

PSYCHIATRISTS—ONTARIO REGIONAL RECEPTION CENTRE

Question No. 4,453—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychiatrists at Ontario Regional Reception Centre and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada and abroad (iii) salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

NOTE: For the fiscal years 1970-71 and 1971-72, all psychiatrists were on the staff of the Regional Headquarters, Ontario Region. For the fiscal years 1972-73 to 1974-75, all psychiatrist were on the staff of the Regional Psychiatric Centre, Ontario.

PSYCHIATRISTS—QUEBEC REGIONAL RECEPTION CENTRE

Question No. 4,454—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychiatrists at Quebec Regional Reception Centre and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada and abroad (iii) salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil. Psychiatric treatments are provided by the Quebec Regional Medical Centre.

PSYCHIATRISTS—LAVAL

Question No. 4,455—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychiatrists at Laval and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada and abroad (iii) salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil. Psychiatric treatments are provided by the Quebec Regional Medical Centre.

PSYCHIATRISTS—ONTARIO PRISON FOR WOMEN

Question No. 4,456—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychiatrists at Ontario Prison for Women and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada and abroad (iii) salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

NOTE: For the fiscal years 1970-71 and 1971-72, all psychiatrists were on the staff of the Regional Headquarters, Ontario Region. For the fiscal years 1972-73 to 1974-75, all psychiatrists were on the staff of the Regional Psychiatric Centre, Ontario.

WASTE RECYCLING

Question No. 4,926—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

Has the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce received any applications for grants from industries interested in waste recycling and, if so, in each case, what (a) was the amount (i) requested (ii) granted (b) was the name and address of the industry concerned (c) was the performance in terms of (i) productivity (ii) profit of the industry concerned?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): (a)(i) This information is not readily available. (ii) See (b).

(b)	Program	Company	Address	Grant Amount
	PAIT	Polyconverters Industries Ltd.	Hamilton, Ontario	$20,000
		Turbo Refineries Ltd.	Edmonton, Alberta	500,000
		M&T Products Ltd.	Hamilton, Ontario	337,498
		Canadian Industries Ltd.	Montreal, Quebec	433,387
		Spring Chemicals Ltd.	Toronto, Ontario	355,000
		Canadian International Paper	Montreal, Quebec	89,000

	The Ontario Paper Co. Ltd.
	Multi-fibre Process Ltd.
	Domtar Limited
	Fer et Métaux
	Zalev Brothers Ltd.
PEP	Forsythe Lubrication Ass. Ltd.
	QSP Ltd.
DIP	I.I. Selig & Sons Ltd.

(c) The following project has been completed successfully with the results indicated. Polyconverter Industries Ltd.—Sales $4 Million to December 31, 1974. Three other projects in the list above have been completed unsuccessfully. The remaining projects are not yet completed. We do not have any other information with respect to the performance of the companies involved.

RECOVERY OF LOSSES FOR SMALL COMPANIES

Question No. 5,751—**Mr. Herbert:**

Is any consideration being given to providing financial compensation for those small companies who have lost considerable sums of money from the manufacture of large quantities of non resaleable material for Indian nuclear reactors?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Yes. Until very recently negotiations with the Government of India were continuing and there was a possibility that Canadian manufacturers might recover some of their losses through a resumption of deliveries. Following the May 18, 1976 decision to terminate nuclear cooperation with India, the government is giving active consideration to requests from industry for compensation to cover losses for undelivered equipment and materials. Export permits for these goods were suspended on May 22, 1974 following the explosion of a nuclear device by India.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 5,261, 5,296 and 5,690 could be made orders for returns, those returns would be tabled immediately.

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

[*Text*]

GRANTS TO CONSTITUENCY OF NIPISSING

Question No. 5,261—**Mr. Blais:**

1. Was any money granted by the government, its departments or agencies to the Constituency of Nipissing from January 1, 1973 to April 1, 1976, with the exception of grants made under the Opportunities for Youth, Local Initiatives and New Horizons Programmes and, if so, in what amount?

2. For each such grant, what was the (a) date of approval (b) amount (c) name of the municipality, collectivity or association concerned (d) nature of the project?

Return tabled.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS PERSONNEL ON CONTRACT

Question No. 5,296—**Mr. Nowlan:**

1. How many persons were put on contract by the government for the Department of Communications in (a) 1972 (b) 1973 (c) 1974 (d) 1975?

Capital Punishment

Thorold, Ontario	114,000
Montreal, Quebec	38,000
Montreal, Quebec	168,000
Laprairie, Quebec	850,000
Windsor, Ontario	417,000
Hamilton, Ontario	41,500
Lachine, Quebec	28,000
Lasalle, Quebec	131,000

2. For each such contract, what was (a) its purpose (b) its duration (c) its amount (d) to whom was it paid?

Return tabled.

EXPORT OF CONTAINERS

Question No. 5,690—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What is the government's best estimate of the total number of 20 foot, 35 foot and 40 foot containers that (a) originated in Canada and were exported via (i) Canadian Ports (ii) US Ports (b) arrived in Canada having been imported via (i) Canadian Ports (ii) US Ports, for each year since 1970 on the East Coast of North America?

2. What are the comparable figures for the West Coast?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed from Thursday, July 8, consideration of Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs and motion No. 36 (Mr. Stevens) and motion No. 37 (Mr. Fortin).

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are now considering motions Nos. 36 and 37, but there are certain points of order on other motions, specifically those moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), that is motions Nos. 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 41 and 43.

The hon. member for Lotbinière has indicated that he wishes to withdraw the motions.

The hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the following procedure would be the easiest: instead of withdrawing the motions, since they are valid, they should be passed or defeated as a whole on division as they were last evening.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to indicate, in respect of the motions I have just enumerated, that the Chair would have the greatest difficulty in finding such motions procedurally acceptable at this time. The motions relate in some manner to the imposition of the death penalty which, as a result of the defeat of motions last night, no longer exists in the law.

● (1230)

The Chair would be prepared to entertain discussion at this time on why it should not rule the motions which I just enumerated, along with motions Nos. 40 and 41 which relate to commutation, as being procedurally out of order on the ground that since they are consequential upon the existence of the death penalty, the death penalty not being part of the bill they are completely irrelevant to the bill. Therefore, it would be my disposition, if there is no argument to the contrary, to rule them all out of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Considering your explanations, Mr. Speaker, with them in mind, I agree.

[*English*]

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As the mover of a number of motions, I would agree that a number of them are strictly consequential. I do not care how we dispose of them, whether with the unanimous consent of the House they are withdrawn or whether you rule them out of order; it does not matter how it is done. I point out to the Chair that two motions are not consequential but are substantive and should be considered at the report stage.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Our review this morning would indicate that the two motions now before the House, Nos. 36 and 37, would remain for consideration. Motions Nos. 45 and 46 are not in any way related to the death penalty, and motion No. 42 relates to the transitional provisions. I could entertain discussion on whether it is related to the death penalty. It would appear from our review that motions Nos. 42, 45 and 46 remain to be discussed. Motions Nos. 36 and 37, now before the House, also remain to be discussed, and the remaining motions which have not been voted on up to this time would be ruled out of order by the Chair. I so order at the present time, because all such motions are consequential upon the existence in the Criminal Code, or this amended statute, of the death penalty and as a result of last night's vote that does not exist.

Therefore, there is no sense, procedurally, in accepting any such motions. The simplest course would be, rather than seeking consent to withdraw such motions, to put them to a quick vote. The Chair ought to take the decisive step; therefore, I order all such motions to be procedurally unacceptable.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: This is not to indicate that motion No. 45, in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), is not without procedural difficulty. However, no argument has been made on the procedural regularity of that motion.

Motions Nos. 42, 45 and 46 have not been called. Their calling is without prejudice, in other words, to the right to raise any procedural argument which may be raised when such motions are called.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question about the deferred division on motion No. 38 in the name of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). I do not raise the matter in any argumentative sense. I am concerned about the procedural difficulty in which we may find ourselves if there is still listed a deferred division on motion No. 38—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thank the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for bringing that to my attention. That motion is equally out of order, I would think, as a result of last evening's votes. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), the mover of the motion, is in the House; I see him assenting to that decision. I should have included motion No. 38 in that ruling along with the others because it is consequential upon the imposition of the death penalty under the statute, and that is no longer possible as a result of last night's votes. Although discussion was completed on that motion and there was an order that the vote be deferred, I now rule, unless there is objection or argument to the contrary, that that motion is also out of order and therefore the possibility of a future vote on it ought not to be considered.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid confusion on my side of the House, may I raise a question? I understand that the motions still left for debate are Nos. 36, 37, 42, 45 and 46.

Mr. Speaker: That is correct. The debate now is on motion No. 36.

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of motion No. 36 moved by my colleague from York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). I shall try to keep my remarks brief. I think the House ought to give serious consideration to the worthwhile motion moved by my colleague. I think the amendment would, if passed, provide greater protection to the Canadian public and assure our people that the process whereby we grant absences with escort to those convicted of serious crimes will not be abused.

From my conversations with Canadians I have learned that many are concerned about abuses which occur with respect to absences, with or without escort, from prison. Sometimes prisoners who have been sentenced to long prison terms are allowed to be absent, with or without escort, and some of them have not returned and have violated the conditions under which they were allowed to be absent. The amendment which the hon. member has proposed would ensure that no absence with escort for humanitarian or rehabilitative purposes may be authorized under the Penitentiary Act without the approval of the National Parole Board.

At present it is possible for such leave to be granted by the Commissioner of Penitentiaries on the say-so of the director of the jail wherein the person is imprisoned, or in the case of a person who has been referred to a provincial mental hospital, on the say-so of the director of that provincial mental hospital. I feel that the present procedures to which I have referred are too loose, and suggest that the bill should be amended in this regard. Canadians are entitled to be reassured that the present procedures will be tightened.

Because the government has done little to reassure Canadians that it takes seriously the fight against violent

crime, that it will take strong action to deal with it, and that it is prepared to reform the overly liberal provisions with regard to bail, parole and sentencing, Canadians are frightened. They have good cause to be frightened. They are looking for extreme remedies to solve a serious problem. I hope that the government will take its reponsibilities seriously and will reassure Canadians that their safety is of paramount concern. Therefore, I hope the government will look favourably on the motion my colleague has proposed.

Last evening, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), alluding to the proposal made by my colleague, suggested that if this motion were passed it might not be possible for a person who had, for example, suffered a heart attack, to obtain medical attention if it were made necessary for the Parole Board to approve absence with escort. As I understand it, the amendment would not affect the ability of the inmate to receive medical attention. It would affect only those prisoners who are released temporarily for humanitarian or rehabilitative purposes. It makes no mention of medical purposes. In my judgment, if a prisoner needed, on grounds of medical necessity, to go out of prison with escort, perhaps to go to hospital, that would be possible.

It cannot be stressed too often that Canadians are disturbed by the increase in violent crime. The increase in the last several years is demonstrable statistically and from one's reading of the newspapers. Clearly, violent crime is on the rise in Canada. Canadians are entitled to expect assurance that the government will do everything it can to put the security of the Canadian public before any other consideration.

● (1240)

Any measure which is reasonable, moral and just which can be taken to provide safety for the Canadian public should, in fact, be taken. The reason we are in this policital situation today, where there is a question about the legitimacy of the government putting forward the legislation now before the House, is the government's failure to come to grips with this issue. They have failed to prove to Canadians that they take seriously the issue of violent crime. The Canadian public do not feel that the government regards public safety as a concern.

As an illustration of the way the government has acted in this area which cannot help but lead to cynicism and doubt on the part of many Canadians, I refer hon. members to the exchange last fall when I pointed out the fact that one half of the people in Toronto charged with murder were out on bail at that time. This concerned me. I felt there was a positive incentive for a person with the prospect of being convicted to violate the terms of his bail. I placed a question on the order paper asking the Solicitor General what percentage of those persons charged with three very serious categories of crime, murder, arson and rape, and granted bail had violated the terms of their bail.

The federal government has the responsibility of passing legislation dealing with bail, parole, prison security, and so on. Obviously, the onus is on the federal government to monitor the effect of these laws, to keep up-to-date statistics about the way they work and to make amendments where it is proved those laws are not functioning properly. I was distressed with the answer I received from the Solicitor General, in which he indicated that the government had not bothered to keep statistics with regard to the percentage of persons violating the terms of their bail when they had been charged with serious crimes. The government's approach to this whole issue of violent crime is so lackadaisical that obviously Canadians cannot help being concerned about public security. They cannot help questioning the government's sincerity in dealing with this issue.

The motion moved by my colleague, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), is a good motion. It would provide some assurance to the public about the importance this parliament attaches to their right to safety. It would do something to ensure that abuses that can take place under the present legislation will be corrected. It should commend itself to all members of this House.

I hope that when the Solicitor General has had an opportunity to consult the legal authorities in his department he will realize that this provision cannot do anything but good for the Canadian people and our prison system. I hope that all members will give consideration to the motion, will support it enthusiastically and insure that it will be incorporated in the new legislation.

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am concerned about motions Nos. 36 and 37, particularly motion No. 37 on which I would like to say a few words. I share the concerns of the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty) that there are some aspects of Bill C-84 which suggest that not enough protection is provided for society against the serious crime of murder. There is not enough protection against those individuals who perpetrate serious types of crime, those individuals who are not capable of any resolution or correction, with our present knowledge of reform of prisoners.

There should be something in this bill to give assurance to the citizens of Canada that we intend to protect them against these heinous crimes—granted, by some other method than capital punishment, and with this I agree. I do not see anything in the bill which precludes, in practical terms, a person who has committed first-degree murder or treason being out on the street again in 25 years' time. This concerns me because some people occasionally commit more than one murder on different occasions. If a person has been given one chance to reform, and commits a second murder, he should not be permitted a third chance to do the same thing. I feel the same way about those who commit treason. An attempt should be made to get something into the bill, even as late as this, to protect society against this kind of offender.

In view of these remarks, and in view of the fact that many members of this House are concerned about providing better protection against that type of prisoner, I would like to propose a subamendment to motion No. 37. If it meets with Your Honour's approval, I will read it at this time. It is:

That motion No. 37 be amended by striking out paragraph (a) thereof and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) Strike out lines 22 to 31 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"669. The sentence to be pronounced against a person who is to be sentenced to imprisonment for life shall be,

(a) in respect of a person who has been convicted of high treason or first degree murder, that he be sentenced to imprisonment for his *natural* life without eligibility for parole,

(a)(1) in respect of a person who has been convicted of second degree murder and who has been previously convicted of either first degree murder or second degree murder, that he be sentenced to imprisonment for his natural life without eligibility for parole,"

This subamendment is not unlike my amendment which was defeated in the House last night. However, it will be obvious to Your Honour and to hon. members that I have removed the offensive part which gives the prisoner the option of choosing life imprisonment for this natural life or death. I appreciate that many members find that offensive and I am quite prepared to accept that. By the same token, I believe there is no question in the minds of most people that we must protect Canadians against those who would commit murder on more than two occasions. That is the intent of the subamendment. I commend it to Your Honour and to all members of the House.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As I understand it, the hon. member cannot introduce his amendment at this time without the unanimous consent of all members in the House. Standing Order 75 refers to an amendment to any clause of a bill. I suggest that an amendment to an amendment to a clause of a bill is included in that Standing Order and cannot be introduced without 24 hours' notice.

● (1250)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I would suggest to the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) that he put his amendment in writing. I understand it is in order to move amendments to motions, so I would request the amendment in writing.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Does he not need unanimous consent?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my understanding that unanimous consent is not needed because in the past amendments to motions have been allowed.

Mr. Blais: I rise on a point of order. We are dealing with clause 36, and I understand that the proposed amendment relates to clause 37. I have no objection if there is consent on the other side to debate all the remaining motions in one group in order to hasten our proceedings—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my understanding that motions 36 and 37 were to be grouped together for purposes of debate, but voted on separately.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I say a word on the point of order, Mr. Speaker? I am satisfied that you ruled correctly on the point raised in the first instance by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais). It is clear, under Standing Order 75(8), that a report stage motion can be amended. However, there are other rules relating to amendments, and it would seem to me that at this hour of the day, five minutes to one, that aspect might be looked at more closely. It appears to me that the amendment proposed introduces substance which is new to what is already there, and on that score there might be some question about it. Has the hon. member not gone a bit far afield from what was contained in the motion on the order paper?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Shall we call it one o'clock by unanimous consent, and take this matter under advisement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At 12.55 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. At one o'clock the House had under consideration motions Nos. 36 and 37. Moved by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) was an amendment which in effect would redefine imprisonment for life in order to introduce the concept of imprisonment for natural life, without eligibility for parole, in respect of a person convicted of treason or first-degree murder and in respect to a person convicted of second-degree murder who had previously been convicted of either first or second-degree murder. The Chair at that time reserved its decision on whether such a motion is procedurally acceptable.

The ground of concern regarding the acceptability of this motion procedurally, of course, is that the introduction of a new concept of this sort should be made upon proper notice, under the provisions of Standing Order 75. If there are any further arguments on the procedural acceptability of the motion—and I must say I have serious misgivings about it—I would be pleased to hear them now.

Mr. Halliday: I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that you feel there may be a problem with this new concept that I have added, namely, "for his natural life". If that is the case, I would be pleased to ask the House whether Your Honour would consider removing those three words, "his natural life", and replacing them with "fifty years".

Mr. Speaker: Order. I appreciate the offer of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), but it is not for the Chair to propose alterations at this stage. I have seen that attempted in the past and it always seemed to lead to problems. It is really better for the Chair to stick to making decisions as to the procedural acceptability of motions. If any changes or alterations are to be made, that privilege could rest with the hon. member who already has an amendment on the floor, and he may have the opportunity to get consent to move a different amendment. Alternatively, he might be able to persuade a colleague to move the amendment for him.

In any event, I should stress that the reason for my misgiving is that the provisions of Standing Order 75 require, for the introduction of report stage motions, first of all a 48-hour period between reception of the report by the House and the taking into consideration by the House of the report stage of a bill. The purpose of this is to enable all hon. members who seek to make substantial amendments to the bill to do so upon 24-hour notice, as required by the rule.

It is not, by any means, that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Oxford offends the provisions regarding motions at the report stage: far from it. Had it been put forward as a motion under Standing Order 75, upon 24-hour notice, there is no doubt in the Chair's mind that it would have been extremely relevant and very much in order from the procedural point of view.

The only question that concerns the Chair at this time is this. If hon. members are required to give 24 hours' notice of an amendment which introduces a substantial change to a bill, how would it be possible or fair to allow other members to move subsequent amendments to one of the motions which is not in any way to be construed as a simple explanation or alteration of the language or a change in some of its terms, but must be taken to introduce an important new concept?

I am sure that the hon. member for Oxford agrees that this amendment introduces an important new concept, otherwise he would not have bothered to move it. It is a very important concept, one that would have been a worthy subject for consideration. However, in fairness, if there is to be justice and equality under Standing Order 75 which provides that 24-hour notice must be given by members who seek to make this kind of change in a bill, surely it would be improper to allow, by way of what is, in effect, a subamendment, the introduction of a rather important new concept into the whole debate and to ask hon. members to vote in that regard without having had the benefit of study and examination of the question that is provided by the 24 hours' notice rule.

● (1410)

In respect of paragraph (a.1) of the proposed amendment by the hon. member for Oxford, I would rule it out of order now on a different ground. The passage last night of motion No. 12 in the name of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) in effect redefined the definition of first-degree murder so that a second offender does, if I understand the amendment correctly, become liable to prosecution for first-degree murder.

That being the case, paragraph (a.1) of the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Oxford would seem to be covered as it is in respect of a second offender and a more severe penalty being imposed. To a certain extent, therefore, it is redundant to the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham. However, it is only redundant to a point, because it does not accomplish the full change envisaged by the hon. member for Oxford, and that is "life imprisonment" meaning imprisonment for one's natural life, without eligibility for parole.

Therefore, I would have to rule that both paragraphs, in the final analysis, are out of order on procedural grounds because they ought to have been put forward as a substantive amendment to the bill under the ordinary 24 hours' notice provision of Standing Order 75(5). I think it would be unfair and improper to put them in this way because they introduce a substantive, new concept into the definition of "life imprisonment".

I would not want to comment again as to whether the hon. member might be in order in changing the language of the clause to read "50 years" from "25 years"; whether he could do that or get someone else to attempt to do it for him. This is a decision I would prefer to make only if and when such a step is taken by the hon. member for Oxford or others.

I should like to add one other word. The House should remember that this is a bill amending the Criminal Code. There is absolutely no restriction at any time on the right of the hon. member for Oxford or any other member to put forward a bill amending the Criminal Code in respect of the definition of "life imprisonment" after careful consideration and refinement of the ideas that have been put forward and discussed in respect of this particular amendment. Nor is there any restriction on the right of the hon. member to put forward a notice of motion which would call on the government to take into consideration such an amendment. In any case, there is no reason to believe, if there is merit to the amendment that is proposed, that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) or others who would be responsible for such an amendment could not be persuaded privately that such an amendment might be put forward by the government.

Therefore, I rule out of order the proposed amendment by the hon. member for Oxford. Is the House ready for the question on motion No. 36?

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions in respect of motion No. 36. I am not sure whether the Solicitor General is prepared to say anything yet, but if he were given the opportunity to add to this debate we might defer the putting of the question until later this afternoon.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I have sought advice from the penitentiary service and the parole board in respect of the hon. member's proposals in motion No. 36. While I have some of that opinion, I have not been able to reach all those I was seeking to consult, and I would be willing to suggest that we agree to the hon. member's request that we postpone putting the question on motion 36 until later this afternoon. Maybe after we have dealt with a few other motions I will have heard from the Commissioner of Penitentiaries.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House agreed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to motion No. 37. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is in the name of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

An hon. Member: On division.

Mr. Speaker: Shall it be recorded that the motion was lost on division?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 37 (Mr. Fortin) negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 42 in the name of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence).

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham) moved:

Motion No. 42.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in clause 25 by striking out lines 38 and 39 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"25. (1) This act shall come into force on the 1st day of July, 1978, and if, on that day any person is under a sentence of death".

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are two elements involved in this amendment. First, no matter when the law comes into effect, presumably there will still be people who will be under sentence of death. If the measure comes into effect now, comes into effect on proclamation or comes into effect six months from now—no matter when—unless commutations have been made under the existing Criminal Code there will be people under sentence of death. The whole clause refers to that probability.

The amendment before the House seeks to change the date of the coming into force of the act. The reason I would like to see the effective date of this measure postponed to the first day of July, 1978, is really a reference back to an original undertaking when the present sections of the Criminal Code were enacted in 1973. You will recall at that time, sir, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), on behalf of this ministry, undertook that there would be a further trial period of five or six years of the law as it is presently enacted, to see whether the present provisions of the Criminal Code would be effective in reducing the rising incidence of violent crime in this country.

That period will not be completed until 1978. Therefore, I feel that the undertaking which I took very seriously at that time and which has been broken by the Solicitor General and this ministry in respect of the bill now before us, should be adhered to. Obviously, the government will not stay with that undertaking, and I think they should be made to do so. That is the purpose behind this amendment. The purpose is to put off until July 1, 1978, the coming into force of these amendments. I submit it to the House for approval.

● (1420)

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate some of the logic in the hon. member's argument, I have to say that we would work a very inequitable system if we were to do what he suggests. If I understand him correctly, he is suggesting that this law, which is an abolition law, should only come into effect after July 1, 1978. I assume he suggests that in the meantime we should apply the law in force at present, which is to hang some of the people on death row or selectively to commute some and hang others. In response to that, I can only say that if the House takes the decision to abolish capital punishment, I think it would not be just to hang some people merely because they happen to be sentenced before a certain date, and commit to life imprisonment those who were sentenced after a certain date. I think the House should decide either to have capital punishment or not to have it, and once we have made that decision the law should go into effect. So, with all respect, I suggest that we reject this amendment.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 42 (Mr. Lawrence) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): We move on to motion No. 45 in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens).

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe) moved:

Motion No. 45.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in clause 28 by adding immediately after line 7 at page 15, the following new subsection:

"(3) Where, at any time after December 31, 1977, a motion for the consideration of the House of Commons, signed by not less than 50 members of the House, is filed with the Speaker to the effect that section 218 of the *Criminal Code*, as enacted by section 5, be amended, so as to reintroduce capital punishment

(*a*) for the murder of police officers and prison employees,

(*b*) for first degree murder,

(*c*) for any form of first degree murder, or

(*d*) for treason,

for any period, fixed or indeterminate, commencing after the motion is adopted, the House of Commons shall, within the first fifteen days next after the motion is filed that the House is sitting, in accordance with the rules of the House, take up and consider the motion, and if the motion, with or without amendments, is approved by the House, the Minister of Justice or Solicitor General shall take such steps as are necessary in order that a measure in their name giving effect to the motion may be placed before the House without delay."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting motion No. 45 partly because the present bill proposes that the death penalty shall no longer be in effect in Canada for ordinary

crimes, yet Bill C-2, to which my colleague the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) has already referred and which was passed in the last parliament, provides that the death penalty shall continue in Canada, for certain crimes, until December 31, 1977.

In view of the public interest in this question and, if you believe the various gallup polls, the fact that the public is heavily in favour of the death penalty being retained, I believe it is important that the House retain unto itself some facility to allow the members to reintroduce this question, if they see fit, some time after December 31, 1977. That is why I am proposing that any 50 members in the House can introduce a motion in the terms that I have set out in motion No. 45 and that, should the House agree to the motion, it would instruct the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General to bring in whatever motion or legislation is required to give effect to the will of the majority of the House.

In short, it is a way to ensure that this parliament will always be responsive to the public will. If we are going to agree, as appears to be the case now, to end the death penalty immediately, I believe the original commitment which the Solicitor General gave, that the death penalty would continue until the end of 1977, should be acknowledged and that at some time after that date, when there has been time to see to what extent the murder rate has dropped in this country or any other consideration that may come up, it would be helpful if members of the House had the possibility of reintroducing the topic and a debate to bring them to a different conclusion.

In suggesting this 50-member approach, I would remind hon. members, and I am sure they will agree, that it is not a particularly new approach. In fact, in the last parliament and in this parliament there were two obvious examples of this being done. First, with respect to the Turner tax affecting manufacturing and processing industries a clause was put in allowing 50 members to initiate a debate concerning the effect of that tax on the manufacturing and processing industries. Second, when we dealt with that very contentious piece of legislation, the anti-inflation program, and were setting up the AIB it was specifically provided—in this instance it was really the government which in a compromising mood suggested that 50 members should have an opportunity to review the anti-inflation program after a date which was set down in the legislation.

So certainly it is not uncommon for the House to allow 50 members an opportunity to have a further debate, and in view of the fact that there is at least a token gesture in the way of a free vote on the death penalty, surely the House should try to facilitate a free vote being taken if at least 50 members of the House see fit. That is the thrust of what we are saying. Granted, any member could perhaps introduce a motion asking that the Criminal Code be amended to return the death penalty, but we know the frustrations and difficulties involved in setting any precedence so far as the order of business of the House is concerned. In short, this motion will ensure that if there are 50 members—after all, it is a significant number; about 20 per cent of the membership of the House—who would like to have the matter debated and brought to a new conclusion, it may be done.

I urge hon. members to support this motion, bearing in mind that perhaps in this parliament we should not pass a piece of legislation that is so dramatically out of step with the public will as we are doing currently in July of 1976. I think it behooves members of parliament to say, when we are so out of step with the public will, that at least we will facilitate a new debate in the House in order to get back into step with the public in this country.

● (1430)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

An hon. Member: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 45 (Mr. Stevens) negatived.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta) moved:

Motion No. 46.

That Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be amended in clause 30 by deleting lines 11 and 12 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:

"30. This act shall come into force on the 1st day of January, 1978."

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Paproski: On division.

Motion No. 46 (Mr. Reynolds) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my understanding that earlier we deferred motion No. 36. I would suggest that we now complete consideration of this motion.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I have not finished all the consultations I wanted, but on balance I think I will accept the proposal of the hon. member and agree to it. In principle, I was in favour of it. It was the wording about which I

was a bit worried. However, I have rechecked the wording and I hope there is no legal technicality which will make it difficult to live with. The principle is good, so we will accept motion No. 36.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion No. 36 (Mr. Stevens) agreed to.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General) moved that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): When shall the bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): By unanimous consent, now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Allmand moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUMMER RECESS

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Before the debate on third reading begins, I understand that there has been further consideration of the motion I put forward this morning and I would like to repeat my request for unanimous consent to put the motion. I hesitate to read it all again because it is a very long motion. It is on the record, and I hope I can dispense with reading it again. However, I seek unanimous consent to introduce it now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Does the House give the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) unanimous consent to introduce his motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Sharp) agreed to.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the third time and do pass.

[Mr. Allmand.]

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, I assume we are now on the third reading debate of the bill. Quite frankly, I think at this hour on a Friday afternoon, in spite of the fact that perhaps they should be here, there are several hon. members who would like to have an opportunity to speak on third reading but who are not present this afternoon. While it is fine for those of us who are here to think that that is too bad and that perhaps they should be present, they are not present. If I may say so, I think the House leaders would be quite ill-advised to try to push the final stage of this bill through the House this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence: I believe some hon. members who have left Ottawa for their constituencies left in the belief that some time on Monday or Tuesday there would still be an opportunity for them to enter into some sort of meaningful debate on the third reading stage of the bill. Therefore, I hope there is no intention this afternoon to close off the third reading debate.

On that assumption, I would like to say a few words about the actions and attitude of the government in the last few years with respect to the whole field of law and order, crime and punishment and the administration of criminal law in this country. The third reading debate gives one an opportunity to do exactly that. First, I think it is a betrayal of the integrity and the moral honesty of this government that the whole subject of Bill C-84 came before the House this session.

An undertaking was seriously given—and for those of us who are retentionists it was seriously accepted over two years ago—that there would be a five or six-year period before we would be plunged once more into the emotional chaos and confusion which we have all gone through in the last three or four weeks. I think all of us have to look at the reasons or, as I am firmly convinced, the one and only reason we have gone through this heartrending and mind wrenching experience of the last few weeks in this House once more on this very emotional subject of capital punishment. It is simply this. If the full period of time is to run, as the undertaking given in 1973 indicated, then the next time this House and this country will debate this emotional issue will be during or just before a general election. I am firmly convinced—and I am led to believe that I am not the only one in this House or across the country to think so—that the sole reason the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) brought this matter to the fore is that they were afraid to face public opinion of this country when approaching a general election. There is no other reason.

● (1440)

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Lawrence: I do not know whether "yellow-bellied, mealy-mouthed politicians" is a parliamentary expression; I suspect it is not, and therefore I am not going to use it in relation to this government. I merely say to you, Mr. Speaker, I am not only disappointed, I not only feel betrayed by the actions of my government, but I am sure my feelings in this regard are shared by countless thousands across this country. I do mean thousands. I do not

think there is any question that the majority of public opinion in the country is decidedly against not only what has been done but the way in which it has been done. I want to say no more than that. I think this government, if you will excuse the expression, should hang their heads in shame over what they have done on this issue. I think it is a betrayal of the principles and concepts of democracy. They may think it is sour grapes because of the way the votes have gone, and there may be an element of that.

I would point out that I did not speak on the second reading debate because I believed that this time the government was going to win. This is the fourth time in ten years that this matter has been dragged before the House of Commons. It is usually brought up when the temper of the House is getting pretty crotchety due to a prolonged session and the heat of Ottawa in summer. I think all the elements surrounding the introduction and passage of this bill through the House by the government has been despicable, and come 1978 they will rue the day. The people of this country will then have an opportunity to express their opinion. The government is counting on the public having a short memory. Maybe, they have, and maybe they have not.

If I have anything to do with public opinion in the next general election, the whole question will once again be an issue. It is not only the principle of capital punishment that will be the issue but also the moral integrity of those who have been running this government and this House and the manner in which they brought in this bill. I think they are very foolish indeed to add an extra weapon to the armanent of retentionists by behaving this way.

For several weeks I have managed to bottle up my mental outrage at what has happened here, but on third reading debate I feel I can be silent no longer. I am sorry the Solicitor General is unavoidably absent for the remainder of the debate, because the final thing I want to discuss is the abuse by this government and its predecessors of what used to be commonly known as the royal prerogative of mercy.

Mrs. Holt: But your backbenchers supported that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) has the floor.

Mr. Lawrence: I do not think the principle of the royal prerogative has been recognized throughout the country. When questions have been put to the Solicitor General, he has attempted to shrug them off by saying the only commutation that has taken place since he has been Solicitor General is the one case that was openly discussed in cabinet, and only after a great deal of discussion was a decision made. Nevertheless, the Solicitor General and the Prime Minister are on record as enunciating the general principles of capital punishment and unquestionably, whether they were fully discussed or minimally discussed in cabinet, the final outcome was that every death sentence that has been imposed has either been stayed or commutation has been granted outright.

There has been a terrible abuse of a worth-while discretionary power in the hands of the parliament of this country. I am firmly convinced that due to the actions of this government and the principles respecting capital punishment which have been enunciated by various ministers of the Crown, that although the royal prerogative of mercy is based on a sound principle, it has been sadly abrogated and the whole matter has been brought into disrepute. They have made a mockery of the whole procedure, and that is a shame because it is a worth-while procedure.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the present ministry has completely destroyed the concept of the royal prerogative and the discretion of the Crown. I am a member of this House, I am a citizen of this country and I am no longer going to trust the word or the integrity of the people who make up this government. I do not believe that such discretion should longer be vested in them.

There are many other discretionary matters which, although they may not be built into the statutes of this country, are traditions of this country. Most of them from Great Britain. Many of these discretions exist because they are a matter of tradition, not a matter of statute. I, for one, having watched the way in which the government have abused that discretionary privilege with regard to the royal prerogative of mercy, do not trust it with any further discretion. That is not a nice thing to say, and perhaps it is not even a polite thing to say, but it is something I must say as we debate the third reading of this bill. I cannot let this occasion pass without indicating to the front bench opposite that my opinion is neither unique nor exclusive.

● (1450)

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; if the hon. member merely wishes to raise a question, I will not entertain it.

An hon. Member: Chicken!

Mr. Lawrence: The way in which the front bench opposite has acted in the last couple of years and, indeed, in the last couple of weeks—I am speaking about their handling of this bill and the capital punishment issue—leads me and many others in this country not to trust their word any longer.

With that, sir, I will sit down. If the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell), or any other prattling member opposite has a question to ask me, I will be glad to try to answer.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat made some comments about the duration of the debate on third reading. I assure him that the government does not intend to ask for completion of the debate today. If we run out of speakers, I will take the opportunity to move the adjournment of the House so that debate may resume on Monday.

Hon. Martin O'Connell (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I intend to say only a few words on third reading. The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) built his case of mistrust in the government on false

premises. He suggested that the commutations which have taken place in recent years are based on the royal prerogative of mercy; at least, that is how I understood his argument. I stand to be corrected, but believe that the commutations in question have not been based on the royal prerogative of mercy. There may be one or more cases in which that prerogative has been exercised. In general, however, commutations have not been based on it. They have been based on a section of the Criminal Code authorizing the governor in council to commute sentences without using the royal prerogative. Surely the hon. gentleman is misleading the public if he builds his case of distrust in the governor in council on the royal prerogative of mercy argument when this very parliament gave the governor in council authority to commute sentences without using the royal prerogative. That prerogative has been untouched.

That will be my only intervention in this part of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Five o'clock.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking just because the government House leader said we shall adjourn if there are no more speakers this afternoon. I want to say a few words on third reading. Since there are not too many people present whom I can bore, this is a good time to speak.

I do not agree with the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) who suggested there has been unfairness in this debate. In my time as a member of the House we have discussed capital punishment four times. We have gone through a good deal of emotion, discussion and soul-searching in this matter. In the end it boils down to this: either you believe in capital punishment or you do not. When all is said and done, all the arguments about capital punishment being or not being a deterrent really come down to one thing: you are either for capital punishment or against it.

About a week ago, when speaking with constituents who were berating me for being an abolitionist, I pointed out that I had fought three elections since I had made known my position publicly and they had not objected. Judging from my last questionnaire, the majority of people of my area were in favour of abolition. If they have changed their position, it is not known to me; although I must point out that retentionists have made their position known vociferously.

I asked my constituents how many people they thought would be executed in one year if we were to reinstitute capital punishment. One chap said he thought about 5,000 would be executed; another said the number was not so high, maybe about 3,000. I said to these people that if we executed that number every year we should quickly eliminate the criminal element right down to the level of pickpockets or kids who go joyriding, because it would not take long for the message to get across to people in jail that crime does not pay. But I do not think even retentionists suggest we should hang that many people.

When I told my constituents that the retention of the death penalty might mean that we would hang, say, ten or 15 people a year—unless something really drastic were to happen within the next few years—one of them, I think the one who thought we would hang about 5,000, said,

[Mr. O'Connell.]

"Then you're making a hell of a lot of fuss over such a small number of people." Perhaps because of the small number involved the deterrent argument is no longer being used.

I did not vote with my party when the House divided on motion No. 4, which would allow a convicted person to choose death instead of imprisonment because I have for long felt that an extremely long prison term is the highest price anyone can pay for an offence. I felt, when the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) said that there would be imposed a 25-year mandatory sentence for first-degree murder and a 15-year mandatory sentence for second-degree murder, that he was calling for an extremely stiff penalty. I know that in certain cases the court might recommend reduction of sentence. Even so, think of it this way: the person of 40 or 50 years of age faces the prospect of spending the rest of his life in jail, with no hope of getting out, with no hope of being with his friends and relations. He must be locked away for the rest of his natural life. I suggest he will pay far too great a price, and in those circumstances I would favour providing the prisoner with the means to end his own existence. That does not mean the state should execute him; it means he should make the decision. Because he is in confinement, the state must provide him with reasonable means for eliminating himself. Frankly, I think a lot of people would take that choice. It think it would be a good choice.

Mr. Speaker, we will soon be faced with the problem of mercy killing. I am thinking of the person in hospital, terminally sick and suffering untold agonies. I am thinking of those whose minds have gone, an example being the young lady in the United States who was in a coma for a long time. People like that obviously have lost the ability to decide. Equally obviously, any prudent person caught in such circumstances would, if capable of making a decision, take that way out.

● (1500)

Some have said that it is a barbaric situation to allow people to commit suicide. However, we may remember a situation not too long ago with our neighbour to the south which is not considered barbaric. Many of that country's citizens berated Francis Gary Power for not taking the cyanide capsule he was given when he fell into enemy hands. Because of his special mission, it was anticipated he would take the pill and destroy himself. He carried a large number of national secrets. Therefore he was a great risk to the United States. They felt he should have done the honourable thing.

If it is all right in those circumstances, it should be available to someone with no hope for the future. A society that is socially well adjusted should make that kind of provision. I am sorry other hon. members do not see it that way.

I am not the least bit pleased with the way the motion has been written. If passed, I am not sure it will accomplish exactly what is intended. That brings us to another problem. Many motions presented during this debate have been poorly constructed. This indicates that members of parliament are receiving inadequate legal advice on how to prepare these amendments. This is something that should be looked into. A member who does not have legal training

should be able to get the proper legal wording for his amendments in order to accomplish what he wants. Many motions in this debate were not properly worded.

I would not only be surprised but offended if what the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham said should come to pass because of something that he does. I have known him for a long time and have considerable respect for him. I would not like to see him travel throughout the country fanning his argument for the purpose of an election. If the Conservatives form the next government, they will not immediately change this legislation. If the hon. member gives that impression, he is being dishonest. If some opposition members argue that they have been unfairly treated in this debate, this is also dishonest. The number here today who are in opposition are very small.

Mr. Towers: They are good, though.

Mr. Peters: I do not think they are good. I remember two members of this House who really believed in an idea. They were here every Friday for six years. Every time that particular subject was discussed, they were here to discuss it. They put up a good fight.

With all the amendments to this bill, we have had an excellent fight. It has been a parliamentary fight. It has been the kind of fight that ought to take place here, one that is fought hard and with all the weapons at our disposal. However, when a decision is made, even though the majority is small, it should be given a chance to work.

This is only a simple amendment to the Criminal Code. It could be made by any government or any parliament. If circumstances change, and the reintroduction of the death penalty is warranted, it will be reintroduced. If new evidence comes forward or if circumstances change, I am sure the government will reintroduce capital punishment. Despite what the injured lady member may think, as circumstances change, members' opinions usually change. In my opinion, this is not a final decision. However, I am happy that it is not going to come forward on a periodic basis. It should not become an election issue.

There was another piece of legislation within the past ten years that was very important. I refer to the flag debate. That was fought hard and long during many hot summer months. The legislation finally passed. As I travel throughout this country, particularly northern Ontario, with the exception of the May 24 weekend, I am pleased to see that the Union Jack is no longer flying from the masts of this country.

Mr. O'Connell: Put it the other way around.

Mr. Peters: That is the way I see it. Although I was not totally enamoured with the design of the flag, it was adopted and became the Canadian flag. Canadians accepted it. I think that they will accept this piece of legislation, although reluctantly in many cases. If it does not do what they want, I am sure they will demand that it be changed. I believe members of parliament will react in that way.

Mr. O'Connell: Were you happy to see it go?

Mr. Peters: I certainly have no objection to the Royal Ensign being flown on the Queen's birthday. I fought under that flag for some time. It served its purpose. However, we made a change. The Canadian public accepted that change, and I hope they will accept this one.

I have never been particularly interested in one thing that is inherent in many of the amendments. I refer to the price we paid five years ago with regard to police and prison guards. I think most people will agree that those in our police forces have been paid a fairly good salary and have received the benefit of certain legislation. In addition, they have the right to carry a gun. That does not necessarily make the fight even, but it certainly helps. There have been a number of cases where that has been a factor.

A jury in North Bay recently heard the case of a policeman stopping a car and hauling out the driver of that car. A scuffle ensued, during which time the policeman drew his gun. The driver of the car took the gun away from the policeman and shot him. The jury found the accused not guilty, and he walked away a free man. An interesting comment made during the course of that trial was that if the policeman had not brought the gun into the fight, no one would have been killed. There is a certain amount of truth in that.

In my opinion the police have to exercise a great deal of responsibility. The other day a retentionist said that the police will now shoot all criminals rather than take them captive. If that happens we will be well on our way to becoming a police state. I believe we are headed in that direction fast enough without encouragement being given to those who want to accomplish that.

● (1510)

We are always happy to ask other people to do unpleasant things for us. The general public has to decide that it also has a responsibility for maintaining law and order and that when the need arises it has a duty to respond. If they have to give testimony in court they will have to do so even if they lose a day's pay. I have heard people say they would not testify in court because they would lose a day's pay, receiving only a pittance in exchange. Surely that is not the spirit in which we should approach the process of justice. We should not always depend on other people to do the proper thing.

There is no doubt that the public is demanding protection but I do not believe that killing ten or 12 people a year will make any difference to the social morass we find in our major cities. I do not think there would be any great change in habits of those in the drug-oriented sections of society or those who are involved in organized crime—the latter have been able to acquire a good deal of status in the community which they damn well do not deserve; they get it because some of them are reaping great rewards from activities which take advantage of discreditable social conditions.

I am surprised that the Solicitor General has not spent more time and effort helping to correct some of the problems which will affect our penitentiaries after the passage of this legislation. I am not thinking of the legislation itself but of some of the things which have been said during the debate, both here and outside.

It has been said, for example, that no guard will be safe in a penitentiary when there are murderers confined there because they will be able to commit murder again with impunity. The fact is that this has only happened twice in

our history. Only twice has a person convicted of murder been allowed out and murdered a second person, so it is not a real argument. Nevertheless it is the kind of argument which will stir the guards up and scare the pants off them. A scared penitentiary service will be dangerous to itself and to the whole institution, and the injured lady, despite anything she may say about this, any ideas she has on this subject are purely superficial. The remarks she makes are an indication of that.

Very few guards get into difficulty unless they are violent and rough with inmates. Undoubtedly there are psychotics in these institutions to whom normal standards do not apply but in the main, and I have talked to hundreds of guards, guards who are good guys are in no trouble. Those who are not, either get out or find themselves in serious difficulty.

This was well demonstrated in St. Vincent de Paul. We remember the difficulties which occurred daily in that penitentiary. They were eliminated by giving the guards some training and using more selectivity in choosing the guards. Efforts were also made to improve relations between the guards and the administrative staffs. The situation was improved 100 per cent with very little effort on the part of the penitentiary authorities. A little instruction and a little help would be of great value in lessening the animosity which develops between the guards and the prison staff. I have in mind the situation in British Columbia, for instance. In my opinion the guards decided to shoot one of the counsellors because they were very unhappy with her conduct. That was a decision, and that kind of thing indicates a total breakdown in the relationship between the two sections. I think a lot more money will have to be spent—

Mrs. Holt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the guards at the British Columbia penitentiary have been maligned and that feeling is borne out by the inquest which ended last week. I think the hon. member's remark was grossly unfair to the tactical squad whose lives are now in jeopardy. They have been absolved of all blame.

Mr. Peters: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know anything about the inquiry which was held. I will just leave the one fact with you, Mr. Speaker. You can decide for yourself.

An hon. Member: What fact?

Mr. Peters: It seems to me they decided to issue guns to a number of guards, and then they got the guns back and mixed them up right away so that they would not be able to find out which one fired the shot, knowing that the bullet would eventually be recovered. This indicates to me that there is a breakdown between the two sections, the one which dealt with security and the one which was trying to accomplish a measure of rehabilitation. It is my opinion that the rehabilitation section did not come out very well.

I raise this aspect because assertions that the guards will be placed in jeopardy will create a great deal of dissatisfaction and fear among the guards and, if this happens, nervousness itself will create a situation intolerable for many of the guards and others working in that field.

[Mr. Peters.]

I myself have no objection to violence. I am not a pacifist by any means. I have no objection to being in the armed forces and killing if necessary. That does not bother me, because it would be an action against an enemy, whoever the enemy might be. And this might apply even against my own neighbour. I could be very vengeful in many situations. But I do not think I could justify going into a court tomorrow as a member of a jury knowing that my vote, one of 12 but the only one that exists for me, would lead to the execution of some individual. I would never be sure I was right. And because I would not ask anyone else to do what I would not be willing to do myself it is not hard for me to make up my mind on this issue.

There is no need to call further attention to all the doubts and misgivings which may arise, or to the part played by such important factors as the environment or the social background of an accused person. An important consideration to my mind is that no rich man in this country has ever been hanged since the days of Confederation. And no rich man ever will. If you can buy a proper defence under our court system you will not be convicted of a capital murder. But this is not true of all classes in our society. It is not true in the case of the poor Indian who comes into court undefended, possibly unaware of the charge against him. Such a person as he would inevitably face the severest possible penalties. He is the one who is always picked on.

● (1520)

I firmly believe there should not be capital punishment. I think society is big enough now to take care of most of the people who are anti-social and who cannot fit into what we set as the standards for society. It is my opinion that we are getting to the stage of also being able to look after people in our mental institutions, society's misfits. We have not been concentrating our attention upon them. Surely the answer is not building more jails to hold more people; instead we should determine how these people relate to society.

Society has not the right to vengeance. If those who want to keep the death penalty are not prepared to argue on the basis of its deterrent value, then I suggest all that is left is vengeance, and surely society cannot afford the luxury of vengeance. We should continue to eliminate the cause of crime, which in many cases is committed by people who are unable to help themselves in any other way.

I suggest that whatever decision we make in the next few days, it will not be final. Most of us who believe in the abolition of capital punishment are fully aware that if the situation develops where we can no longer handle our criminals without capital punishment, we shall have to review the situation, not as moralists, not from the point of how we feel about it, but on the basis of passing the legislation that society requires. I only hope that those who fought on the other side will carefully watch what takes place and ascertain whether or not the time has come for them to renew the fight for what they believe in on the basis of what has developed. I hope they do not stir up emotions that are easily stirred up on the part of people who have not had the benefit of the knowledge imparted to members of the House by many notable organizations that

have presented their case very fairly and with great ability.

I feel that this, like most other laws, has no particular finality to it. It is an indication that most members of the House feel that society does not demand a death penalty to deal with its criminal element; but if the situation changes, then another day the other side might win.

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the comments of my colleague from Timiskaming who said that in Canada a rich man could never hang. It reminded me of the policy of capital punishment instituted by this government over the past eight years or so. This policy does not relate so much to the life of a man as to a man's capital.

The government across the way has determined upon a new way of capital punishment. Its members tax the industrious people of this country in order to raise huge government revenues, and they then turn around and invest the revenue in businesses which compete with the businesses of the taxpayers from whom they took the money in the first place. However, that is not particularly relevant to this debate and I would not want to be anything other than relevant.

I should like to refer to the preparedness of the government in this debate. It was evident earlier today, I think, that the government was completely unprepared, even though the bill has been before the House, before committee, and then has been brought back again to the House over a period of many months. The calendar this year is very similar to the calendar last year. The government knew very well when July was going to begin and it could very well have determined when the session would end or the recess was going to commence.

This morning we witnessed what I would call a spectacle of incompetence when the government House leader tried to short-circuit the well-established rules of the House. One member cannot, of course, control the House. Even the four House leaders found that they were not completely in control this morning. Therefore I have no real complaint when I find the government House leader has finally succeeded in putting his motion and getting it approved by the House in my absence. They are the rules, Mr. Speaker; I understand them within the limit of my ability after four years in this House, and I accept them.

The point I want to make to the House, Mr. Speaker, is that the government had no need to pass this bill on any particular day. It makes not a particle of difference to anyone in Canada whether Bill C-84 is passed today, next Wednesday, July 29, or indeed October 12. Although capital punishment has been on the law books of Canada for goodness knows how many years, there has not been one instance during the last 14 years of capital punishment being carried out; every single death sentence has been commuted or deferred.

This is a typical example of the attitude taken by the government. Its members feel they can order things just as they wish to have them ordered. I hope that once in awhile they continue to get a few surprises. As I said on second reading, there is absolutely no need for this debate in the first place since the present law on capital punishment does not expire until December, 1977, a year and a half from now.

When I first came to this House in 1973 following the 1972 election the House then considered a bill on capital punishment, the reason being that the government at that time had let things go for too long. The government does not know what timing is, it seems, except perhaps when it comes to winning elections. In 1973 the capital punishment provisions had expired and so we considered a bill. We are now being asked in 1976 to pass a law that will replace a bill that does not expire until 18 months from now.

I made what I thought was to be my only contribution in this debate on second reading, but I find myself compelled to make some summary remarks regarding the issue of capital punishment itself. I was, of course, disappointed at the result of the votes to date. I do not say this for any political or personal reasons but because I have the genuine belief, though I think some others in this House have not, that society deserves the protection that capital punishment provides.

● (1530)

Many questions have been raised during this debate and in committee on how the state is to protect the innocent members of the public. The government says it will put the murderers in jail. The very people to whom we have entrusted the jail-keeping and the enforcement of our laws have told the government and members of parliament on all sides, time and again, that there must be some ultimate penalty for murder in this country. I am going to use the word murder, although in the debate so far it has been obvious that a similar penalty has been called for in respect of high treason, treason, and other serious crimes such as the hijacking of aircraft.

I do not know whether it is appropriate at this time to mention the incident at Entebbe, but there was a case of air piracy, pure and simple. There is no question about it. Hundreds of innocent peoples' lives were put into danger. There was no government in a position to impose a penalty on those hijackers that was suitable or at least sufficient to ensure the safety of those hostages. What happened in that case? We had what we might describe as an international incident. Really it was a matter of a minor war in which a force from one country made a sudden, middle-of-the night invasion of another country.

There was all sorts of killing and the world in general praised that act, although one or two were moved to call it an act of supreme aggression. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) said in this House that he, if not welcomed, at least admired the action of the Israeli force that went in there in an admitted act of bravery and rescued those innocent people. Yet the Government of Canada assumes no action is needed to protect the innocent of this country. The state has a duty to protect the innocent, and what has been proposed in Bill C-84, which has been unchanged to date, is that we will take despicable murderers and imprison them for life.

Perhaps we should divert for a moment and define for ourselves what is a murderer. We are not talking about someone who in the heat of passion kills, or one who kills accidentally one way or another. There are lesser penalties

for that. We are talking about the most heinous crime, murder; the willful taking of another's life.

There was an incident just this week in the United States, I believe it was. In any event it occurred on a bus when, with the slightest provocation, a passenger pulled a gun, shot and killed another passenger on the bus, then ran off and disappeared somewhere, probably never to be found again. If that had happened in Canada and he had been found, the government's proposal is that if he were convicted of murder, and that is not even certain, he would simply be sent to prison for life. Of course life is subject to definition. The bill would lead you to believe that life means 25 years. I would hope that many men who were convicted of murder and sentenced to 25 years' imprisonment might, when they came out, be so old and feeble they could no longer be considered a menace to society. But our prisons are not always like that.

The situation in prison is untenable and certainly unpleasant, and when a man of any age whatever is facing 25 years in prison what is another life? He can only serve one. The Solicitor General and his friends over there were so accommodating to accept the amendment of my colleague, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), which provided that one accused of murder for the second time would be charged with first degree murder. What a sop that is.

Those on the other side do not seem to have considered that these killers have contacts on the outside. They have certain abilities. We heard during the question period today about guns and ammunition being found inside prisons. There are countless stories of weapons being fabricated in prison workshops. At the British Columbia penitentiary in the last 16 months there have been seven hostage incidents. I do not know how many deaths have resulted from them, but certainly there have been some.

I would ask those on the other side, and the government which presented this bill, to consider the effect on the work of prison guards particularly, and on the very people we call upon to enforce our laws, the police all over this country. I do not understand how we can be so fortunate in Canada to have a force of policemen and prison guards remaining on duty today. The government have shown that it cares not at all for the lives of these policemen and prison guards.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said to the retentionists that if capital punishment were retained in Canada somebody would hang, and that such hanging would be on the shoulders of the retentionists. Of course that is the case, and I do not think there is any retentionist in this House who does not fully realize that and is not fully willing to accept the responsibility. Neither the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) nor any single member of that cabinet over there apparently had any consideration for the responsibility that would fall upon them and all of the abolitionists who voted in favour of this bill for the death, by any gruesome method, of any innocent member of society in Canada. It disturbs me greatly; more than that, it confounds me how such a caring group of people could so easily dismiss the fate of some innocent members of society.

[Mr. Clarke (Vancouver Quadra).]

I have heard all the bleeding heart arguments about how we must be kind to prisoners because society was mean to them and we must try to rehabilitate them because they are really good people. I could not really argue that there is some amount of truth in it, but how can that be a truth when it is applied to a hired killer, someone who has been paid thousands of dollars to kill a person? How can that be applied to the killers in Montreal last year who locked up 13 people and burned the place down? I have not heard a single argument from the government side, or from the abolitionist side, to justify the saving of the life of this kind of person.

● (1540)

The abolitionists are all very concerned about the lives of a few murderers in this country. How many can there be? Why should they spend all this time agonizing over this scum of the earth? Why do we not worry a little bit about you and me? Why do we not worry a little about the policemen's widows and children? Six thousand people are killed on the roads in this country, but this hardly gets a headline. People are used to this sort of thing; it is not news. But one murderer who for some heinous crime against society deserves to die, deserves to be removed from society permanently, gets all the attention. It is absolutely incomprehensible.

I often think that there is very little difference between the abolitionists and retentionists in most cases. I have spent many hours talking to my friends and my colleagues who are abolitionists and I find that we agree right down the line up to a point. My abolitionist friends agree that persons convicted of murder should be removed from society permanently. The only difference that we seem to have is in how to implement it permanently. The abolitionists say that such a person should be kept in jail for the rest of his natural life. When the bill was finally presented to us we found that "the rest of his natural life" has been reduced to 15 years, and although I cannot interpret all the technicalities in the Solicitor General's bill, my information is that many murderers will be out of prison in much less than 25 years, perhaps 15. I have even heard, and I have not had it refuted yet, that escorted absences may be allowed after one year in prison.

If the abolitionists and retentionists agree that a murderer guilty of some terrible crime against society should be removed from that society permanently, then the argument should simply evolve on how best to achieve that end. Obviously if the removal from society is achieved by executing the guilty person, that is fine. We heard from my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), that the law we are passing now is not final. Well, it may not be final for the murderers but you can be sure it will be final for a good deal more innocent victims that it would have been if the opposite case were true.

I have asked many of my abolitionist friends how we should keep these horrible offenders away from society if we do not execute them, so that the innocent members of society are protected in this so called free and democratic country of ours. Well, they say, we will put them in prison. Then we get right back to the argument about how we should keep them in prison where, skilled as they may be, they have nothing better to do all day in prison but to make their weapons, or receive them over the fence, and

dream up ideas on how to escape. What deterrent is there in a life sentence once one is serving a life sentence?

We have heard all the arguments about whether hanging or execution is a deterrent or is not, but our whole society is built on the deterrence of punishment of one kind or another. If that were not so, we would not need to worry about any kind of fines today. We would not have to worry about policemen issuing tickets here on the hill, in the city, or on the highways for speeding. We would not need to bother locking our shops and our houses because breaking and entry would not be an offence punishable in any way. The whole thread of our society is based on punishment for deviation from the accepted rule.

There are many changes that occur as society evolves, and I am not one to suggest that society should remain rigid. We can all think back 50 to 100 years when crimes which are laughed at today were considered capital offences. At one time the stealing of a loaf of bread carried the death penalty on conviction, and pickpockets had their hands cut off. Those punishments were on the books and were meted out for their deterrent effects, just as all the punishments that are on the law books today are meted out as deterrents. It was decided, as society evolved, that certain crimes did not call for quite such severe penalties as others. Whether that added to the incidence of crime I am not able to say, but the principle remains that if we are to continue our society as we know it, we must have some penalty that is a deterrent.

It may be that life imprisonment is a sufficient deterrent for some people. I think that life imprisonment might keep many in this House from committing that final act that they might sometimes think of committing. But what can we expect a prisoner under a life sentence to think, when all he has to lose by killing anyone in sight is a further life imprisonment?

The basic premise is so simple, so easy to understand, that I do not understand what the government in presenting this bill, and the abolitionists in supporting it, can possibly be thinking. They say they want a safer Canada for innocent citizens. How can you make a country safer for innocent citizens by removing from the law enforcement agencies the final tool that they have for the protection of society?

● (1550)

I spoke earlier about the duty of the state. I heard the Solicitor General say that the state does not have the right to impose the death penalty to protect the innocent citizens of Canada. What can the citizens expect of the state if they cannot expect protection? In fact something like 80 per cent of the people in Canada seem to be demanding that these days. I have yet to hear the government explain the difference between executing an enemy of the state in the form of a murderer or of a person guilty of treason or piracy. What is the difference between executing one of those despicable people and calling upon an ordinary citizen in time of war to kill another kind of enemy of the state? To me the difference is minuscule, and the explanations offered are not satisfactory.

I would welcome any explanation which could answer some of these arguments. Over the months I have listened to the arguments, but there has been no explanation about how we are going to keep these heinous criminals from harming Canadians. There has been no explanation of the difference between killing in war an enemy of the state and the killing of a person who on July 17 becomes an enemy of the state. I think the people of Canada want an answer. They have let their opinion be known, and the majority of this House in its so-called democratic way has given its answer. I suspect that the people of Canada in their democratic way will give their answer the next time they get a chance.

I have mentioned some practical considerations with regard to keeping murderers in prison. Perhaps I should say impractical considerations, because I do not think it is possible. Some would raise the matter of cost. It is certainly costly to keep a prisoner locked up. I am told that the cost is about $18,000 per year per prisoner. At one time I might have attached more significance to that cost than I do now. It is obvious that this government in the past eight years has paid very little attention to costs of any kind, but I think it is fair to say that one should not argue about human life in terms of dollar costs.

People have argued that juries and judges can make mistakes, and that innocent people can be convicted. In my remarks at second reading of this bill I quoted an old friend and jurist in Vancouver, the Hon. John Valentine Clyne. He wrote to me with great concern at the time of the earlier stages of the consideration of this bill, because he was concerned about what would happen in Canada. When he was on the bench he saw many of these cases. He was concerned that too many people would feel that the system of justice in Canada would not serve to protect an innocent accused person, but he was convinced from his experience on the bench that the system available to an accused in Canada, whether he be rich, as the hon. member for Timiskaming said, or whether he be poor, assures that there is no danger of having a wrongfully accused person executed.

However, as an aside, I ask what difference would it make if a person was executed or if he was imprisoned wrongfully for 25 years? There is no way the state can bring back a life, but there is also no way the state can repay a man for 25 years of wrongful imprisonment. Arguments such as that should lead those who think that way to spend the rest of their lives in bed because, if they dare set foot out of bed, they might break their leg, be run down by a car, or fall down a flight of stairs. That kind of thinking is so antiquated and backward that it hardly deserves comment at this time.

In a week or so we shall be having visitors from around the world at the Olympic Games. One month ago Vancouver was host to representatives of 136 countries in the United Nations for the Habitat Conference. These major events invite violent visitors to this country to perpetrate their vile acts. The passage of this bill will leave Canada powerless to control that kind of violence. We know that particularly this year there have been special rules put into effect for immigration purposes so that we can keep undesirable aliens from entering Canada and causing trouble at such things as the Habitat Conference and the Olympic Games. However, we know that people can come across the border either by subterfuge or by sneaking across.

● (1600)

We talk about our undefended border; it certainly is. Anybody can come into this country from the United States through miles and miles of the undefended border. It is all very well to have rules for immigration if a visitor wishes to come in through the formal channels and be examined, but it is clear that there are many roads open into Canada which are not officially scrutinized. If we have an incident in this country this year, next year, or in the future, what will we do then? Are we inviting people to come here and commit crimes? It may be that some countries instil fear in their criminals by imposing severe penalties. Canada will be putting every visiting dignitary in a danger that would not exist in his own country or in many other countries. I think I referred already to hired killers. They come into the same category.

If I may summarize what I am trying to say to the good minded abolitionists who are voting for this bill, it is that they owe something to the protection of the citizens of Canada. I have never criticized the motives of an abolitionist. As I said earlier, our ideas are very close, that is, the removal of the offender from society, permanently. I am simply saying that the method of long prison terms—even for the rest of one's natural life in prison—is not a satisfactory way of removing a killer from society permanently. There is only one way to do that and it is by some form of state execution. It does not need to be hanging. I think the press has done an injustice to the people of Canada because every time the media mention capital punishment, especially on television, there is a picture of the noose in the background. The noose may not be the answer.

An old friend from Vancouver, the Hon. John Valentine Clyne, wrote to me saying that he had done a study when he was on the bench about methods of execution. He had compared hanging with the gas chamber and one or two other methods—and for whatever reasons that he was unable to give me in the letter—it was his conclusion that hanging was probably the most satisfactory.

I sense, Mr. Speaker, that you are about to rise so I will close my remarks with a final appeal to the abolitionists in this House who also represent the innocent citizens of this country that they give final consideration to the innocent people in Canada who desire, deserve, and demand the protection of the state.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Five o'clock.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the undertaking that I gave a little earlier that there are no more speakers this afternoon, I move the adjournment of the debate and, if that is acceptable, I will move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is moved by Mr. Sharp, seconded by Mr. Drury that the debate be now adjourned.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Clarke: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I understood the government House leader properly, but if he said he was moving the adjournment of the debate then I do not think it would be acceptable, but if he meant to adjourn the sitting for today that is quite a different thing.

An hon. Member: That is what he said.

Mr. Clarke: I did not hear him say that, Mr. Speaker. In his incompetent way he has bungled it again. Perhaps he could repeat it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The minister, by adjourning the debate, was postponing it until Monday morning when it would start again, to make sure that if something happens during the week end there is no difficulty. The debate is suspended until the next sitting of this House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed we call it five o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to the order made this day.

At 4.08 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 12, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Friday, July 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the third time and do pass.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the debate at this point to indicate to the House what my position will be when the third reading vote on this bill is taken.

When I voted in favor of the principle of abolition of the death penalty on second reading of the bill, I did so after a great deal of study, in which I learned that in no country has it been demonstrated that capital punishment is a deterrent to committing murder, and it is for that reason that I believe that the most effective punishment for the crime is life imprisonment.

However, since the second reading vote, I have learned from my riding that the overwhelming majority of the people living in Prince Edward-Hastings strongly favour the retention of the death penalty for the crime of murder committed against any person. I have always believed that when a member of parliament is made aware that a clear majority of those living in his riding hold a strong opinion on an important matter which is before parliament for decision, it is the duty of the member to express that opinion in parliament on behalf of those he represents, and to back up that opinion with his vote.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to vote against this bill when the third reading vote is taken, and by so doing, express the very strong opinion of the overwhelming majority of those I represent in parliament that the death penalty should be the punishment meted out to those who commit first degree murder.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members recognize that at this time there is not very much new which can be said with regard to the retention or abolition of capital punishment. I think, however, that the events of recent weeks have demonstrated quite clearly to Canadians that Canada, in all likelihood, is about to become an abolitionist state.

● (1110)

I should like to take some time on third reading to put on the record what I think becomes the obligation, now in view of the fact that we are likely to abolish capital punishment, of some sectors of our society other than parliament. The real issue that we have been talking about has been the issue of law and security or law and order. That is not a goal that can be attained by legislation alone. The attainment of that goal is an obligation that must fall on other groups of our society, and it is highly important that some of these people take on the full responsibility of achieving peace and security.

In this debate I should like to refer to what happens in radio and television, that is the emphasis on negative concepts in which we keep marinating our minds, the soaking up of what we find is bad in society and making that the main subject in our news. Obviously, this is one of the factors leading to the violent crime which takes place in our society. The fact of the matter is that we never hear all the news, we only hear part of the news; we hear the bad news, the negative aspects of the news which enter into the newscaster's script. If advertising sells Chevrolets, bubble gum or beer, then surely it is also true that if we marinate our minds in negative concepts it will have an effect on how we behave, it will have the same effect as advertising on our behaviour. If every time we turn on the television to listen to the news or open up a newspaper and the predominent issues we hear or read about are the negative aspects of what has happened in society, that will have an influence on people who are wavering between behaving acceptably according to the mores of our society and behaving not in accordance with the norms of prescribed behaviour.

Recognition is more important to a human being than whether that recognition is obtained through good or bad behaviour. People have a psychological need to be recognized, and if they know that in the newspaper, the television or the radio we give recognition to the negative aspects of what happens in our society, then obviously that will have an influence on how people will behave. I believe that the spreading of the news has largely been the cause of the hijackings that have taken place around the world. The first hijacking was very novel, but it hit the news every hour following the incident. It is interesting to note that within the first week of that hijacking more hijackings took place. Aeroplanes have been around for a long time but the hijacking concept is very recent and it is interesting to note that following the first hijacking there was a rash of them. I believe the cause was in large part prominence and attention given to it by the media.

I should like to underscore another situation which I think was an inexcusable example of how the press focuses on the negative. This past summer I attended a national student debating seminar for high schools students from

across Canada which was held in Winnipeg. There were students from every part of Canada at that seminar which was held on the topic of regional and economic development. The organizers of this large event invited over 100 students from all over Canada and asked the press, radio and television to film and report some of the activities that were taking place. The television people announced that they would not attend that particular seminar. However, when the organizers arrived the next morning they found the television crews had arrived. The reason they were there was that some vandals had broken windows in the school the night before. Here was a national event with students collected from all parts of Canada speaking on major topics at a seminar which could not get publicity, but when some vandals broke windows in the school the press found that this had to be reported. This exemplifies the fact that the negative aspects get attention in the press. I believe that this kind of reporting leads to some of the violence and to some forms of unacceptable behaviour. In my view, it is not only the politician who should bear the burden of trying to achieve peace and security in our society.

I should like to give another example. Recently on parliament hill the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) was drenched in milk during a demonstration. Later that night I heard on the radio that milk had been thrown on the minister when he spoke in English to French speaking farmers. The implication was obvious, that this was not simply a situation of upset dairy farmers but that the bilingual issue was involved. That kind of reporting is not only inaccurate, it is malicious. When we get that kind of reporting which focuses on the negative, when recognition is given to only certain sectors in our society, this stimulates the amount of violence in which certain elements engage. Surely, there must be a balance between the positive achievements that take place and the negative behaviour that occurs. We should not be continually exposed to such words as terrorist, hijacked, escaped, defrauded, incarcerated, raped, government graft, ransom, arrested, on strike, commando raid, demonstrators, execution, mercenaries, security, alleged plot, revolt, armed guard, Liberals, or defeat. All those words were gathered from one news broadcast. When you listen to such broadcasts and focus on the words, you ask yourself where all the good news is.

I should like to recommend two possible ways of trying to develop a system in which we can focus more on the positive achievements of man and give more credit to those who do positive things by giving them more attention in the news we hear and read. The newspaper guilds should establish within their ranks a regulatory body similar to that established by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. There have been a number of examples across the country of the College of Physicians and Surgeons severely disciplining doctors within its own ranks. I know there is a newspaper guild, but it does not ensure that newspapers give proper balance to the positive achievements in our society versus negative aspects, such as crime and violence. I believe there should be such a regulating body that would have some muscle. Obviously, this is not the role of the government or of some outside agency; it is high time that the press organized such a regulating body.

The other suggestion I should like to put forward is that radio and television should change their practice of coming

before the CRTC in Toronto. Such hearings should take place on a periodic basis in the radio and television broadcast regions. I have heard people in my constituency recommend on numerous occasions that news about crimes be taken off the air, but when you talk to them you find that they watch such programs as Kojak, and this is reflected in the ratings. A more reasoned discussion, however, might show that the very people who watch are those who recognize the risks. If groups made representations at CRTC hearings in a more thoughtful manner instead of basing their judgment purely on the ratings, society would probably have a greater influence on the kind of television and radio programs it receives, and I think this is important.

● (1120)

I would simply conclude by saying, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to have peace and security in society, it is not the role only of the legislator—it is not the role only of the press either; it is the role of all Canadians. I think we could take a tremendous step forward if we could establish a number of organizations which would ensure that radio and television programs would reflect some of the positive achievements of Canadians. In this way, our young people would find a sense of reward in the programs rather than growing up believing that human nature is slanted to the negative and that there is more to gain outside the mores of society than from within. I believe all sectors of our society would then begin to pull together to give the young people a sense of achievement and to play down negativism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have chosen to speak again on third reading debate to oppose Bill C-84 because statements have been made here that beg answers.

The statements of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)—which were most impressive—also require some answers. Those statements better argued for retention than abolition, I may say. The Prime Minister has said this is a guessing game. It is indeed. Any time the state seeks solutions to human behaviour with its hundreds, perhaps thousands or maybe 22 million variations, it is a complex guessing game with no definitive answers possible. No absolutes are available, whether at the polarized ends or in the middle.

There will never be, and never has been, a perfect solution. There cannot be formulas to solve the social problems of a fast-changing, fast-moving society that is bombarded on all sides with depressing, disturbing, distorted information. Not only is society fast changing, but people change and as fast as a solution is found for one individual, never mind the whole of society, another change occurs.

Rather than debating with the Prime Minister I would have preferred to debate with the abolitionist statement of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark). Unlike our leader, he is consistent in that he says nothing—nothing worthy of debate. In fact, I suspect his politics consist of two sides and a fence.

This will be my last attempt to halt a dangerous experiment in the lives of innocent people and the fabric of our

society, Mr. Speaker. I hope that some of the additional knowledge I provide in this debate may cause some who voted for this bill on second reading and who rejected motion No. 13 at report stage, to rethink their position. This vote will be the last chance they will have to represent the wishes of their constituents and at the same time halt some premeditated ruthless killers who have proclaimed they have nothing to lose if they kill again. I believe capital punishment is a deterrent, Mr. Speaker, and I shall explain that later. I am not making a token speech. Some such people have already served notice on our guards and police. Throughout the country the number of murders, attempted murders, vicious, assaults with rape is growing at an accelerated pace.

Perhaps one day in the future when we are advanced sociologically far beyond where we are now in our preventative correction—as was suggested by the hon. member who just spoke—we can face the abolition question and end hanging in Canada. We must not do it in the way of Bill C-84, however, which is an abomination in justice, a trade-off in brutality and cruelty.

When all our children are assured of safe passage into adulthood, when mature programs replace whimsical, hit and miss social work for preventing family breakdown and destruction of children, when our institutions—-schools, hospitals, treatment centres and holding facilities—are competent to prevent and cure social ills before frustration, violence, paranoia, psychopathy and sociopathic ills develop, then I shall be the first—if I am still alive when that great day comes—to strive for abolition. I did work for abolition in the 1950's when every person who killed was sentenced to death if convicted.

Before I go on I want to discuss briefly the right of every member to participate fully in this debate. One or two members—perhaps three—have indicated that we on this side should only participate with token statements to let our constituents know we have taken a position in this debate. I suggest this was a reprehensible attempt to silence and intimidate us which reflects the superficiality of those—very, very few, I might say—who would say that. It only inspires me to greater determination to complete my intervention in this debate.

It is my understanding of parliament that this is the place for debate—that it is here that we make our points and if possible influence others who may have less knowledge or experience in the subjects under discussion—whether it be abolition or finance. Many talented people are gathered in this House and each has some knowledge, experience and wisdom in his or her own field to pass on to others. I have learned much from hearing and reading the debates; I must admit I have also learned a great deal about corn and balderdash.

I feel very strongly that I have every right to use my time in debate here, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe in the backroom lobbying that I have seen in this House. If the debate continues in the lobby, I will participate. But I do not believe in rigged votes whether in this House or in party conventions—that means the other parties and my party—where the advocates of one side pack the vote. It is a fraud on the people of Canada. Nor do I believe that inducements or threats should be used to influence people to change their vote—especially when this is a free vote. Unfortunately, both the cabinet and the opposition shadow cabinet are toeing one line so we are not alone over here in the lack of a totally free vote. The NDP is even worse, toeing a party line on an issue as serious as this. Participatory democracy is thus frustrated, Mr. Speaker. Had this been a totally free vote the public wish for retention of the death penalty would have been fulfilled.

Perhaps this rush to get this bill through is so that some people can make history—Richard Nixon made history from his victory—and they are prepared to win by default, by limiting debate and witnesses in committee and trying to intimidate their opponents, thus imposing their wish on the people of Canada and denying the majority the right to the protection of the state.

Canadians today are perhaps more angry over parliament's—and that is both sides of this House—arrogance or elitism in overriding the wishes and demands of about 18 million of their 22 million constituency than they are over the issue itself. This is not the society of Edmund Burke. Ours is a public that is wise, educated and sees what we do within minutes of our actions. It judges us from a background of its own knowledge and experience which in the majority of cases is equal to if not superior and even better than, that of many of us here. In the majority of cases that knowledge and experience is equal to if not superior to that of many members of this House.

● (1130)

My remarks apply even to the media which tries to press its convictions on the public. I am thinking particularly of that segment of the Ontario group which imagines, amusing as that may be, that it is an opinion maker. It tried to establish an erroneous opinion on the Calgary Stampede. The hate mongering *Maclean's* magazine tried it with reports of anti-Americanism, which does not exist in the west. They have been found to be wrong. People of this ilk are writing this type of material on this issue which we have been reading. There are those in this eastern group of the media, and some stragglers from other areas of Canada, who attempt to press their convictions on us and on the public. Perhaps some may mistake this as public opinion. I do not. Most people recognize such writing for what it is, that of one single voice. The public also has the intellect to recognize the exaggeration, perversion of truth and the strange practice of reporters interviewing other reporters on events they all covered together. The Prime Minister described that as "Drinking each other's bath water."

I am disappointed at finding it necessary to say all this. Fortunately, there are some great reporters in this country who can call themselves part of the fourth estate. The others dare not take that name. They are a disgrace to the fourth estate.

There is emptiness in mere talking or writing and in never doing anything. There are those who verbalize about standards of behaviour and morality but cannot meet them themselves. There are those who express compassion for a concept such as abolition but would not fight for the life or freedom of one convicted person. I have seen this both in journalism and law. The very people who criticize my position today have never worked on a parole and never as lawyers or journalists cared a damn for the people locked in cages we call prisons. Nor have they attempted to listen

to the anguish of the guards who are spoken of by some here as less than human. I have heard a member of the NDP talking about bad prison guards. We assign them to the role of protecting us. How dare any member suggest that these people should expect to die or that they are less than human.

It is the attitude of some that our prison guards and policeman are less than human. As if this were not bad enough, inside prisons policemen and prison guards are called pigs. In this very House they were held up to contempt on Friday. If they try to achieve control or discipline, they get no support from the administration. That is the truth in British Columbia. Their lives and the lives of their families are in jeopardy, and they face many threats. But who in this House is listening to them or cares? Which member of this House will take their places after this House enacts laws whereby killers will be locked away for 25 years, their only hope being in hostage taking, murder and escape? That is the only way open to them.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): That is the only way out for them.

Mrs. Holt: That is right. I recall, in days when there was only one degree of murder, capital murder, and on conviction the judge had only one choice, to sentence the killer to death, that I was involved with the tenants of death row. I am speaking of the period of the early 1950 and early 1960s. During that period I approached lawyers, the Law Society, reporters and columnists—all the big talkers, the ones who should care and who put out much of the dialogue we hear on the issue—I appealed to them to help to save some who today would not even be charged with second degree murder, perhaps not even manslaughter, let alone first degree murder.

Most lawyers then who took murder cases did it for everything the accused owned. They charged all the traffic could bear. Few top flight lawyers took murder cases on the basis of legal aid. Legal aid fees then were $100 for the trial, no matter how long, and $50 for preparation fees. There was provision for payment of a transcript if the case went to appeal. Naturally, the amateurs and beginners did not care about the fee. They needed the publicity to establish a practice. I fought at that time to bring legal aid defence fees up to the level of the prosecution fees, which ran at $100 per day, plus all the resources of the state. The Law Society was silent in response to all appeals. Yet some of those people—I hasten to say that there are only a few—are crying out today for abolition. In those days only beginners chased after murder cases in order to get headlines. As a result, many accused were convicted because they were represented by a bad lawyer. But the killer had to face the gallows.

There is a columnist in the west today—at that time he was at the top of the professional ladder—who today accuses me of "wanting to hang every jaywalker." Others here have described me as an ardent retentionist. That is remarkable inaccuracy. I believe in capital punishment for persons who plan and carry out murder for a fee or to satisfy their own ends.

Let me come back to this western columnist. Recently, while searching through some papers, I found a letter I had written to him on July 17, 1957, pleading for his help to save several condemned men in death row. I offered information, letters from these people and insights into life on death row from those facing the gallows who, as I said before, today would not be charged with first degree murder; at best they would be charged with manslaughter. Any reporter would have welcomed this kind of material handed to him on a platter. That columnist would not do anything; he would not help and he remained silent. Today he sits in his study and writes nice columns and attacks all those who did something. But wait; he would do nothing to help even one person. Today, he still does nothing either but verbalize high principles. I could name others.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Who is it?

Mrs. Holt: I could name a couple of others, but I will not. Some day I may write a book in which I shall name them.

As I watch some of the lawyers who were involved in those cases and are now abolitionists, I wonder at the load of guilt they are carrying. In those days, because the convicted killer went to the gallows, they had real reason to feel guilt. I wonder if they do not feel that, somehow, they can cleanse their own souls by voting for abolition because they could not prevent convictions in the past.

I also wonder at some of the journalists who engage in punditry. I remind them all that the end of all talk must be action. When I oppose this bill now, I oppose it because I believe that killers of policemen and prison guards, contract killers, international terrorists who kill and criminals who in the course of rape and robbery kill another human being should be prepared to face the courts on a capital murder charge. They should face the consequences of their acts. I do believe in equality in justice.

There have been many generalizations bandied about in this debate and in the newspapers based on emotionalism. I was going to say, male emotionalism, but that would be chauvinism. I note, too, a great reliance on academia. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) hired a man from academia, Professor Ezzat Abdel Fattah, to say what he wanted said in support of his abolition position.

There are a number of competent people in academia; certainly, those who leave the cloistered halls periodically to work in the real world can make judgments based on reality. But too often academia is a retreat for those who dare not grapple with real life: those whose egoes cannot stand the competition of valid expertise born of worldly experience. They dare not leave those cloistered halls lest their dreams be shattered by life's truths. They would rather collect government money to write "learned papers", for which the only source material is usually provided by students learning to research. Usually, the work is a series of footnote fantasies. They rewrite other theories which, too often, are footnotes from the writings of others who theorize but who are maintaining tenure in accordance with the university syndrome, publish or perish. Perhaps it would be better for society if their academic contributions did perish. I would not waste any more time analysing that ridiculous document produced by Professor Fattah than I would analysing the sort of person who produces such nonsense.

There is another incident to which I must refer, another attempt by the Solicitor General to distort facts so as to make his point. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for the

Solicitor General to demolish a major study of an economist well known in this country and in the United States, Isaac Ehrlich, in order to sustain the abolitionist claim that the death penalty is not a deterrent. Ehrlich examined documents covering some 36 years. On the basis of data pertaining to the period 1933 to 1969, he was able to claim that each execution prevented either seven or eight murders. Some say he has stated that some executions prevented as many as 17 murders. That is a pretty significant deterrent argument. But I gather it does not convince the abolitionists.

The Solicitor General hired one Robert G. Hann, a lecturer and principal of Decision Dynamics Corporation of Toronto, whatever that is. Who knows Hann, and what is Decision Dynamics? I never heard of Hann in the west; perhaps he is known in the east; I do not know. Why should anyone take seriously his report, an instant report assigned to contradict information compiled by Ehrlich in his study? Obviously, it was intended to demolish obstacles raised in this debate aimed at abolition. As retentionists, we are challenged to prove that capital punishment is a deterrent. I have already given proof through statements from the mouths of would-be killers. They admitted they were deterred from committing murder when the death penalty existed but would act quite differently now that there is abolition. No one took me very seriously because they are still mouthing their platitudes. With all the research facilities available to hon. members, this documentation can be found to prove that capital punishment is a deterrent. I also pointed out that where murder is deterred, there cannot be comprehensive statistics. Most members here must have, at least, elementary education; they learned that ten times zero is still zero. Therefore, if it is a zero, you will not have a valid statistic.

● (1140)

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), whom I consider to be the most brilliant member of this House, even though he is a refuge from academe, had a worldly experience to offset the cocoon intellect of many who hide in the cloistered halls. In his abolitionist speech of June 15, he said:

> Strictly speaking, therefore, it is not up to me, as an abolitionist, to prove that the execution of murderers will not prevent other murders. It is up to the advocates of capital punishment to prove that it will. If they cannot, their case must fail.

Why is it up to us? We are not the ones who are changing the law, imposing a dangerous unproven experiment on the public. We are not the ones fighting for a weakening of the law, diminishing the protection of the public. We are not in the minority of this nation as are those who are fighting for abolition. We share with the majority, a majority which knows the society in which we live has become angry, the knowledge that death is occurring that would not occur if there were strength in the law. However, since the Prime Minister and others appear not to have noticed the examples given by many members of the deterrent effect of capital punishment, I will provide a few more, and if necessary reiterate some previously given.

First, there is the case of Charles David Garry. Head, age 30, who murdered the seven year old daughter of a British Columbia penitentiary guard, a constituent of mine. He raped the child, Tanya Bush, in every perverted way, assaulted her and then murdered her. His words—and if this is not a message I do not know what is—were "If I kill the father I swing: if I kill his daughter I get nothing more than what I'm serving." Therefore, a child who could not defend herself died. The guard, who was protected by the law, survived. There might not have been another murder because the guard would have been stronger than his daughter and possibly could halt this murder. The little girl could not. No deterrent, hon. members?

Leonard Peletier, the American Indian who killed two FBI agents in the United States and was arrested in Calgary, has been carrying on a relentless battle against extradition in Vancouver. He knows he faces execution for his crime in his country. It is known that he is prepared to kill a Canadian, probably a guard, rather than be returned to the United States where he can die. He knows in Canada he can remain in prison and live, perhaps take a hostage or two, kill someone and escape. It would not matter if he killed two or three people; he would get exactly the same punishment. No deterrent, hon. members?

John Waslynchuk, the aristocrat of bank robbers and safe crackers in the west for many years, gave me insights into prison and crime from his knowledge and experience. Most of this was after I was involved with two police officers in collecting evidence that proved he was innocent in a capital murder case in Seattle, Washington, a bank robbery murder. He was not there at the time and we were able to prove it. Though close to the gallows himself, but reformed by the experience, he still maintained after modified abolition was introduced here in 1968, that if he were still in "business" he would shoot his pursuer or any witness because he could be sentenced to the same time in prison for murder as for armed robbery. It did not matter if it was 14 or 20 years. To him, it was life. What is the difference, he said to me. He told me, "There are advantages to killing". He and one of his associates told me the advantages of killing were so obvious that they wondered why those who abolished capital punishment did not see them. There is the gamble of escape, the elimination of witnesses who could identify them and give evidence against them in a trial. No deterrent, hon. members?

Incidentally, the word in Vancouver is that all witnesses in major cases, cases where long sentences are inevitable, will be put on contract for murder. Can you see what will happen to justice? What citizen or police officer will take the risk to do their civic duty in a court of law? Warnings have gone out to the B.C. Penitentiary task force who were assigned to a terrible responsibility in the hostage incident of June 11, 1975 in which Mary Steinhauser died. They were absolved of blame in that incident by a coroner's jury last week. An NDP member attacked the guards and claimed in this House, without even studying the facts, that the guards had killed her. The coroners' jury found that the killer, Andy Bruce—a man who had already killed on contract—was responsible for Miss Steinhauser's death. He had participated in four hostage takings. He was held responsible.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That was the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

Mrs. Holt: No, it was the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). I would like to remind the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and all the others who

deny the deterrent quality of the death penalty of a case that the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin) would probably have used in her speech as a retentionist had she been able to participate here. She was the one who told me the background on Leopold Dion. After he and his brother raped a girl in Quebec in 1940, he started to strangle the victim to death. His brother shouted: "If you kill her, Leo, you will hang." Leopold loosened his grip. The girl survived. She no doubt gave the evidence that convicted him.

Paroled in 1960, Leopold picked up four small boys aged about nine to 13, and one at a time assaulted them and forced them to their knees to pray before he murdered them. He was convicted of murder, his sentence commuted by cabinet, and his execution was carried out by the inmates of St. Vincent de Paul. But I suppose such executions are acceptable to the abolitionists, as long as the state does not do it, as if the state is not responsible. I am sure the original victim of Leopold Dion would tell you that capital punishment was the deterrent that saved her life.

By 1971-1972 police murderers and guard murderers were pretty sure they would never hang for their crime. Certainly by 1974 it was an absolute certainty. Thus, John Miller, 29, and Vincent Cockreill, 19, could feel secure in their plan to kill a policeman—any policeman. On March 29, 1974, RCMP Constable Roger Pierlett, 23, was ensnared by them in their plan for the senseless execution of a cop. The next day he was to celebrate his engagement. His parents, flying west from Montreal for the occasion, found him on a slab in the morgue. His assassins were protected by the law from the same fate. Roger's older brother, Luke, 29, who at the time did not know whether he was an abolitionist or not, recently said, referring to his brother's killers:

● (1150)

> I am not bitter against them as persons. I don't even know them. But they should hang for the deed they did. When two men can kill a complete stranger, I maintain this behaviour is undermining our whole moral fabric. What the government is doing is giving everyone a licence to kill. They are devaluating the price of everybody's life.

I list these facts because abolitionists say that capital punishment is no deterrent. Somebody will no doubt be saying we shall have to mop up the floor of the House again. But I do not mind a little compassion being shown in this chamber.

Then there is the case of Rainier Peter Schuenemann, 27, who kidnapped Mrs Margaret Siborne, 53, on May 1, 1976. He left her in the woods to die, bound, gaged and tied to a tree, while he attempted to extort money from her husband. When picked up by the police, Schuenemann said:

> I'm a dead man. The woman in the bush for three days without food or water must be dead.

Told Mrs. Siborne was alive, that she had escaped her bonds, the prisoner fell to his knees with his hands over his face and wept uncontrollably, according to witnesses at his trial. He knew that the only person who could identify him had survived to give evidence against him. He knew he would get the same sentence if she had died. But in that event there was a chance that no witness would appear against him and he might thus have escaped conviction.

We are speaking of deterrence. Since there is *de facto* abolition in Canada, perhaps the price demanded for murder in Vancouver today will tell us something about the usefulness of the ultimate penalty as a deterrent. Life is very cheap in Vancouver today. In the 1950s and early 1960s when murder could bring the death penalty, the price of a contract to murder ran anywhere from $2,500 to $25,000. Today it is $50 to $500. Indeed, paid killings are now child's play since it is easy and the penalties are not too severe for hardened criminals to contemplate. Most killers are certain they can get away with it anyway.

Members may be interested to learn that a 10 year-old boy has built up a sophisticated crime gang among peers in Vancouver. He has formed a crime ring, organizing it in a way few older people could have done, and has advertised through the underworld that his gang is prepared to accept contracts to kill. A sidelight to this story is that social workers and civil libertarians, many of whom favour abolition, are upset that in the course of investigating the numerous crimes of this "child Fagin" the police decided to take his fingerprints.

Ernest Von Den Haag in his book "Punishing the Criminal"—and I wonder why the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) did not assign a local to debunk this work—said:

> Life becomes cheaper as we become kinder to those who take it. The burden of proof should be on those who oppose the death penalty, not on those who favour it . . . for say the death penalty does not deter; all we have lost in exacting it is the life of a convicted killer. But if the death penalty does deter, then by refusing to impose it we have consigned to death some future innocent victim.

In refutation of those who maintain capital punishment is not a deterrent, I can produce statements by the very people who use murder as a tool in crime—evidence which the abolitionists could find themselves with a bit of effort. How many times have hon. members read or known personally of cases where the robber got the loot he had come for, but killed anyhow? There was such a case in Burnaby, B.C., in the past week. Three brothers ordered a young clerk to lie face down on the floor while they carried out their crime. They robbed the company, Lumberland, and then they shot the young man in cold blood. They got what they wanted, but the slaying could add little to their penalty if they were caught; it was a gamble, and the murder was an outlet for their brutality.

I could give further proof of the deterrent value of capital punishment, but at the moment I will simply refer hon. members to other evidence which I have put on record in previous speeches. I challenge those who say it is not a deterrent, to prove their case. The onus is on them, not on the majority of Canadians. To quote Von Den Haag:

> If the death penalty does deter, by refusing to impose it we have consigned to death some future innocent victim.

Apropos the dialogue on the deterrent effect, the day after the vote was taken on the second reading of Bill C-84, inmates in B.C. jails and in the B.C. penitentiary were jeering at the guards, shouting such things as, "You lost, we won." Some were saying, "Our quota: one cop a day, one guard a day," or "Careful, pig; we can slash your throat." One particularly violent inmate expressed himself in this way, "Careful, pig; we can slash your throat; we have nothing to lose. You had better start taking Dale Carnegie courses to improve your attitude, because we can cut your throat."

In addition, there were two attempts in recent weeks to take hostages. These, I presume, are now barely noticed in the B.C. penitentiary because they have become so commonplace. The technique in one case was to start a mattress fire in order to lure one or more guards into the cell. This method was used in an American prison last week and it ended in death for four people. We were more fortunate in B.C. because the penitentiary guards there have greater experience. They fought the fire from outside the cell and the inmates got the smoke, not the hostage they had expected.

Let me turn to another aspect of this proposal. I find it remarkable that no serious contingency plan has been prepared to take into account the instant effect of the passage into law of Bill C-84 which provides for 25 years' imprisonment, without hope, for those convicted of first-degree murder, and 15 years—possibly 10 or 20 years—without hope, for those found guilty of second-degree murder. To my mind, this trade-off for abolition is inhuman in its effects both on inmates and the staff. Perhaps the army is being prepared to enter our prisons and assist in dealing with the explosive situation there.

What is likely to happen is that we will return to the medieval practice, dropped 15 years ago, of caging men in tight security locking them in their cells for as long as 22 or 23 hours a day, and put an end to programs which might have rehabilitated a few of them? We are already seeing the abandonment of the practice of issuing day passes to prisoners with possibilities of rehabilitation, brought to an end because of careless handling of this valuable technique for rehabilitation. Yet the only real protection society has is the prospect that convicted criminals will return to the streets better than when they were sentenced, not worse, as is the case after long imprisonment with poor treatment services.

A number of abolitionists resort to the specious, yes, childish whimper, "If you favour capital punishment, you should be prepared to spring the trap." Mr. Speaker, by the same reasoning, those who would abolish it should become guards to look after desperate killers who have nothing to lose if they kill again in the course of a 25-year sentence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: There are other stock lines which are used ad nauseam. One is that the death penalty is simply legalized murder. Mr. Speaker, that is as stupid as it would be to suggest that arrest and imprisonment are nothing more than legalized kidnapping or legalized slavery.

I agree with Von Den Haag that the application of the death penalty to those guilty of premeditated killing is the mark of a society which holds dear the life of its citizens. It is the society which holds life cheap which imposes weak penalties for taking life.

● (1200)

There is another point that must be raised in this debate, and that is that those who attempt murder, intend to kill. When statistics are used in this debate, few recognize the significant fact that there is a large statistic of people who fail in their attempt to murder, though they may succeed in maiming or injuring their victims for life. Take the case of the UBC and Florida criminologist, Dr. Charles Eichman, 38, who beat his wife Cora, 48, almost to death. She had a good life ahead of her, having completed her education to the Ph. D. level in education. She had a considerable amount to contribute. She now lies in an institution in Regina. This was not murder, but partial murder, because in this institution she is unable to do anything for herself. She cannot even think. They use the word "vegetable". Eichman was given a ten-year sentence, and if when he comes out he succeeds in a subsequent murder attempt, this will be regarded as his first murder. When he comes out he will be the better prepared to finish the job because of the lessons he will have learned in prison.

There are two reasons why attempted murder is not murder. The first is because the killer was a bad shot, or did the job badly. The second is that medicine was too good; it saved the life. Attempted murders have quadrupled in Vancouver since modified capital punishment came into effect in 1968. In Canada it has more than doubled. Montreal statistics and general reports indicate that murder and attempted murder has increased as much as or more than in Vancouver.

Candy Knowles, 16, a constituent of mine who lived only a few blocks from my office, died at the hands of a man who once served time for attempted murder. This man's name is Edward Donald Bigelaie. He shot his girlfriend and knifed himself in Toronto in 1960. The girlfriend did not die that time. After 11 years in prison he was released on a pass and never returned. In Vancouver, as Mile Lewis, about age 30, he dated Candy Knowles. The girl's former boyfriend, a postman, was threatened by Lewis but wrote it off as idle talk. Something happened to stop the murder—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but her allotted time has expired. She may continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mrs. Holt: On September 20, 1974, the man who had attempted murder in Toronto succeeded in his second attempt. Candy Knowles bled to death from six bullets that he fired into her. Her cries for help were unheeded by people passing by.

The remarkable speech by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), which influenced so many members of this House, requires answering. He accuses the retentionists of engaging in "specious philosophy" in discussing the fact that if capital punishment saves one innocent life, it is worth while. He called it "compelling rhetoric". However, he set it aside because of a fatal flaw, namely, that we would be experimenting with human lives.

So much that the Prime Minister said in his speech could have been said by the retentionists. What he said could more appropriately apply to the abolitionist philosophy and I repeat it in that light. It is compelling rhetoric, but it contains a fatal flaw, namely, that the abolitionists in this House who want to remove the final and ultimate punishment would be experimenting with human lives. I repeat, the abolitionists, not the retentionists, are experimenting with human lives.

As for the concern of the Prime Minister over a society that adopts vengeance as an acceptable motive for its collective behaviour, is it vengeance any more than any other punishment, or is it strong and equal justice for the most horrible crime possible, that of taking—without right or law—the life of another human being? And what about the collective behaviour for which the state must be held responsible, that of allowing execution by the underworld to continue unabated without any threat to their own style of justice, by police who know that the state is no longer willing to protect them, by inmates in prison, by guards and by citizens who believe that the state's machinery has faltered and broken down? What about that collective behaviour?

The abolitionists constantly ask the question: What civilized country still uses capital punishment? I ask them, what civilized country does what Bill C-84 will do—lock men up for 25 years without hope other than escape through hostage-taking? As reported at page 14500 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister had this to say:

—it is inevitable that the defeat of this would eventually place the hangman's noose around some person's neck.

If I am willing to take on my conscience the execution of police killers and those who commit deliberate murders, I am quite satisfied, if I vote as all of you vote, that I am taking the responsibility for my vote.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: But the abolitionists must also take responsibility, especially those who voted in 1968 and 1972, for saving the lives of sadists. Take the example of three ruthless killers who seized hostages in the B.C. penitentiary incident that ended in the death of Mary Steinhauser and the mental breakdown of at least two prison workers. Because of those votes, these three lived to kill another day. They are Andrew Bruce, a paid contract killer, Dwight Lucas, who planned and carried out an axe murder on the prairies and was the one who for 41 hours held a knife tip in the eye and at the throat of John Ryan, who is now mentally ill, and junkie killer Clair Wilson who, after his conviction, stabbed a sheriff who was guarding him. I think that the abolitionists must accept responsibility for the conduct of these three people.

If the abolitionists win this week in this major vote, the public, which no doubt will feel that their wishes have been treated with contempt, will have their say in the next major vote. Let us hope that the sanction to kill that will be given by this House will not allow the hoodlums to move beyond control before the mistake that the majority vote of this House could be making this week is corrected. I urge hon. members at least to study the points that many of us have made in support of the retention of capital punishment in Canada.

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak following the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt), whose speech was one of the better ones that we have heard in this debate. I have been in touch with this debate right from the beginning of second reading and all through committee stage, and have spoken a little over three hours in total, so I am not going to take long on this third reading stage. Most of the cases that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway brought up are good examples of why I am a retentionist, though I was an abolitionist at one time. Having heard some of the cases that the hon. member referred to, I think a lot of people will, or should, show consideration for change.

One of the points that I want to bring up in this final stage of debate concerns the method of capital punishment that is used today. I think this is one of the reasons some people in this country are still opposed to capital punishment. All through this debate, every time the CBC, CTV or any newspaper carried a major story on capital punishment they showed a rope and noose and talked about how cruel was that aspect of capital punishment.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that some day there will be a return to capital punishment in this country, but I hope that the next time we have to debate this subject we will decide on a more humane form of capital punishment before the debate begins which would remove the situation where everyone who is a retentionist is called a hanger. Other methods of capital punishment can be used, and personally I think the gas chamber is a much better form. Had that method been in effect in Canada, I do not think some of the comments that have been made would have been made. I think the way the press reported the method of capital punishment that is used was irresponsible.

I should like to quote a couple of articles that were sent to me. During this debate all members of parliament have received a lot of mail, and I am no exception; but I have a couple of items that I think are very appropriate. One of them was sent to me by a constituent in my own riding of Burnaby-Richmond-Delta and is about the government's attitude toward capital punishment. I was sent this copy of an editorial which appeared in our local paper, and I should like to read it. It states:

● (1210)

Morally, intellectually and psychologically there is a glaring irrational streak in the federal government's attitude toward the sanctity of human life.

The Trudeau cabinet is committed—some of its members emotionally so—to the total abolition of capital punishment. Yet it not only condones but actively encourages an enterprise which can endanger the lives of millions.

That enterprise, of course, is the peddling of CANDU nuclear reactors to unstable nations.

There has been ample evidence, including India's behaviour, of the dangers inherent in CANDU sales. Now from the U.S. energy research and development administration comes a terrifying report.

A study completed for that body six months ago, but only just made public, says that, based on the output from just half the reactors that the International Atomic Energy Agency has projected would be sold to the less developed nations in the next 15 years, "the annual production of plutonium in terms of minimum bomb equivalents is truly staggering." The 46 countries studied, according to the survey, "could annually produce some 15,100 kilograms (33,022 pounds) of plutonium by 1990—enough to produce 3,002 small nuclear explosives."

In the face of this, continuing CANDU sales to unstable countries like Argentina is to bury our heads in the sands of balance sheets.

It makes a mockery of the government's cliché-ridden expressions of concern for the human predicament.

That is the concern of many of my constituents. I wanted to point that out to the House because I think it is very appropriate at this time. I received another letter, from a young lady in Quebec, which I was not even sure I should

read into the record. It is a sad type of letter, but I did check it out and I think I should read it because it is very important, particularly if we are to talk about one of the things that I consider important, that is, what happens to the victims of crime. I am very saddened that even before we got into this debate the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) did not introduce something to this House which would tell us what he and his government plan to do for victims of crime. With the type of easy-going attitude which this government has adopted in respect of law and order, I think we are going to see an increase in crime in this country. I am sure we will see that increase in the next few years. What is this government going to do for the victims of crime?

Let me read the House this letter to show what can happen to families as a result of these tragic happenings that occur from time to time. It reads:

Dear John Reynolds:

I am 15 years, and cannot wait to be 18 years old so that I will be able to vote, (that is if I make it to that age). And when, and if I ever get a chance I will make sure the person who I vote for is a retentionist like you. And many of my friends intend to do the same. When we are teenagers, people ignore our opinions, but soon we will be the future voters. You see, sir, since last year our whole family's life has changed. My mother has been in the hospital, under psychiatric care. She is out of the hospital now, but still has to take many pills. She cries all the time, and sleeps with a knife under her pillow; she also bought a gun, just in case someone breaks in. My twin sister and I are afraid to go to the store alone, or even to the bank. It is terrible to be afraid, but our family has a good reason to be, because last year my 16 year-old sister, Sharron, went to the store and never came back. She was kidnapped, raped and murdered. And that was at 7 p.m. on a Saturday. I was taught to love and trust, but now I trust no one, not even the government.

Doreen Prior.

It is in cases like this about which the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway has expressed the fear that some of these sick individuals are getting out of prison and doing it again. In one case that she mentioned this did occur, and there have been a number of others. For that reason alone, I think capital punishment has a place in our society at this time. For this reason I emphasize the question as to what the Solicitor General and his government intend to do to protect the victims of crime. Certainly, these people are not being protected at all at this time, yet the persons who are guilty of such crimes under the law that has been in force could be out again in seven years and back on the streets with very little to worry about. I do not think these other people will ever again lead normal lives.

Let me also ask the Solicitor General about the intended review of our penal system. When is he going to put a program before us that will solve the problems that occur in places like the British Columbia penitentiary and Millhaven? We have not seen that program, yet we are being asked to abolish capital punishment. When is the Solicitor General going to bring before this House a program in respect of juvenile crime? The Solicitor General might well say that he does have a book out called "Youth in Conflict with the Law" that is being discussed across the country. That is true, but why can this program not be considered as quickly as the measure to abolish capital punishment? I do not think the priorities of the Solicitor General's department are appropriate.

One of the major problems in this country is associated with juvenile crime. Certainly, in my own area we have taken an active part, with the Solicitor General's department, in respect of this specific problem. I have attended a number of meetings of interested parties. In fact, we are now having meetings on a bi-weekly basis. These meetings are attended by my constituency secretary when I am unable to attend. The people in the area are trying to come up with solutions to the problem of the juvenile crime rate there. I must admit that there is no money available, but the people and the programs are available to solve the problem. Yet here we are abolishing capital punishment, spending a lot of time in this House on the one thing that would probably result in a very small number of people being put to death over the years.

I think the Solicitor General owes it to the country, before this vote is taken on Wednesday, to take some time to come up with his priorities, to tell us what he intends to do in respect of penitentiaries in this country, and to solve the juvenile problem across the land. None of us expects a utopia, and we know the Solicitor General is unable to solve all the problems; but we would certainly like to see a blueprint of a plan the Solicitor General might possibly have to cut down on the number of problems that lead to the existence of some of these vicious people about whom we are talking.

I would like to finish by talking for a minute or two about the vote to be taken on Wednesday. I hope all members of this House will be here for this vote. I know a lot of people are saying that the whole issue has been decided and maybe they should not come back. We heard that from a number of sources over the weekend. Let me point out the closeness of the vote on second reading and the fact that since then we know the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) has indicated he is switching his vote. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) also indicated on the weekend that he is switching his vote. If you add to that the two gentlemen who are retentionists who could not make it for the last vote due to unforeseen circumstances, such as the airline strike, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), that brings us to within two votes.

In view of rumours that others in the House intend to switch their vote, I hope every member will see fit to be here to exercise the responsibility of voting on Wednesday, because I would not like to see an issue that is so close, an issue that has so divided this country—for which we must blame the government—won or lost by one or two votes, with one or two members not present in the House.

Mr. J. Larry Condon (Middlesex-London-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, we are now getting down to the time when we will finally have to make a decision on this very important issue. My great concern—and I will be very brief—is for the feelings of the people in the riding of Middlesex-London-Lambton and, I believe, of the people throughout Canada. I had a very disturbing phone call this morning from one of the teachers in our local high school. She said, "Larry, I took a poll of our grade 13 class with regard to capital punishment, and I am afraid it is going to be quite a shock when you find out exactly what the consensus is, and the percentage." I asked her to tell me, because I felt that perhaps some small pocket in my riding would agree with the abolitionists. She said, "Larry, 90 per

cent of this grade 13 class agree with the retention of capital punishment."

I believe this is an overwhelming indication of how the people of Canada feel. I thought the 90 per cent figure was too high, but I have also heard 80 per cent and 70 per cent expressed as being in favour of retention. My great concern in this respect is for the people and their viewpoint. During my political life, including my background of 11 years in municipal politics, I have always tried to remember what the people want. I was told many years ago never to forget the people, because they are the ones who put us here and they are the ones who will take us out. If we do not listen to the people, we are in trouble because we are not doing the job we have been put here to do.

I am not endowed with an intellectual background. My background, rather, has been one of hard work, getting things the hard way, sometimes by using my shoulders and arms to a greater extent than my head. It is my belief that the people of this country feel that our basic problems can be related to hard work, and their existence may be the result of a lack thereof. When they look at this parliament and see its members completely disregarding the feelings of the people, they lose confidence; and when people lose confidence in government they lose confidence in the basis of the democratic system—this is, government for the people, by the people, something that is said many times in retort. But in this case, on this bill, in making this important decision we come right down to the crunch that these things can be rhetoric no longer.

● (1220)

Let us get back to the grass roots. If I were an abolitionist I would have no qualms about going back to the people and listening to them. There has been some discussion but it is obvious that the abolitionists have not been listening. I feel that at this time perhaps we should take more time and let the abolitionists talk to their people, get their feelings, not just through the newspapers but directly from the people who elected them. It is important to listen to the people of this country if we are to keep it united. There is always the danger that this great union of ours will be broken up, and I would hate to see that done through this bill. I am sure the abolitionists would be glad to talk to their constituents over the summer. If they believe in abolition, they will come back at the end of the summer and vote for abolition. There is no problem there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I propose a motion, seconded by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles):

That all the words after "that" be struck and the following substituted therefor:

"this bill be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day three months hence".

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I considered speaking on third reading prior to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon). My reason was twofold. I will not go into all the pros and cons of abolition and retention put forward in the philosophic debate we have had on Bill C-84 for several weeks. I am one of the members who has been confronted with this question three other times in parliament and, like the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt), who in my opinion made a very powerful speech at the third reading stage and mentioned that she had been an abolitionist, in the philosophic sense, prior to her election as a member, I voted the first time on capital punishment in 1968 in favour of abolition, and the second time I voted for a qualified abolition, or retention, depending on how you define that vote.

I believe that perhaps the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway was more interested and involved in the matter than I was when I was practising law in Vancouver for some years and used to read some of her columns. I must confess that I was not all that involved in the issue before I became a member of parliament, and since then, quite frankly I have been overinvolved in this issue, as has the parliament of Canada, because four times in 11 years this House has debated the issue.

I believe that this issue should have been resolved some time ago. This bill flies right in the face of 70 per cent to 80 per cent of Canadians from coast to coast, and that is one of the reasons I wanted to speak at this time. I do not think this is a normal debate on capital punishment. Before this time we were supposed to be in a trial period, and perhaps Canadians were uncertain as to the conclusions to which such a trial period might bring us, and thus the public, in my opinion, has not been as aroused or irritated and certainly not as frustrated as they are today with Bill C-84 which does not propose a trial period but proposes the total abolition of capital punishment.

We all know that the law until now has been for capital punishment for the murder of prison guards and policemen, yet it has not really been followed, and therefore there has not been a reasonable trial period. In a general sense, that is one of the reasons the Canadian public has been more exercised over the debate on capital punishment this time than at other times. I also think that the Canadian public at large has never been more frustrated, and capital punishment has become the focal point for the frustration of Canadians over a good number of issues, even more than the law and order issue.

It is the feeling of the Canadian public from coast to coast, regardless of their political leanings or beliefs, that the government in Ottawa—that "far away" government if you live in the east or the west, and even sometimes if you live close to Ottawa, geographically—is very far removed from the pulse of the people of Canada. This time it is the feeling of the people that capital punishment is not only symbolic of law and order and the punishment for heinous crimes, but an assurance that law and order will be applied more strictly so that people perhaps will be able to walk on the streets with a greater sense of security.

On this occasion, because of the circumstances in which the country finds itself, capital punishment has become the focal point of people's frustrations on a good number of issues. I will not name them all, but if you pick up the paper you read about air traffic controllers, the Olympics, the unemployment insurance fund, almost any other issue which makes headlines in the papers. There is a feeling among people that the government which they elected is so far out of the mainstream on an issue with which they can identify as much as the member they elected, namely, capital punishment, that, ipso facto, the government must be out of the mainstream and out of touch on other issues.

We have heard the views of members from both sides of this issue, but certainly those favouring abolition, justify their position by saying that this is a free vote, a matter of individual conscience. What has always bothered me about this type of reasoning—the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway certainly met head-on a couple of the specious arguments of the abolitionists against the retentionists, such as, "Will you pull the trap?" and in some cases which I know about, I think I could pull the trap—is that it is the same type as that which says, "Let the abolitionists go to prison or walk the streets at night with a policeman." What she said about legalized execution, if you believe in retention, was a good argument in rebuttal. If you believe that retention is legalized killing, then it can be said that if you arrest someone and put him in jail where he will be making baskets, you are in favour of legalized kidnapping and slavery. This is how ridiculous these arguments have become.

Let us come back to the individual conscience. I do not know whether the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton will pass and there will be a summer lull in the debate—the realities of numbers may prevent that happening—but I know members of parliament who over the July 1 long weekend deliberately did not go home to their ridings because they did not want to encounter, during the July festivities, a public which was not so favourably disposed to their vote in favour of abolition. Well, I went home.

● (1230)

Mr. Boulanger: Name them.

Mr. Nowlan: I am not going to name them.

Mr. Boulanger: I do not think what you say is the truth.

Mr. Nowlan: You are entitled to believe what you believe. I can tell you what I know.

Mr. Boulanger: Prove it.

Mr. Nowlan: I know my hon. friend very well, and respect him. He has a conscience, and I have a conscience; but the constituents who sent us here also have consciences and I have been bemused, even though it is rather serious, by the fact that the individual conscience of hon. members dominates the collective conscience of their constituents. As hon. members who have spoken on this matter, certainly from the retentionist point of view, have said, rarely has there been an issue where the collective conscience, reasoning or verbal expression of constituents from coast to coast, regardless of whether they are Liberal, Conservative or NDP, has been as clear as on this issue. Never has it been as clear, although every hon. member will say something else. Instinctively, I do not think they are right, although I cannot prove my case from statistics or figures.

The abolitionists certainly cannot prove their case from statistics or figures, no matter how preconceived some of the studies have been on this issue. We should not try to confuse the Canadian public with statistics, facts and figures, legal reasoning or logic to which they could be exposed only if they came before the justice committee or heard some of the lucid arguments put forward on the floor of this House. We all know that on this issue, that type of logical assessment of facts and figures just does not apply and it does come down to an individual conscience situation.

I said that it bemused me to hear hon. members, albeit sincerely, stand up for their individual consciences, and I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway that this is not the day and age of Edmund Burke, who wrote a letter to the electors of Bristol to tell them that he stood, not just for the people of Bristol but for all the people of England. Hon. members who referred to that quotation failed to point out that he was not elected at the next election.

I agree that hon. members must lead on public issues, but it is a paradox, to me, that when in this House we say we have a free vote and there will not be pressure applied by the government to lead government members—and we had a good example today of two government members who spoke out for retention—we are nevertheless deliberately defying the larger context of the collective conscience of Canadians by voting for this bill. I just cannot rationalize that paradox. If it is good enough for hon. members to vote according to their individual consciences in a free vote, why are we ignoring the collective conscience as expressed in the polls and by the people who have written to us? I defy any hon. member, including my hon. friend, to say to me that his correspondence has been heavily in favour of abolition. I would say, conservatively, that it is the other way around. It certainly has been for me.

In any event, this will become a focal point of alienation and the people will feel more removed from the government. I say "government" in generic terms; I mean the government of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). If things keep going this way, we will obviously have a government of another kind when we have another election. However, this issue has become a focal point of alienation, and if Bill C-84 carries by this type of vote, that alienation will be increased. It is a paradox that the individual conscience of hon. members reigns supreme because they are members, but they deny the collective conscience of their constituents who sent them here. Some of those hon. members who are abolitionists are my best friends, but I sincerely believe this will not be like the other capital punishment debates and the public will not forget, because it has become a focal point of alienation. I do not think the public will forget about this, because they will continue to feel alienated.

This is not the final time the question of abolition will be before us. It will be before us every time a policeman makes a raid on a house and a suspect is shot. That will bring the issue back through the newspapers and the question will be asked: Did the shooting occur because the policeman knew that if the suspect ended up with the protection of the judicial process, he would never pay the supreme penalty anyway? Thus the policeman may decide who should live and who should not live. That is a horrible thing, no matter how sincerely motivated the officer may be. A colleague of his might have been shot to death, but there is no way that type of thing should be substituted for the judicial process. If we have policemen and, more especially, prison guards in the next two years before an

election ending up dead in prisons or on the streets, that will reactivate this issue, and it will not go away if a one-time killer, as has been demonstrated here in debate—and I am not going to review all the cases—kills again.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway did not mention the case which switched me, but it happened in British Columbia. I refer to the case of the two-time killer who killed a third time, in that case a little girl. That finally switched me, because in my opinion the pendulum has swung too far in redress for the accused and not protection for society. I think that was the fundamental reason.

I can argue the sanctity of life philosophically, on either side of the coin, but other than in the Evans' case in England back in the 1950s, a known case in the Commonwealth of a man convicted of murder, put to death and then later proved to be innocent, hon. members cannot use the argument of wrongful execution. That may have happened in the judicial system before the Second World War or immediately afterward, but the sad thing which has happened is that abolitionists keep saying that we do not want to make a permanent mistake by putting to death someone who cannot afterwards be resurrected.

On the other side of the coin, since 1961 there have been four cases of one-time killers who have been let out of our prisons or who have not observed weekend passes and killed a second time. I think that for some of these reasons this issue will stay alive and hon. members will have to be prepared to live with it.

In conclusion, there is a funny paradox—not funny "ha, ha", but funny "sad, sad"—that while this House was voting on one of the amendments the other night as to whether there should be capital punishment for the murderers of prison guards or policemen, or whether there should be capital punishment for acts of terrorism or insurrection against the Queen, the Israeli cabinet, which is one of the most liberal in terms of small "l" governments in the world, and which created a country almost out of the ashes of many millions of their race, whilst still believing in the sanctity of life is seriously considering exacting capital punishment on convicted terrorists where lives have been lost. They are not necessarily arguing the sanctity of life; they have argued that and have lived through it.

The state of Israel was created after millions of Jews were hideously brutalized and had gone to gas chambers. They are not debating the sanctity of life, but they do not want to be put into a position which we have witnessed from afar. That is what makes it so easy for some of us to debate philosophically this issue; we really have not been confronted with some of the realities of the world. Nor do they want to be placed in the Uganda situation again, where 43 convicted terrorists were held within their jails. Whether they were all terrorists who had killed, or whether they were all crimes committed in Israel, I am not sure. They do not want to get into the position again of having hijackers keeping citizens of their country as hostages in exchange for the transfer and release of convicted terrorists who have killed citizens of that state. It is an interesting paradox that we, in the abstract, not having gone through the pain of birth that that state has and the agonies of so many of its citizens, can sit here and have this philosophical debate. That state which has lived through hell, and grew up through the smoke of hell, is thinking of bringing back capital punishment for that kind of crime.

● (1240)

Mr. Speaker, I have been on both sides of this issue, but this time when I vote against Bill C-84 it will be with more conviction than I have ever had before. I believe fundamentally in the potential of the ultimate penalty for the ultimate crime. It is not likely that any prime minister is going to sign the paper, figuratively speaking, for capital punishment on the first occasion, should the bill be defeated. In the mood of this country, it would have to be a heinous crime, with no extenuating circumstances, for the penalty of capital punishment to be exacted, but the fact that it was on the books might set a standard for a stricter administration of justice.

I do not want to digress, Mr. Speaker, and I should end right there, but I am confronted with a problem. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) mentioned that hon. members should be present on Wednesday for the vote on third reading, which I suspect may be a closer vote than some of the others would indicate. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday Her Majesty is going to be in my home town at two o'clock in the afternoon when the vote is to be taken. I may resolve the conflict if I can be paired with a fervent abolitionist who will also be away. But I might very well be here, because I am rather irritated and I believe that the people of Annapolis Valley have been insulted by some of the arrangements made for the royal tour. Due to sloppy planning at the least, or to petty politics at the most, on the part of those making the arrangements, which I believe to be the premier's office in Halifax, but they must have been advised by Ottawa—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest the hon. member return to the terms of Bill C-84.

Mr. Nowlan: My remarks are relevant, Mr. Speaker. I am explaining why I might well not be here on Wednesday. On the other hand, the reason I may be here is that I am so irritated and the people of the Annapolis Valley are so insulted by the arrangements which may be due to sloppy planning or petty politics. According to protocol, a member of the House of Commons ranks ahead of even a provincial cabinet minister. Yet I have not been invited to one of the functions taking place on the day Her Majesty visits my riding. I have only been invited to a luncheon because I am a member of the board of governors of Acadia University. This is the fault of the provincial government in Halifax, unless I can move around from Greenwood to Wolfville to Windsor and be there when she visits the premier's home town. There is no reason why I, as the member for Annapolis Valley, who ranks ahead of an MLA, the mayors and other elected officials, should not have an opportunity to be present when Her Majesty visits, rather than to be at table No. 10 at a luncheon with several hundred other people.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta that this issue will not go away even though we are coming to what is supposed to be the final vote. Members of parliament are going to live with this vote and the issue will come back to the House of Commons on another day. I certainly believe that several mem-

bers, partly as a result of their votes, will not come back to this House one day.

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in this debate as one of the few who has abstained from speaking on the bill so far and yet has listened to all the speeches given on the matter.

Miss Bégin: Poor you.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): The abolitionists have not changed my mind with the weak arguments they have brought forward. I feel it is important to place on the record that on second reading and report stage I voted as a retentionist, as I shall vote again on third reading. I am prompted to speak by the remarks made by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) in his speech on June 15. As reported at page 14497 of *Hansard*, he said:

> Our constituents do not have the time to weigh the evidence and consider the arguments. They are preoccupied on a day-to-day basis with earning their livelihood. That is their serious, immediate and pressing concern. They do not have the opportunity that we in this chamber have to look at the evidence and listen to each other in order to formulate a final opinion. We, therefore, must make the decision. As elected members of parliament, we must take the consequences, not only on capital punishment but on all other issues.

I was rather surprised at that, Mr. Speaker. I would answer the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby that at least my constituents are human beings with souls, intelligence and compassion. They know what is going on in Ottawa and around the country, and they can make up their own minds. Surely to goodness, if any member of parliament assumes that constituents cannot make up their minds on matters as serious as the death penalty, or in fact any other matter, there is something wrong.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): The people of my constituency are good living, honest people. They are concerned with the subject of capital punishment. I feel they are as smart as any member of this House, and as capable of making a rational decision. The volume of correspondence that I have received indicates this very clearly. Yet they do not always necessarily vote along party lines.

● (1250)

To answer the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, let me tell him that I was committed to the retentionist cause before my election to this House. When I was mayor of my city and chairman of the police commission, I was convinced that capital punishment was a necessity. My decision at that time was not based on whether the majority of Canadian citizens wanted, or did not want, capital punishment. It was based on the experience I had gained in my particular position, and that is still my personal conviction. I was convinced then of the validity and effectiveness of capital punishment, and I have yet to be convinced that there is a better way to deal with certain types of crime.

Some say that the death penalty is immoral. Mr. Speaker, I honestly feel that we commit a greater immorality when we put people in cages for 25 years and treat them like dogs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Nobody calls that immoral.

Mr. Dinsdale: It is a living death.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Yes, it is a living death. It is even worse. We know what goes on in this country's penitentiaries. We hear about escapes, about orgies, sex scandals, and so on. Why do we tolerate it? Yet we are to imprison some people for 25 years. I am concerned about the ability of some people to obtain parole or to leave prison.

At least the death penalty has one effect; it protects society from the risk of a second offence committed by the same criminal who, if not executed, may subsequently be released or escape. The death penalty is thus based on the principle of self-defence. Since the death penalty is the only means of eliminating the offender altogether, this penalty is necessary, at least provisionally, when the public peace is endangered by certain particularly dangerous forms of crime.

I say that public opinion remains generally favourable to the retention of the death penalty. The public as a whole, particularly the police and prison officials, believe in its effectiveness. I say that this sincere belief should be respected in its own right, especially since it may be correct. It would be virtually impossible to find another penalty to replace capital punishment. Imprisonment, even for a long time, is inadequate and its effects are minimized by anticipated release. A man sent to jail for 25 years knows he has been given the maximum penalty and knows that he will not receive a greater penalty if he kills a prison guard. Even if he kills a prison guard and is given another 25 years, what is there to prevent his killing another prison guard, and yet another? How many could such a man kill?

Mr. Clarke: One a day.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Has nobody thought of this? Mr. Speaker, I could say much more on the subject, but I will try to limit my remarks. I say that the death penalty would safeguard the police, because in the absence of the death penalty a criminal seeking to avoid arrest would have much less to fear from the consequence of the use of firearms or violence. The punishment inflicted for a grave crime should adequately reflect the revulsion felt by the great majority of citizens. The ultimate justification of any punishment is not that it deters, but that it is the emphatic denunciation by the community of a crime. From this point of view, some murders demand the most emphatic denunciation of all, the death penalty. The law should not ignore the public demand for retribution which a heinous crime understandably provokes. Further, it would be dangerous to move too quickly, far in advance of public opinion.

Many abolitionist speakers have recited statistics to prove that the death penalty is not a deterrent. Mr. Speaker, statistics which ordinarily fail to demonstrate the deterrent effect of capital punishment are, for the most part, assembled by people who want to abolish the death penalty. In other words, such statistics are not compiled for the purpose of reaching a conclusion; rather, they are compiled to support a conclusion already reached morally, philosophically or intuitively. Statistics, as we know, are susceptible of different interpretations and are unreliable

and misleading. It is almost impossible to draw valid comparisons between different countries, owing to differences in the legal definition of crimes, the practice of the prosecuting authorities and the courts, the methods of compiling criminal statistics, moral standards, customary behaviour and political, social and economic conditions. I submit that life imprisonment is not necessarily less inhumane than the death penalty. In any event, there is no longer any true life sentence in view of our practices regarding parole which I mentioned previously.

Let me draw to the attention of hon. members two instances of crime which occurred in my constituency. The first incident involved constable Shakespeare. He and his partner were patrolling in a police car and answered a call to investigate a break-in which had occurred in their patrol area. One constable ran out and the other stood beside the car and radioed for help. While he was summoning more help on the radio, a criminal who was lurking just around the corner leaned forward and shot him. Constable Shakespeare fell. He was not fatally wounded but was unconscious and bleeding. The other constable did not know this had happened. He ran to the river to try to head-off the other criminal who was running away. The criminal who had shot constable Shakespeare, knowing the other policeman was away from the scene and that the constable was by himself, came up to the police car, kicked the constable who was on the ground to see if he was still alive, looked him in the face, then shot him three times in the face and once in the heart. If that was not deliberate murder, I should like to know what is. As far as I am concerned, criminals like that should hang.

There was another incident in Winnipeg in which constable Houston was killed. He left a widow and family. Nobody now talks about what happened. There are several other crimes in my area which I could mention. We did not find the murderers in those cases. We do not even talk about those events any more. Somebody said we should reassure the police because the worst thing you could do is parole those convicted of murder. I say that abolishing the death penalty will do more harm to the morale of this country's police forces than almost anything you could do.

I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), a long-time member of this House, say the following:

> I have always believed that when a member of parliament is made aware that a clear majority of those living in his riding hold a strong opinion on an important matter which is before parliament for decision, it is the duty of the member to express that opinion in parliament on behalf of those he represents, and to back up that opinion with his vote.

Mr. Speaker, I shall finish shortly. I say that we should have undertaken a much deeper and serious study with regard to our problems regarding penitentiaries and rehabilitation. This study has not been undertaken. I suggest that if all members of parliament were to vote in accordance with the wishes of their constituents, capital punishment would be retained.

I remind all members of this House that the vote on third reading is to be held on Wednesday at two o'clock. I expect all members of this House to be present in order to vote. I feel that no excuse for absence ought to be tolerated. No member ought to say, "I will not be present in the House for the vote." The people of Canada expect us all to be present. No member should say, in any circumstance, that he cannot be here to vote. No excuses should be accepted. I am sorry that I must say this, but the hon. member speaking before me said he had to meet the Queen and he suggested that as his reason for being absent. Mr. Speaker, the vote to be held next Wednesday is of paramount importance. It is more important to be present for the vote than to attend any ceremony. The vote we shall register will affect all the people of our community. It is on a most serious subject, and every member of parliament should discharge his responsibilities and vote. No member should accept any engagement save that of being here and voting in the manner he or she wishes on Wednesday at two o'clock.

[Mr. Guay (St. Boniface).]

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

At one o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House met at 2 o'clock.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

CONDEMNATION OF CANADA'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I should like to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek):

> That this House voice its thanks to the delegation of the Republic of China at the Montreal Olympic Games for the dignity and generosity it has shown in the imbroglio which occurred between the Canadian government and the International Olympic Committee;
>
> That this House deplore the fact that the Canadian government has interfered with the international rules of the International Olympic Committee thus introducing political considerations in the field of international olympics and creating a dangerous precedent for the future of the games;
>
> Finally, that this House extend its apologies to the International Olympic Committee for the way Canada has intervened in its internal administration and has compelled it to meet its requirements, thus jeopardizing the time-honoured principle of the non-political character of international olympic events.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

[*English*]

ELECTIONS

PROPOSAL TO APPOINT RETURNING OFFICERS ON THE BASIS OF MERIT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity arising from the fact that the government will shortly appoint by order in council returning officers for the 282 constituencies that will exist as a result of redistribution of electoral boundaries in Canada. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon):

To ensure the conducting of federal elections on a strictly non-political basis that, with the few exceptions where impartial and experienced incumbents may be reappointed, all future appointments of returning officers for each constituency be made on the basis of merit as a result of advertising competitions held by the Public Service Commission of Canada and that the present system be ended where such appointments are again about to be made on a political basis by rewards to party faithful with generous scoops from the Liberal party's pork barrel.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION OF BILINGUAL AIR-TO-GROUND COMMUNICATIONS AT OTTAWA AIRPORT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43.

Since this House has agreed to the principle of bilingualism and the fact that the Ottawa-Hull area or what is called the National Capital region has a francophone population of over 40 per cent; since the Ottawa airport serves all this region, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That this House instruct the Minister of Transport to set up bilingual air-to-ground communications at the National Capital airport.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

SUGGESTED SECRET BALLOT ON THIRD READING OF BILL C-84—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I, too, rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that a great majority of Canadians are opposed to, if not outraged at, the outcome of the recent votes on capital punishment, largely because of the fact that a number of members were unable to, and indeed did not, vote as they would have liked—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Neither pursuant to Standing Order 43 nor in any other way is it ever in order to comment upon a vote in the House of Commons. If the hon. member has a motion which he wishes to put, he might put it.

Mr. Jelinek: Then, Mr. Speaker, may I say because of pressure tactics by members of the ministry, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds):

That this House dispose with normal voting procedures on the third and final vote on Bill C-84 and that instead a secret ballot vote be applied in order to give all members the opportunity to vote pressure free on this most vital issue.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

TRAIL

CONGRATULATIONS TO CITY ON SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in order to perhaps change the tone of the House I should like to inform the House that the city of Trail, which is the home of the world champion hockey team, the Trail Smoke Eaters, twice world champions, in 1939 and 1961, and also home of the largest silver-lead-zinc smelter in the world, whose workers have contributed much to our prosperity, is currently experiencing its 75th anniversary. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston):

That the House of Commons, representing all Canadians, extends congratulations and best wishes to the mayor, and municipal council, and to all the people of Trail, British Columbia, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the incorporation of this industrial and industrious community in south central British Columbia.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the presentation of

the motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Having heard the terms of the motion, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON WHETHER ARGENTINA PROHIBITED FROM REPROCESSING SPENT FUEL FROM CANDU REACTOR

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and arises from an answer he gave on July 6 to my colleague, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham, in which he indicated that the present safeguard agreement between Argentina and Canada precludes the possibility of Canada taking steps to prevent Argentina from reprocessing spent fuel from the CANDU reactor into pure plutonium. In light of that assertion I should like to draw his attention to Article III paragraph 3 of the Argentina safeguard agreement which states in part:

Nuclear material referred to shall be reprocessed . . . only as may be mutually agreed between the two Parties—

I ask specifically whether this gives Canada an interest and whether Argentina can produce plutonium from the CANDU reactor?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I believe the quotation the hon. member read supports the answer I gave to that hon. member earlier. I will be happy to look at the text again, and if I have made a mistake I will be ready to acknowledge it.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, I raise the question because I think the answer given on July 6 is far from clear. I would ask the minister specifically whether under the safeguard agreement Canada has the right to say to Argentina that it cannot in fact reprocess this, and that Canada is a participant in that decision-making process with the Argentina government?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I think the words of the agreement justify that conclusion.

Mr. Gillies: In view of press reports and so on which indicate that Argentina does not have that same interpretation, has Canada communicated and made it clear to the government of Argentina that in fact that government cannot reprocess plutonium from the CANDU reactor without the agreement of Canada?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, this particular agreement was very closely negotiated over quite a period of time, and I am sure that the Canadian negotiators have made every term abundantly clear to the Argentina side. In respect of this point, which is a very important one, I will again read the agreement to make sure there is no confusion whatsoever. I will do so because it is a vital point.

INQUIRY WHETHER NOTICE RECEIVED ARGENTINA INTENDS TO ESTABLISH PLANT TO PRODUCE PLUTONIUM

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, has the government, this particular minister or his department received any notice as yet from Argentina that it intends to build a reprocessing plant for the reprocessing of pure plutonium in Argentina? Have you received that notice, have you received information, or have you not received it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not personally received any such information.

POSSIBLE OBLIGATION TO SUPPLY HEAVY WATER TO ARGENTINA—EFFECT ON DOMESTIC NUCLEAR GENERATING CAPACITY

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): In view of the impending shortages in the heavy water supply predicted by many authorative sources in the nuclear industry, including close advisers to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, can the minister tell the House whether the agreement with Argentina calls for Canada to supply heavy water for the Cordoba reactor and, if so, does it mean that there will have to be a curtailment of the Canadian domestic generating capacity simply because we will not have the capacity to produce heavy water for both Argentina and our own needs?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I have no recollection that any such obligation is included in the safeguards agreement.

Mr. Lawrence: Did the minister and his advisers consider when the Cordoba agreement was being negotiated, just what the future situation of the heavy water supply will be because there may well be a supply going to Argentina from Canada for this purpose? Does it mean that Canada's own domestic requirement will have to be cut back?

Mr. MacEachen: I will check on this factual point as to whether there is any obligation to provide heavy water to Argentina. I know of no such obligation included in the safeguards agreement. My colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, may have some other commercial arrangements upon which I would like to check before making a categorical disclaimer that there is any obligation whatsoever. I do not believe there is any such obligation, but I would like to recheck with the minister.

INQUIRY WHETHER SAFEGUARD AGREEMENT PROHIBITS ARGENTINA FROM ESTABLISHING PLANT TO PRODUCE PLUTONIUM

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. When this matter was being discussed in the House some weeks ago, if I remember correctly the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that Argentina already had a small experimental separation plant capable of extracting plutonium from the waste from a CANDU reactor. Has the minister specifically put into the safeguards a provision either that Argentina will dispose of this separation plant or, even further, that it will not purchase or operate one? Are there any specific commitments that there will be no separation equipment in operation in Argentina so as to produce plutonium from waste from the CANDU reactor?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, the safeguards agreement was not intended nor could it apply over the whole field of nuclear operations in Argentina.

REASON GOVERNMENT NOT MAKING ADHERENCE TO NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY CONDITION OF SALE OF CANDU REACTOR

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Surely, it is ridiculous to talk about this being the strongest safeguards agreement in the world if it does not deal with the important question of whether or not a country which has a CANDU reactor can produce plutonium from the radioactive waste, plutonium being the material from which explosives are made. I want to ask the minister, in view of the fact that most countries which are anxious to co-operate in order to stop the proliferation of nuclear arms have signed the non-proliferation treaty, why the government has not insisted that in the case of Argentina, South Korea and indeed Pakistan they must sign and ratify the non-proliferation treaty as one of the conditions for purchasing a CANDU reactor from this country.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): We have not made membership in the non-proliferation treaty an absolute pre-condition.

Miss MacDonald: Why not?

Mr. MacEachen: In the case of the Republic of Korea, with the assistance of other countries and with a good deal of persuasion, we have secured the ratification of the NPT. That has not been the case with countries like Pakistan, for example, which have taken the view that the NPT is a discriminatory instrument. It is, of course, a discriminatory instrument, and for that reason they regard it as objectionable from their point of view. They will not ratify the treaty, even though in our view it ought to be ratified, but we have not made it a pre-condition of doing business with any particular country. What we have done up to the present time is ensure the strongest possible safeguards upon Canadian supplied materials and technology. We have not been able to go beyond that and include the total coverage of nuclear materials in that country.

● (1420)

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that the government rests its whole case for selling nuclear reactors in some of the troubled spots of the world on the ground that the developing countries are entitled to this technology to meet their particular economic needs and if Canada is prepared to take the risk of selling CANDU reactors, surely these countries should be prepared to play their part in this deal by acceding to a request to sign the non-proliferation treaty and to give firm guarantees that they will not procure separation plants to produce plutonium. I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs why Canada should not insist on this, particularly in the case of Argentina, where we are going to lose over $25 million on the deal.

Mr. MacEachen: I have made the situation quite clear already—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: —that we have not insisted nor do we intend at the present time to insist, as a precondition, on membership in the non-proliferation treaty because there are legitimate objections which can be taken to that treaty on the grounds of national sovereignty and the existence of discrimination, and the treaty is a discriminatory treaty.

* * *

[Translation]

BILINGUALISM

POSSIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTING BILINGUAL AIR-TO-GROUND COMMUNICATIONS AT OTTAWA AIRPORT

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Considering that the principle of bilingualism was adopted by the House a few years ago, that the National Capital Region has an airport which is not provided with bilingual air-ground communications, and that this is a bilingual region, since 40 per cent of its population is francophone, could the minister advise the House whether he is considering the development of a bilingual communication system at the Ottawa airport?

[English]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it has been our intention to proceed with first things first, and that includes the attempts to develop the appropriate procedures for bilingual air traffic services in the province of Quebec, including the Montreal region. We are anticipating doing that. We have no plans in terms of a schedule beyond that, but we have always indicated the distinct possibility that, as we proceed to a conclusion with those steps, we would be examining the Ottawa region to see whether similar service ought to be extended there, in view of its geographic location and also in view of its nature as the national capital. I repeat, however, that we do believe that first things must come first, and that this is a matter which does require a step by step implementation. Therefore, we have been concentrating on introducing bilingual air traffic services in the province of Quebec.

REASON PAKISTAN EXEMPTED FROM DEADLINE FOR RENEGOTIATION OF NUCLEAR SAFEGUARD AGREEMENT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Given that the government undertook in 1974, at the time it introduced its new safeguard proposals, to renegotiate within one, and now two, years all safeguard agreements with countries receiving Canadian nuclear supplies, can the minister explain why Pakistan was exempted from this deadline for the agreement on upgraded safeguards?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Pakistan has not been exempted from the decision of the government to secure upgraded safeguards. However, the deadline has been extended because of a number of factors, particularly the question of Pakistan wishing to be considered in tandem with India. Pakistan was not prepared to enter into an upgraded safeguards agreement until our decision with respect to India had been taken. That decision having been taken, we are presently proposing a new series of negotiations with Pakistan this month, I believe including, we hope, an upgraded safeguards agreement with that country.

Miss MacDonald: In view of the fact that this is beginning to look more and more like a two nuclear policy, and in view of the obvious reluctance of Pakistan to upgrade their nuclear safeguards agreements, can the minister say how long Canada is prepared to continue supplying nuclear material to Pakistan without having obtained an upgraded agreement?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): As long as there is a buck in it.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, we are presently providing materials to Pakistan under previously arranged agreements. At the present time Pakistan has not been in default of any agreement it had previously concluded with Canada. That ought to be made very clear. What we are seeking is an upgrading of agreements with Pakistan. The hon. lady should not insinuate in her question that in some way Pakistan has been in default. It may be that the stringent proposals we will put before Pakistan will prove to be too onerous for that government, and at that point we will have to consider what we will do by way of further co-operation with Pakistan.

POSITION OF PAKISTAN ON NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AGREEMENT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is more than four months since the Prime Minister stated in this House that he could not give the House any assurance that Pakistan would change its position on the NPT, can the minister report now if in the current negotiations with Pakistan they have indicated any willingness to change their position with regard to the NPT?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I would say no, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Lang.]

AIR TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL IN QUEBEC

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. I should like to ask whether his statements in conversation with CFCF were correctly reported this morning in the Montreal *Gazette* in the headline "Both Languages in Quebec air space by 1978". If so, can the minister explain what purpose he foresees for the commission or whether he was merely summarizing the obvious, as there are already six airports in Quebec offering the two languages?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the remarks and the report have to be put in the context of what our intentions are in relation to the volume of air traffic serviced in Quebec, assuming that we can indeed establish certified, secure procedures which assure safety. The conversation, in other words, related to the fact that at all times we recognize the need to certify procedures as safe before moving toward the implementation of the actual procedures. Of course, a lot of work has been done on that in our own ordinary departmental office and also with the commission. The conversation would continue with the question: assuming that that all works favourably and you get the procedures which are assured as safe, then what is the timetable? That is when I indicated that our timetable had been for progressive implementation throughout the province of Quebec through to the end of 1978. That is not a guaranteed time because there are implementation questions that arise as it moves forward but that is the target and that is the way it was described.

POSITION OF FRANCOPHONE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ON CO-OPERATION WITH COMMISSION ON BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for that explanation. I think it is most important that it be clarified. I should also like to ask whether the minister has had any indication of a change of attitude on the part of Les Gens de l'Air who to my latest knowledge made no suggestion whatsoever that they were prepared to co-operate with the commission. I think it is highly desirable that they should.

● (1430)

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, some of the discussions we have been having with Les Gens de l'Air have been for assuring that co-operation with the commission. This is quite apart from the necessary involvement of Les Gens de l'Air with the simulator exercises and other activities. We have been making progress in that regard, but the discussions will no doubt be continued.

NEW AIR NAVIGATION ORDER ON USE OF LANGUAGE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport to do with the memorandum of agreement among the

controllers, pilots and the minister which stipulated that by July 1 there would be an air navigation order regarding the use of language and the enforcement thereof. I understand that this was complied with on June 30, under air navigation order Series 1, No. 1. Will the minister explain to this House, and confirm, that last Friday the air navigation order was repealed and a new order brought forth?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The actual reference in the memorandum of understanding was not that the air navigation order would necessarily be effective in its final form by July 1, but, rather, that a form to become effective would be put forward to the Privy Council office for the usual processing. We have since looked at the order from a text viewpoint and made a number of changes in it. We may make more changes, either before it becomes effective or shortly thereafter.

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister in a general way could clarify precisely what the second order contains? Is it now in effect, or has the second order been repealed? What is its status? I ask this particularly since we hope that by bringing about some harmony and understanding we may be able to improve the air situation in the Montreal air control region.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I understand that air navigation orders become effective upon or after publication in the *Gazette*. This has not yet taken place. Therefore, they are about to become effective orders.

Mr. Mazankowski: You are breaking your own agreement.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): And creating confusion.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS ACT

POSSIBILITY OF AMENDMENT TO DO JUSTICE TO FRANCOPHONE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board.

Considering that CATCA is in process of expelling the only Quebec member from its board of directors and that the ostracism of the French-speaking minority by CATCA is now indisputable and obvious, is the President of the Treasury Board prepared to consider and amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act to enable Les Gens de l'Air du Québec and French-speaking controllers who no longer find a place within CATCA, which will not defend them any more and even wishes to expel them, to negotiate with the government?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, if a union member believes he is being discriminated against by his union bosses, he can apply to the Public Service Staff Relations Board and ask for an end to the discrimination. I hope that, if this discrimination does exist, the board will give a more favourable ruling concerning Les Gens de l'Air's claims. However, the right of appeal is provided for and I invite Les Gens de l'Air to avail themselves of it. If the law is unfair, we shall amend it later but I think the normal procedure should be followed under the circumstances.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE EVICTION OF NATIVES FROM WHITE DOG AND GRASSY NARROW RESERVES TO CREATE PARK

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can the minister confirm that, given the loss of livelihood and the serious health problems suffered by the Indian people of the White Dog and Grassy Narrows reserves as a result of mercury pollution in the English-Wabigoon river system, rather than compensating the Indian people the government intends to expropriate their land and evict the people from their homes in order to create a national park?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, that is not correct.

Mr. Symes: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the creation of a national park which I suppose the minister will call "mercury pollution national park" will in no way deal with the problem of loss of jobs and compensation for health as a result of mercury pollution, nor with the assessment of liability against the polluting company, I ask the minister how in heaven's name the creation of a national park in this polluted area will help the Indian people most directly affected?

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has mixed up several matters. The prime thing the Indian people were interested in achieving was the closure of the park; the second was the question of compensation and the third was the question of the economic development of this area. We discussed these matters at some length and feel that with the vehicle of a national park we can best accomplish those three objectives.

Mr. Symes: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister, in view of the unanimous opposition of the peoples of both affected reserves, still intend to proceed with this ridiculous scheme?

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, if they continue with strong, unanimous opposition we shall certainly reconsider the scheme.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EXPULSION OF THREE CANADIAN MISSIONARIES FROM VIET NAM—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External

Affairs. Has the Canadian government requested from the Vietnamese government any explanation as to why three Canadian missionaries have been expelled from Viet Nam, along with 23 other missionaries from other countries?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I must look into this question.

Mr. Wagner: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While the minister is looking into these questions, will he also tell the House if the government of Canada intends to protest against the unwarranted expulsion of these Canadian citizens, and against this flagrant violation of the United Nations charter on freedom of movement of peaceful persons by the Vietnamese government?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, once I have had an opportunity to examine the facts, I will make a judgment whether a protest is justified. If the action carries all the surrounding approbrium the hon. member alleges, of course we will make our views known to that government.

Mr. Wagner: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise the House if the government is prepared to facilitate the return of those Canadian missionaries to Canada?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker; obviously.

DECLARATION OF 200-MILE FISHING ZONE—DISCUSSIONS WITH FRANCE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he can reassure the House and country of the government's intention to proceed with the declaration of a 200-mile economic zone for Canada by the end of the year, notwithstanding French intentions in this regard? Perhaps the minister could also tell the House what progress has been made in talks with the French government regarding their intentions off Canada's east coast?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but that the government will implement its decision to bring into effect Canadian jurisdiction not later than January 1, 1977. We have not had talks recently with the French government with regard to the implications of the extension of the 200-mile limit with respect to St. Pierre and Miquelon but we have made clear our views that the land mass of these islands when compared with the land mass of Newfoundland, justifies a more appropriate solution than that suggested by the French government.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask if Canada still holds to the position arrived at during talks at an earlier stage? Are we prepared to enter into some kind of reciprocal arrangement with France with regard to fishing rights off the east coast of Canada in those areas lying within the 200-mile limit off the French islands?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, our general policy has been to enter into bilateral discussions and reciprocal arrangements where, in those arrangements, Canadian interests are fully protected and we would take that attitude with respect to the French.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ALLEGED DISCOVERY OF THREE VEHICLES CONTAINING EXPLOSIVES AT OLYMPIC SITE

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Has the minister been privy to any rumour or report saying that three unauthorized military vehicles were recently discovered at the Olympic site, and that these vehicles contained explosives?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker. I have not heard that report, and am kept informed daily of the activities of the Canadian Armed Forces in support of the Olympics.

Mr. Brisco: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the possibility that the report is accurate, I wonder if the minister will perhaps examine the circumstances and determine if these vehicles may have originated from a Montreal armoury and contained explosives which were in a deteriorated state and ready for disposal.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased if the hon. member would provide me with the source of his information; I will of course be ready to look into it. But I have no report of that kind.

* * *

● (1440)

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

THE DIFFICULTY IN MAKING IT UNDERSTOOD

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister.

Last Friday night I had the opportunity to listen to the Prime Minister during a CBC broadcast, from 9:30 to 10:30 p.m. He was answering questions from French Canadian reporters. At least two of these reporters were block heads who could not and would not understand anything.

Does the Prime Minister feel he will have as much difficulty getting through to the air pilots and air traffic controllers as he experienced with these block heads during this Friday night interview?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has come to realize once more something of which we are all perfectly aware by now, namely, that there are block heads on both sides of the linguistic barrier.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary.

Has the government, in their meetings with the pilots or air controllers, managed to make them understand that the province of Quebec is an important province from the French point of view on an international basis in that it is, I believe, the third or fourth in rank among Francophone entities in the world? Do Anglophone pilots understand that they are not being kept from speaking English with the Quebec control towers? Far from it, they get their answers in English. But do they understand that two Francophone employees can discuss freely together, either from air to ground or ground to air, without anyone objecting to their use of French, just as we are not opposed to their using English in other Canadian provinces?

Mr. Trudeau: I thank the hon. member because, in the first part of his question, I believe, he states a fact which unfortunately has been distorted by adverse propaganda. The fact of the matter is that no one forces the pilots to speak French or to learn it so they can use it when they fly into Quebec. English remains the language they can use in Quebec as well as in Ottawa, Edmonton, Madrid or Rome. But they must be made to understand that, just as they accept to speak English and hear Spanish spoken when they get to Spain, they should be able to speak English while hearing French when they get to Quebec.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a final supplementary.

I fully share the Prime Minister's opinion on that matter, but how come he could not succeed and convince his former colleague and ex-minister, the hon. member for Langelier, of the reasonableness of what he has just stated in the House?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the Social Credit leader should know that it was not because he could not understand that that the Minister of Environment has resigned from the government, it is mostly because of his irritation at the systematic and voluntary inability to understand that by other Canadians.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DISCUSSIONS WITH FRANCE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF 200-MILE FISHING ZONE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for St. John's East. The minister has confirmed on a number of occasions that the 200 mile limit will be implemented on January 1, 1977. As negotiations between Canada and France with regard to St. Pierre and Miquelon are hanging in the air, can the minister advise the House and the country when there will be a meeting with France on this important question? How many meetings have been held? Have any meetings been held with France since 1972 on this question?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary for the Canadian negotiators to have a meeting with the French authorities before the coming into effect of the extended jurisdiction. There are quite a number of meetings and quite a number of negotiations in play. We hope it will be possible to fit in a meeting with the French authorities before the coming into effect of the extended jurisdiction.

Mr. Marshall: Has the minister been officially notified by the French government as to their intention to extend the 200 mile limit off St. Pierre and Miquelon?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have had no official communication indicating the intention of the French government with regard to such an extension.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON PARTICIPATION OF TAIWANESE ATHLETES

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister inform the House of the government's reaction to the statement of the International Olympic Committee Board in the form of a direct appeal to the government "to review its attitude in keeping its word, and hold it entirely responsible for any harm which the olympic movement may suffer"? That statement was made with regard to athletes from the Republic of China. What was the government's reaction to that statement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the best answer to the olympic committee and indeed to members of this House and the country who have shown concern, is that it is not our policy nor our practice to bar any athletes from the games. We welcome the athletes from Taiwan. We hope they will compete. We do not discriminate on the basis of sex, race or, indeed, national origin.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: All we are saying, and it seems to me this is a policy that would have the support of any member of this House regardless of his party provided he believes in a one China policy, is that we will not let athletes come into Canada under false representations and to pretend that they represent a country, China, that they do not represent. That is all we are saying.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: Will the Prime Minister explain how his attitude has changed with regard to athletes from the Republic of China compared with delegates from the PLO who attended the Habitat Conference? He stated at that time that other people made the decision about who would be the delegates at international conferences. Why not in this particular instance?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question was answered about two or three days ago.

Oral Questions

FISHERIES

REASON FOR LACK OF PATROLS BY FISHERIES VESSELS ON THE WEST COAST

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State (Fisheries). On June 14, page 14452 of *Hansard*, speaking of fishing patrols, the minister said:

I said in Montreal, and I say here, that we are doubling the level of boardings and inspections this year.

On the west coast the number of patrols by fisheries patrol vessels has dropped to zero. Can the minister give the House any assurance that he can find sufficient funds to resume the patrols that are required to maintain our sovereignty out to the 12 mile limit?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would not want to mislead the House. I will of course take his question very seriously and look into the facts. I suspect what may have happened is that DND patrolling is taking place in some cases while Department of the Environment and Fisheries patrols are not. I will have to look at the facts. I suspect the hon. member is probably confusing the two.

● (1450)

Mr. McKinnon: I hope I am not confusing the minister. My question was about fisheries patrol vessels, not about DND vessels, with whose movements I am familiar. On the West Coast, the *Laurier* has been docked for over a month, the *Tamu* has been docked for over two weeks and the *Howay* has been laid up since April 20, all because of a 40 per cent cut in their annual operating budget which is keeping them from their periodic refits. Can the minister seriously contend that Canada is maintaining sufficient sovereignty under these conditions, that is, with all our fisheries patrol ships tied to the dock for lack of funds?

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): The *Tamu* is under refit right now, which answers part of the hon. member's question. He obviously has not read the press release which indicates clearly that DND and Ministry of Transport vessels are undertaking patrol activities on our behalf and, as such, can be called fisheries patrol vessels since they are doing this job for us.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

ALLEGED LEASING BY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS BEFORE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Public Works. Can he advise the House whether it is a practice of the Department of Public Works to agree in principle to lease buildings on which construction has not commenced and on land which the builder does not, at the time of the agreement, own?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): That would be a rather strange lease agreement.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Huntington: It would, indeed, be a strange agreement. In the light of that answer could the hon. gentleman explain the minutes of the National Capital Commission Advisory Committee on Design of June 2, 1975, which state: "Campeau Corporation assembled the land for development before the NCC—

Mr. Speaker: Order. A question of that sort which relates to an event in June, 1975 ought surely to be raised another way.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

LACK OF WORK PERMITS BY FOREIGN STUDENTS WORKING ON PROJECTS

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, now that the Secretary of State has had an opportunity to travel to London to consult with his officials there regarding the activities of the London office, may I ask him whether he was correctly quoted in the London *Free Press* on Saturday as stating that his officials in London probably knew that two foreign students working on a government-funded project did not hold Canadian work permits and, if so, does he not feel they had a responsibility to bring this possible violation of the law to the attention of the proper authorities?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): What I pointed out to the reporter was that my officials had warned the two students involved that they were obliged to have work permits before they could work on a student community service project. I also pointed out that it was the responsibility of those administering the project, not only in London but right across the country, when they were hiring foreign students, to make sure they had work visas.

GIVING OF SECOND GRANT TO PERSON WHO HAD NOT COMPLETED FIRST PROJECT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Is the Secretary of State correctly quoted in the London *Free Press* to the effect that although the individual who last year received a government grant to prepare a film and a saleable book on the London Polish community by September, 1975 has so far completed nothing more than an essay for one of his professors, the fact that the church which helped him sponsor the project has not complained satisfies his concern? Or does he feel it was questionable for his department to give this individual a second grant this year in connection with another project?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): No, Mr. Speaker. I spent some time talking to Father Peter who is the priest at the church concerned and who signed the submission. He pointed out to me that the submission was made to some 20 or 30 members of the Parish Council who debated the merits of the proposal, discussed whether the individual who applied was one they should support, who questioned whether or not he was too young, and so on. They satisfied themselves the project was all right and

went ahead. Incidentally, Father Peter is the only one who has seen the completed project. The critics have not seen it yet but that does not seem to have prevented their criticizing it in advance. Father Peter tells me he is quite satisfied with it as an independent history of the Polish community and is one which will probably serve the community well.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

POSSIBILITY OF SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF SECTION EIGHT OF AGREEMENT WITH PILOTS AND AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport.

Considering that the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association instituted disciplinary procedures against their regional director in Quebec because he supported the establishment of bilingualism in air communications, and considering that section 8 of the agreement reached on June 28 between the minister, CATCA and CALPA amounts to depriving a controller who is being prosecuted for such an offence of the basic right of being defended by his union, can the Minister of Transport tell the House whether he proposes to suspend the application of section 8 until an appropriate defence procedure is established and to enable a controller being prosecuted to go on supporting the policy of bilingualism of the federal government? In addition, what measures does he intend to take to ensure that this situation does not recur?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): It is our intention that there should be a regulation which supports the rules which are in existence with regard to the flying and controlling of aircraft. It has always seemed to us to be extremely important that the rules be obeyed even while studies are going on to determine whether different rules should be put in place. It is true there is a difficulty in terms of union representation in present circumstances between CATCA and the controllers who are Francophone in obtaining the full services of the union on their behalf. I think this would only lead us to be very careful about the way in which proceedings against such a member would take place and perhaps to look for alternative procedures in which his defence could be full and adequate, notwithstanding his membership in CATCA.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REQUEST THAT CAPE BRETON BE CONSIDERED FOR DECENTRALIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the genial President of the Treasury Board. It relates to the decentralization of government services, a subject which I have raised on a number of occasions, in the light of the minister's most recent announcement involving Winnipeg, Moncton and St. John's bearing in mind that it would appear from the comments made in these announcements that high unemployment, indeed, continuing high unemployment, is part of the criteria taken into account when considering decentralization. Can the minister advise us whether he will soon be making another progressive statement in this regard involving Cape Breton Island where we have the qualified people and where we sure have continuing high unemployment?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): I can tell the hon. member that we are thinking of it. We hope to make some further announcements on decentralization and I might add that in the case of Cape Breton I am receiving on a daily basis diplomatic notes from the hon. member for Cape Breton Highlands-Canso, the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

* * *

HOUSING

RURAL REMOTE AREAS PLAN—AVAILABILITY TO NATIVES OF NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs but in his absence today may I direct it to his parliamentary secretary? It concerns the recent announcement that some housing units are to be built in British Columbia under the rural remote areas housing plan. Does this plan fall within the government's rural and native housing policy and if so what process is being used to consult with local native people? Further, is this program available to residents of the Northwest Territories?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I shall have to take notice of that question. The minister is absent today but I am sure he will be able to answer it when he returns.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

DATE OF CLOSING OF ENGLISH AND WABIGOON RIVERS TO SPORT FISHING

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can the hon. gentleman tell us when sports fishing will be banned on the English and Wabigoon rivers? Has he in his negotiations with provincial cabinet ministers from Ontario fixed a date when sports fishing on this river system will be stopped?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): At this juncture the federal and Ontario ministers present at the meeting must now take a proposal back to their respective governments. Both levels of government are very much aware of the urgency of the matter but we have to get approval from our respective governments before further action can be taken.

Oral Questions

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF DISCUSSIONS WITH FRANCE ON STATUS OF ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Bearing in mind the right hon. gentleman's well known interest in the patriation of the constitution, may I ask whether, in any talks he might have had since he was Prime Minister with the French president or any authorities in France, there has been any discussion about the status of St. Pierre and Miquelon with a view to removing an anomaly of history which, while it does not greatly disturb Atlantic Canada, might well have considerable significance in the event of substantial oil discoveries and the implementation of a 200-mile fishing zone?

● (1500)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must humbly confess that I did not have the gall to raise that with the President. I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition raised with the President of the United States the question of repatriating the panhandle either.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the Prime Minister's well known ability in gall—not Gaul but gall—I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman would seriously consider the next time he or officials of the external affairs department, which seems to be more busy in travel than discussion, have the opportunity, raising the matter so this anomaly of history can be removed and we do not have to worry about balancing the interests of two small islands against the territorial mass of Canada.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, in such important matters as this concerning Canadian territorial ambitions I would think it would be useful to have at least a bipartisan policy, so I will approach the Leader of the Opposition, when he is here, to see whether he is interested in forming a package in which we could claim a lot of land, including St. Pierre and Miquelon, the Alaskan panhandle and perhaps parts of Maine for New Brunswick. If I can get that support for a bipartisan policy we might also have a joint election campaign.

* * *

AIR CANADA

ALLEGED CHANGE IN REGULATIONS GOVERNING ISSUANCE OF PASSES TO WIVES OF MEMBERS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a question that I asked on June 25 which is reported at page 14840 of *Hansard*. Leaving out the portions that have nothing to do with the question, I said this:

> Naturally, I am concerned over the revelations, to use the mildest term possible, as reported in the Toronto *Sun* yesterday's date and the *Globe and Mail* of today, concerning promiscuity in the issuance of passes. In the absence of the minister concerned—

I was referring, of course, to the Minister of Supply and Services.

> [Mr. Buchanan.]

> —who apparently admitted everything contained in the statements, I will just ask one question: Has there been any change made by Air Canada concerning qualifications on the part of spouses for passes, and why is it that a pass was issued to one described as a common law wife, an expression which of course is non-existent except in the vocabulary of certain people?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would not speak of changes in policy but I would confirm that Air Canada does have a general policy of dealing with common law wives, which they know has a definition in connection with passes, for instance, for their employees and presumably by extention for other categories. Of course, the expression is also well known in the administration of other programs and is becoming better known all the time in Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister in question made common law wives well known in the vocabulary of our country. My question arising out of his answer is this: Why did the corporation grant the request of the minister to issue a pass for which there is no justification to one whom he described quite frankly as his common law wife?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think that answer was given rather fully in the same case when the incident was raised, and quite frankly I regret the right hon. gentleman taking the time of this House to raise that specific point at this time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I now give the answer and I ask what portion of it the minister is referring to. I feel very sorry he is exasperated and I express my deep regret to him in that regard. The Minister of Transport replied as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is accurate to say that that was the description used in the past.

That is, a common law wife.

> However, I will be glad to have a look at what is the current policy of Air Canada with regard to passes and to report more fully on whether there have been any changes since the time the right hon. gentleman was Prime Minister.

The minister says today the answer was given on June 25. Why the cover-up, I would ask?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the right hon. gentleman taking this trouble to draw my attention in the House to the fact that the word "past" appears in the third line of the reply, whereas the word "pass" should appear. I will see whether that correction helps him.

* * *

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

MR. LALONDE—ANSWER TO ACCUSATION OF INFLUENCE CONCERNING FREE VOTE ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege concerning a statement made some days ago by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) and which, in my opinion, is detrimental to the privileges of

hon. members, particularly those representing the province of Quebec.

This is related to the vote on capital punishment held in the House last week. According to a press release, the hon. member said that during a reception I gave for all members from Quebec, certain undue pressures were exerted on them, and I quote the statement he is reported to have made:

[*English*]

He made them believe the government could fall if the bill was defeated. They were also told if they voted for abolition they would have more chance of advancement, possibly being appointed parliamentary assistants and get government trips.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, my first reaction after reading such a statement was to burst out laughing, as did a good many members. I do not think, however, that we should remain silent about it because I feel it affects the privileges of hon. members. It questions not only my own integrity concerning my relations with members but also the reputation of government members who represent the population of Quebec.

I positively and categorically deny that I, or anybody I know, have or has approached Quebec members to influence them about a free vote. I declare that all members from Quebec who were present in the House voted freely according to their own conscience. In these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe should withdraw this assertion from his statement:

[*English*]

It's silly, but it impressed some.

[*Translation*]

I believe that his statement is not only silly but scandalous and if the hon. member is a gentleman, he will apologize to hon. members of the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Outremont was rising on a question of privilege—

[*Translation*]

An hon. Member: Speak French.

Mr. Wagner: I hear people from the other side say to me again "in French". Did they not listen to the program in which the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) called upon Quebecers to support him in his bilingual program?

An hon. Member: You may speak as much as you want, but at least be clear.

Mr. Wagner: The hon. member could at least say "vous" to me instead of "tu".

[*English*]

I thought the minister and hon. member for Outremont was rising on a question of privilege to apologize to the majority of Canadians for the betrayal by the cabinet on the question of capital punishment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wagner: However, I notice that he is more worried about his cocktail parties, about the timing of the cocktail party, about how much was drunk, whether or not it influenced some people, whether or not—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

● (1510)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think he should be allowed to finish.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You let the minister go on, and he did not have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not propose to stop the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe continuing to make an equal contribution to the question of privilege. However, I insist that he stay within the limits of the question of privilege that has been raised.

Mr. Wagner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will do my best to abide by your ruling. I was suggesting that the minister was preoccupied with his cocktail party. I think it is the responsibility of the Speaker to decide if there is a well-founded question of privilege in this case. I may chide the hon. member for Outremont for relying on a press clipping emanating from the *Globe and Mail* whose correspondent secured the information—

An hon. Member: From you.

Mr. Wagner: No, not from me, but by listening at 8.15 in the morning to a seven-minute program on CKEC, Montreal, and who probably did not grasp all the nuances that were made in the declaration, which declaration followed immediately after the declaration by the hon. member for Outremont which was an attempt to extricate his government from the blunder of the Trudeau-Lang-Sauvé approach to cabinet solidarity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wagner: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Prime Minister is getting so annoyed. That is awful. Perhaps he will cool off for a few minutes and maybe he will get his money's-worth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wagner: In order that you are able to appreciate the situation, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I did declare on that program that it was shameful and, I think, in very poor taste for the Quebec leader of the Liberal caucus to hold a potent cocktail party a few hours before the vote.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wagner: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the celebrations had nothing to do with the vote, because the vote was on Tuesday night and usually these celebrations are on Wednesday night. Maybe it was designed to strengthen the grasp the Quebec leader has on the Liberal caucus, or maybe it was designed to show that he does rise above the

ankle of the hon. member for Langelier as leader of the Quebec party.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wagner: I for one, declare that I do not believe the rumour that whoever arrived at the cocktail party arrived by a Seagram's jet. I do not believe that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wagner: Now the Prime Minister is getting angry again. I am so sorry. I like the Prime Minister when he is smiling. What did occur, Mr. Speaker, is that eight Liberal MPs, avowed retentionists, changed their vote under pressure.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Wagner: I am sure that this pressure did not include pressure by the hon. member for Outremont, because he is obviously above such cheap tactics.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wagner: In any event, Mr. Speaker, that performance, added to the Prime Minister's verbal harangue in this House, succeeded in defeating the will of the majority of Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Joe Clark had no effect on your party?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: What about Stanfield?

Mr. Wagner: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would not only reiterate what I have just said, but add that I have nothing to retract from what I said, and I would even welcome wholeheartedly any motion by the hon. member for Outremont which would refer this matter to the committee on privileges and elections.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wagner: I assure hon. members that the information submitted would require more than the presence of a doctor in the House to come to the aid of the Liberal backbenchers.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wagner: However, Mr. Speaker, I shall let the matter rest in your hands. I am convinced that when an election comes—and it will not be too soon—those hon. members will receive the verdict in their ridings that they should obtain.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Try another one.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The proposed question of privilege has not been followed by a motion. It implicated one other member of the House who has now responded with equal time. No motion is attached to the alleged question of privilege and therefore, no action is required of the Chair. As far as the Chair is concerned, the matter is closed.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, on my supplementary to a carefully prepared question you called me out of order, apparently because I was referring to some specific minutes. The minutes I referred to contained actions that were very germane to the first question and, indeed, confirmed by answer given by the minister that the deal I was referring to was indeed strange. I am wondering if I might have a reason why I was cut off so quickly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in relation to an attempt at an answer a few minutes ago by the Minister of Transport. I cannot complain that he has not answered in full. All I can say is that this manner in which he endeavoured to pretend he was answering indicates an attitude on the part of this government to cover up, conceal, and not reveal. It is the finest example I know of during the present session of a government that is forever hiding the truth.

I am surprised that the Minister of Supply and Services has not risen to explain the unexplainable, namely, his conduct, admitted in the press, of having got in touch with Air Canada to obtain a pass for what he describes as his common law wife. I cannot insist on an answer, but this is indicative of the manner in which the minister pretended to answer today, and knowing I was going to rise he coincidentally disappeared from the House as fast as he could.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, I would like, first, to say that I did not use the words suggested by the right hon. member when I spoke to Air Canada. The words I used were that I had a personal and very stable relationship. Secondly, I asked for a courtesy ticket, and it was issued with the provision that the ruling would be made according to the normal practices of Air Canada in respect of its own employees. The ruling was not made, and I decided to reimburse the company, which I did. That's it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After the investigation started.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

● (1520)

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order arising out of answers given to me by the Minister of Transport in connection with the questions I raised regarding the air navigation order and its status. I regret that the minister is not in the House at this time, but I feel compelled to rise because I believe the minister may have inadvertently misled the House. If he did not mislead the House, then to say the least he did leave a number of questions unanswered and in fact confused this very sensitive issue more than it is confused right now.

The minister left the impression that the air navigation order, series 1, No. 1, which was dated June 30, was not published in the *Canada Gazette* because it requires an amendment based upon technical grounds and the details were in fact being worked out in consultation with all parties to the agreement. Section 8 of the memorandum of

agreement provides as follows, and I will read it for the information of hon. members:

That Transport Canada will submit before July 1 a recommendation to the Privy Council which the government will process expeditiously—

I emphasize the word "expeditiously".

—and publish in the *Canada Gazette* at the earliest possible date as an air navigation order with regard to the use of language in the air, and Transport Canada undertakes to pursue the enforcement thereof.

I need not remind the House that today is July 12 and that the matter has not been fully complied with as yet. But what is most irritating is that we are informed now that the air navigation order, series 1, No. 1, file 75/519, which was brought forth on June 30 has now been revoked as of July 7. In my view, this has the effect of nullifying the terms of the agreement. In fact, it deviates from the very heart of the agreement and from the principal conditions of the memorandum. Second, the memorandum of agreement provides, as an inherent condition provided for consultation between all members of the air navigation industry—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely, the hon. member realizes he is getting into an interpretation, or disagreement with the minister which, while it may be a valid point of disagreement, goes far beyond the question of whether the minister intentionally or otherwise misled the House in the answer he gave today. The hon. member has made his point more than adequately, and it seems to me that he should not be permitted to go into a debate at this time.

Mr. Mazankowski: With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Presenting reports—

Mr. Mazankowski: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has received the ruling from the Chair in respect of an extension of the question period. If the hon. member has a new question to raise by way of a question of privilege, I will hear him. If it is simply to question the ruling that has been made, I do not think I can entertain his question.

Mr. Mazankowski: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The minister left the impression that on technical grounds the air navigation order was being amended. The fact is that the air navigation order has been revoked, and the minister did not say that in the House. I believe that deliberately, or inadvertently, he has misled the House, and that is my question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. What I indicated to the hon. member for Vegreville was precisely that he was given the floor to register the fact that there was an interpretation of the circumstances which would lead to the conclusion that the minister may have inadvertently or otherwise misled the House. I thought the hon. member had made that point but was going into a debate.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS AND IMMUNITIES OF MEMBERS

First report of Special Committee on the Rights and Immunities of Members—Mr. Speaker.

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

* * *

KING GEORGE V CANCER FUND WINDING-UP ACT

TABLING OF REPORT TO TRUSTEES OF KING GEORGE V SILVER JUBILEE CANCER FUND FOR CANADA

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, under Standing Order 41(2), copies, in both official languages, of the report to the trustees of the King George V Silver Jubilee Cancer Fund for Canada, as required by section 4 of the King George V Cancer Fund Winding-Up Act.

* * *

SUPREME COURT ACT

MEASURE TO ENSURE BRITISH COLUMBIA PERMANENT REPRESENTATION ON BENCH OF SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-443, an act to amend the Supreme Court Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the Supreme Court Act and assure that British Columbia has permanent representation on the bench. In view of the political decisions being made by the court lately, the sooner this bill becomes law, the better.

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

* * *

JAMES BAY AND NORTHERN QUEBEC NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

MEASURE TO APPROVE AND DECLARE CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC AND QUEBEC ORGANIZATIONS

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-98, to approve, give affect to and declare valid certain agreements between the Grand Council of the Crees (of Quebec), the Northern Quebec Inuit Association, the Government of Quebec, la Société d'Énergie de la Baie James, la Société de Développement de la Baie James, la Commission Hydro-Électrique de Québec and the Government of

Canada and certain other related agreement to which the Government of Canada is a party.

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

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 3,980, 5,112, and 5,687.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY—GRANTS AND PROJECTS

Question No. 3,980—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Has the Canadian International Development Agency ever made grants for the creation of projects in foreign countries and, if so, how many?

2. For each such grant, what was the (a) name of the project (b) location of the project (c) year it was made (d) amount?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes, since it was established the Canadian International Development Agency has made many thousands of grants to developing countries to provide direct economic, technical and social development assistance to these countries. From 1968 to date, CIDA has made grants to developing countries in the following amounts:

Year	Amount
1968-69	$133,503,723.18
1969-70	156,593.396.05
1970-71	193,303,414.15
1971-72	197,454,117.93
1972-73	245,903,031.66
1973-74	262,192,803.90
1974-75	333,749,668.83
1975-76*	382,946,791.00

*Expenditures up to 31-1-76

2. The data required to answer this part of the question are not maintained for the years prior to 1969-70. Since 1970, there have been many thousands of grants made. To provide the information requested for each and every one of these grants would involve massive research which could be done only with the expenditure of large amounts of both time and resources, which during this period of financial restraint, are not available.

NOVA SCOTIA—GROSS PROVINCIAL PRODUCT

Question No. 5,112—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What is the government's best estimate of its dollar level contribution to the gross provincial product of Nova Scotia in each year for which figures are available since 1968?

2. For each such year, what percentage of Nova Scotia's gross provincial product does the federal spending represent?

[Mr. Buchanan.]

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1 and 2. No official federal estimate exists of Nova Scotia's Gross Product, nor do official estimates exist of the total contribution of all federal government actions to economic activity in Nova Scotia. Estimates of Nova Scotia's gross provincial product are available from the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, and estimates of expenditures in Nova Scotia under a number of major federal programs are available from Statistics Canada. These estimates are shown in the first panel below. The second panel shows the expenditure estimates expressed as percentages of estimated gross provincial product though this is only to provide a general indication of their importance relative to the size of the Nova Scotia economy. These percentage figures do not, in any way, represent estimates of contributions to gross provincial product. Apart from federal wages, the expenditure series shown are not actual components of gross provincial product. They are, however, major sources of financing for personal expenditures and for expenditures by the provincial and local government expenditures. Many other federal actions, expenditures, revenues and non-budgetary actions, both in and outside Nova Scotia, influence Nova Scotia's economy directly or indirectly.

Federal Payments to Persons and Governments in Nova Scotia

	Nova Scotia Gross Provincial Product	Wages and Salaries	Transfers to Persons	Transfers to Provincial-Local Governments
		(in $ millions)		
1971	2,532	247	218	236
1972	2,871	278	281	279
1973	3,230	307	322	346
1974	3,780	346	397	400
		(as per cent Nova Scotia Gross Provincial Product)		
1971		9.8	8.6	9.3
1972		9.7	9.8	9.7
1973		9.5	10.0	10.7
1974		9.2	10.5	10.6

METRIC CONVERSION

Question No. 5,687—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. For what reason did the government decide to phase in the metric system at the present pace instead of implementing the change at the same time as the United States?

2. Is the government prepared to make special financial assistance available to businesses and other organizations for whom the introduction of the metric system will create a heavy financial burden and, if so, what is the nature of such assistance and to whom should inquiries and applications be made?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Canadian sector plans and schedules to take into account the interdependency of conversion activities in Canada with those in other countries, particularly in the USA. Although Canada is slightly ahead of the USA with its Investigation and Planning, much progress has already been made in the USA. Each sector committee in Canada has developed or is still

developing a plan which takes into account the extent to which programs of conversion in Canadian industries require to be coordinated with similar programs in the United States.

2. A program of loans is available to small business; such loan assistance is available to business facing special financing difficulties resulting from metric conversion when such businesses are unable to obtain financing from commercial lending institutions. The loans and counselling services to small business are available through the facilities of the Federal Business Development Bank. There is no indication in Canada or in other countries that the introduction of the metric system will create a heavy financial burden. Refer to the following background information for further explanation.

Background Information:

1. The U.S. Metric Conversion Act was signed by President Ford December 23, 1975. Despite previous delays in the passing of this legislation, U.S. industry, coordinated by the American National Metric Council (ANMC) has been proceeding with metric conversion for three years. The Metric Commission is keeping in close touch with developments in the United States in regard to the adoption of metric standards and measurements, and its sector committees maintain liaison with their opposite number ANMC sector committees which now number 34. Each sector committee in Canada has developed or is still developing a plan which takes into account the extent to which programs of conversion in Canadian industries require to be coordinated with similar programs in the United States. The Canadian Program of Guideline Dates for Metric Conversion is a four phase program. The first or Investigation Phase where sector and steering committees are formed and policies and strategies agreed upon is essentially complete. The second or Planning Phase is about 50 per cent complete, and the third or Scheduling Phase now underway. Canadian sector plans and schedules do take into account the interdependency of conversion activities in Canada with those in other countries, particularly in the USA. Although Canada is slightly ahead of the USA with its Investigation and Planning, much progress has already been made in the USA. It is anticipated that in many sectors, where close coordination is essential, that the fourth or Implementation Phase will proceed at about the same pace in both countries. The fact that the USA has not publicized very many sector plans or schedules so far, should not blind us to the very rapid progress they are making, nor to the ability of the US economy to implement change quickly now that the basic decision has been made.

2. The policy of the government in regard to Metric conversion was outlined in the White Paper on Metric Conversion laid before the House in January 1970 and approved by the leaders of all parties. In the White Paper the overall policy is that the costs of conversion will be borne by those incurring them just as the benefits flowing from conversion will accrue to the individual organizations either directly or through the general health of the economy. The policy does not, however, preclude any adjustment of the incidence of costs that might be desirable to avoid unjust burden on any individual group or sector of the economy or to guide and stimulate the conversion process in particular sectors to the advantage of the country as a whole. To this effect three financial concessions are at present under consideration by government in addition to the program of loans which has now been worked out with the Federal Business Development Bank. The first concerns employed persons required to own measurement sensitive tools for the performance of their duties who, as a result of Metric conversion, are compelled to duplicate tools. As envisaged this concession would consist of a cash reimbursement amounting to 50 per cent of the cost of such duplicate tools and made retroactive to January 1, 1976. The second concerns the owners of retail scales. Under consideration is the provision that parts and units required for the conversion of scales or weighing devices from imperial measure to metric measure or for replacement of scales in imperial measures by scales in metric measure be allowed entry into Canada free of duty and be exempt from payment of Federal Sales Tax. The third concession would be that net capital expenses incurred by firms or undertakings in replacement of imperial scales or weighing devices by metric scales or weighing devices be allowed as an expense for purposes of corporate income tax in the year of installation. Such concessions would be in effect for the limited period of the conversion phase, anticipated, at present, to be five years for tradesmen's tools and two years, beginning in mid 1978, for scales and weighing devices.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions No. 3,121 and 5,095 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

PURCHASE OF AIRCRAFT FROM T. EATON CO. LTD.

Question No. 3,121—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Were any aircraft purchased by the government from the T. Eaton Co. Ltd. and, if so (a) what type (b) on what date (c) at what cost (d) for what purpose (e) on what date and by whom were negotiations commenced for such purchase (f) for what reason was such purchase not listed in the answer to Question No. 344?

2. How many times, for what occasions and on what dates was such aircraft used (a) by the Prime Minister or any member of his family (b) by any Cabinet Minister?

3. What is the identity of all those involved in using such aircraft?

4. Did the Prime Minister or any member of his family or anyone else in government fly in such aircraft prior to the government officially becoming the owner and, if so (a) on what dates (b) for what purpose (c) what is the identity of all such persons involved?

Return tabled.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Question No. 5,095—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. For 1974-75, what was the total value of agricultural exports, except cereals?

2. What were the products exported?

3. What was the number of pounds or tons of the products?

Order Paper Questions

4. For the same period, did Canada import agricultural products and, if so (a) what were they (b) in what quantity in each case?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

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

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The answer to question No. 3121, until the parliamentary secretary mentioned that he was prepared to table it, had not been given, and I was about to ask why that was so simply because he had given us a guarantee shortly before the Christmas recess that all questions on the order paper prior to that date would be answered before the House adjourned, which is likely to be tomorrow or the next day. Now he has answered the question, but the answer has been tabled rather that included in *Hansard*.

In view of the fact that the question was whether a jet was purchased from the T. Eaton Company by the government, in view of the fact that this question was not answered when question No. 344 was answered, and in view of the fact that the question asks how many times the Prime Minister, his family and the cabinet ministers used this jet both after its purchase and before it was purchased from the T. Eaton Company, I feel that it is unacceptable for the answer to this question to be tabled. Whether it is an honest answer or the usual government cover-up answer, this answer should be not tabled, but inserted in *Hansard*.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the parliamentary secretary two questions which I have on the order paper. The first is question No. 3565 which I filed on the order paper last November 14 and has been on the order paper for the longest period of time. I am wondering whether the parliamentary secretary might be able either to expedite the answering of this question or give some reason as to the delay. I am a bit concerned that the government may not feel it is a very serious question because it asks whether it has given consideration to requiring that government documents be put into readable and understandable language so that the average citizen may understand them. I assure the parliamentary secretary that that is not a flippant question; I was very serious.

● (1530)

Another question I thought I might bring to his attention was placed on the order paper on May 28, with respect to the government's 1976 census. In view of the fact that we are about to adjourn for the summer recess, the current aspect of the question would be lost if it were allowed to be held over until the fall, and I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary will do whatever he can to expedite the answering of that question.

Mr. Blais: With a great deal of pleasure.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the third time and do pass, and the motion thereto of Mr. Condon.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, we have now reached a point where we have one more vote in so far as determining whether Bill C-84 will become law. If it becomes law, the abolition of capital punishment will become a reality in this nation. One would have to assume, having examined the votes which took place both on second reading and during the report stage, that we have reached a point where it is likely that capital punishment will be abolished in Canada for all crimes, including high treason and skyjacking, as well as for the murder of police officers and prison employees.

I do not intend to take a great deal of time today, but I want to point out some facts which give me a great deal of concern both with regard to the coming events in Montreal in so far as terrorists and their activities are concerned and with regard to the situations which will develop both in law enforcement in the nation and in the work of employees in penitentiaries. We have to appreciate that the elimination of high treason as a capital offence could be an open invitation to many terrorists in the world and will take away some of the protection which might have been available to Olympic athletes who could face terrorist activity as was the case at the last Olympic Games in Munich.

This is a rather appropriate day upon which to discuss this matter because it is the anniversary of the murder of the Isreali athletes who were in Munich strictly as athletes participating and endeavouring to show the excellence of their sports ability and who died because they happened to come from a country which certain terrorists believed should see the degree of disrespect they felt for that country, for human life, for humanity in general and certainly for any aspect of international law. So it is an appropriate day for a member of parliament to consider the situation once again and to make a decision on whether capital punishment should continue for certain individuals.

In so far as law enforcement in this country is concerned, I am very fearful that as a result of the action of this parliament, which is certainly contrary to the view of almost every law enforcement officer in this nation, there will be a change in attitude on the part of law enforcement officers. If parliament will not react to the wishes of the great majority of the people of this nation and impose capital punishment on those who carry out the murder of police officers and penitentiary employees, I am fearful that in too many instances in the days ahead we will see police officers taking the law into their own hands and shooting first and asking questions later, rather than believing that the courts of the land will deal properly with individuals who embark upon the kind of crimes

which the law now says should call for the supreme penalty.

Canadians may well see law enforcement officers embarking upon an altogether different approach, not being willing to risk their lives in endeavouring to stop crime or to apprehend criminals in the way they did previously, because they now know that parliament has ignored their wishes that the death penalty be retained, has ignored the wishes of the great majority of the Canadian people, and has even ignored the attitude of the supreme court of the United States which recently indicated that it still believes, contrary to an earlier decision, that there are crimes which call for the forfeiting of one's life.

This parliament is ignoring the will of the people. We are saying to the people that we are superior to them and that we know better than they do what the law of the land should be. In other words, once elected we are disregarding their views, and every time we do that we drive another nail into the coffin of democracy because there is just no way people can continue to respect this institution if it has no respect for the institution's point of view.

There can be no doubt in the mind of the public that this parliament has indicated, by the votes which have been taken up to now, that it has no respect for the great majority of the public as far as capital punishment is concerned. I regret this deeply. I do not believe that parliament and parliamentarians today are highly regarded, because all too often we ignore the wishes of the Canadian people on crucial issues which they really believe in; and the more often we do that, the less likely it is that we can raise the standard of parliament and improve its relationship with the people. If we do not do that, all the talk about participatory democracy, people's politics, and so forth, are just hollow words. They are words politicians can say, but when it comes to the crunch politicians really do not believe in them. If politicians do not believe in them, before very long, if it is not happening now, the public will be so sour about parliament and parliamentarians that it will say that parliament is just incidental and is not really important.

● (1540)

The public will say that what we really have in this country is a benevolent dictatorship under which every four years the people are given the opportunity to elect members to carry out their wishes, but it turns out that those wishes are ignored or superseded when it comes to really important matters of the day.

The one amendment that was passed provided that capital punishment will be retained for individuals who commit murder a second time. That is some small benefit to employees of penal institutions, but is of no major benefit to prison employees and law enforcement officers. It will be of benefit to prison employees if the government carries out the sentence, but nothing in the history of this government shows that such punishment will be carried out even when it is written in the statute. That concerns me, as it does many Canadians, and I am sure it is the reason so many people believe there should be capital punishment. As the murder statistics grow, an increasing number of policemen and employees in penitentiaries have been killed, so the public want to see the death penalty carried out.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us in this House will be sorry that parliament did not react the way the public has indicated it should act. A growing number of crimes that were at one time punishable by death will become statistics in the days ahead as a result of the stand we have taken.

I feel sorry for the people who have assumed the responsibility of working in our penitentiaries. Some have been there for many years and would like to leave, but because they must have security for their families cannot leave now and start all over again. Inmates who have not committed murder will be forced to stay longer in penal institutions when in some instances it would be more realistic to shorten their period of imprisonment. Indeed, I believe that about one third of all inmates should not even be in institutions. Surely there are other methods just as appropriate for rehabilitating criminals who are not guilty of vicious crimes. The government felt it would have to be harsh on all criminals in order to secure agreement for abolition of the death penalty, so now they are all to suffer and become charges on the state. We should be moving toward releasing them on parole, with proper supervision, to prepare them to become contributing members to the community.

The whole matter is very sad, Mr. Speaker, because it ignores the rights and views of Canadian citizens who pay the bills. It is sad because we adopt a hard line when we should be moving toward greater rehabilitation, and inmates who are not hardened criminals will become so if they remain in our institutions for a longer period of time. It is sad because parliament is going to mean less to the Canadian public: it really is not an institution that mirrors the view of the people who sent us here. As a result of the voting on this legislation that has taken place up to now, we have become very unrepresentative and this damages the faith and respect that people have for the institution. It is a sad day for parliament and Canada, and I am sorry that parliament has acted this way with the legislation.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet must take a great deal of the responsibility for parliament's action. There is no other way that as many individuals as are in the cabinet could have voted one after the other in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, especially if a member voted a different way when he was not a member of cabinet. It is an indication that freedom of vote does not exist in the cabinet. That being the case, it reflects on parliament. That is probably the saddest thing of all, Mr. Speaker.

One area of this parliament that should be most reflective of the view of the general public is the executive branch, the cabinet. After all, they make the laws of this nation, and if they do not appreciate what the public wants, God help them and God help parliament. There will be less respect for parliament and the public will not want to participate to such a great extent, in days ahead, in the democratic process.

● (1550)

After all, a person's vote will not mean much if after a general election the representative pays no heed to the

views of his constituents. We can say all we want about following our conscience, about being leaders and not followers, and all the other things. We can quote Edmund Burke to our heart's content. Yet if we want parliament to reflect the point of view of the nation, parliament must listen to the nation. That parliament is not listening is clear if one looks at the bill before the House. It is also clear, if one examines other legislation which this parliament has passed. In the end, parliament, democracy and every person in this country will suffer. As far as I am concerned, these remarks apply especially to this peace of legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the debate on Bill C-84 is coming to an end. A great many members have taken the opportunity to express their views, but seldom those of their constituents, because I still maintain that 85 or 90 per cent of the population favour retention of capital punishment in specific cases, where there is absolutely no doubt about guilt.

Several members have spoken about a free vote. I also dit it recently and I even stated to the press that the free vote seemed to me rather like a lot of eyewash, a manouver to allow the government, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), to have Bill C-84 passed, a bill nobody wants in Canada. Once more, I ask the Solicitor general, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government: who requested from the government the introduction of such a piece of legislation, when it has absolute authority to commute all death sentences to life imprisonment? What organization used its influence so that the government introduce Bill C-84?

A short while ago, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) replied to the question of privilege raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) to the effect that it was a free vote and there was no coercion, no strong pressures applied on members. However, I talked with two Liberal members whose names I shall not mention who told me that the ministers were twisting their arms to make them vote the way the government wanted, that is for Bill C-84. They threatened them, for example, to have a convention in their ridings before the next election or they told them that if they did not agree with the government they would not have access to electoral funds if an election were called within one or two years.

And I congratulate the member for Saint-Hyacinthe for having upheld his views this afternoon. But what surprised me in his case is that he blamed the government for disregarding the wishes of 90 per cent of voters. He was applauded by the Progressive Conservatives while he should have started by persuading his own leader (Mr. Clark) who voted for abolition and the former leader of the Progressive Conservative Party (Mr. Stanfield) who, two years ago, voted also for the abolition of capital punishment.

It is all very nice to throw stones into a neighbour's garden, but the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe should try to change the mind of his own leader who voted with the government on the capital punishment issue. I understand that this is a free vote, that the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party may vote in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, but is he thus respecting the will of the vast majority of the voters? Is he taking into account the pressures exerted upon him and the government by various chiefs of police, chiefs of firemen, prison guards and various organizations, these pressures aiming at maintaining law and order in a country such as Canada? What are their reaction to these pressures? What are they saying? Not a word.

[Mr. Coates.]

We have received a document from policemen of the City of Calgary, in Alberta, the home province of the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party. How does he react to the opinion of these people who are blaming the government for not respecting the greater majority of the Canadian public? Is he aware of the hoax being committed by some Liberal and Progressive Conservative members? I feel that the Liberals who are in power are responsible for the introduction of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I was listening to three inmates who answered questions at *Temps Present*, on CBC. Some inmates supported the death penalty rather than 25-year imprisonment, others said that it was more dangerous, among others a newsman named Claude Poirier who stated that the new legislation would make it more dangerous than before for policemen.

Mr. Speaker, even the Solicitor General does not give a hoot about public opinion, the Prime Minister does not give a hoot about public opinion, those people in the government do not care about organized groups, about the policemen we pay. What will policemen have in the future to defend themselves against criminals, usually against hardened criminals? At the present time, a policeman running after bandits to arrest them will fire one shot in the air to warn them that he is firing at them. In the future, the policeman will fire at the criminal first and he will fire the second shot in the air instead of the first one. So the Solicitor General will blame policemen and say that they were too quick, that they did not take the trouble to examine or to question the criminal before firing at him.

As I said recently, an individual came at my door in Hull with a revolver. Was his revolver registered at the office of the RCMP? I doubt it.

● (1600)

Can we assume that police officers will come and go with the assurance that their life will be respected in the name of humanism? What humanism?

Since the vote on second reading, we have received communications, we have received letters, and I have one here from the Province of Quebec Police and Fire Chiefs Association, law and order people, an association which dates back to 1926. They wrote and I quote:

Mr. Réal Caouette, M.P.

House of Commons

Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Caouette:

We just learned with consternation that Bill C-84 dealing with the abolition of capital punishment in Canada has just been given second reading in the House. It is difficult to restrain our deep deception and the deception of millions of Canadians at this unfortunate setback, an open door onto a dubious future. Acting on the authority of public opinion to which we are consistently listening, we send you herewith this brief.

A 35-page brief which has been submitted to the Solicitor General as well as to the federal cabinet. I go on with the quotation:

The latter, far more than the right alone of the association will bring, we are convinced of it, new and decisive arguments to strengthen the open and frank position of those who oppose the bill, and to win over the dissidents.

The stakes are high, namely our institutions, the security of each and every Canadian citizen, law and order in our land.

Sincerely,

J. P. Pelletier,
President

In addition, I have a letter from the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, 116 Albert St., Ottawa. I quote:

Comments addressed to members of the House of Commons and addendum to the CACP brief on capital punishment

In view of the possibility that Bill C-84 on capital punishment may not be referred to the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Justice and Legal Affairs, we wish to draw your attention to the following observations:

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police is studying with keen interest the debate now in progress on capital punishment and we wish to assure each and everyone that we respect all opinions expressed, as well by those who want abolition as those who would keep the death penalty.

Through the briefs we have already presented on that matter, we have clearly indicated our position in favour of retention and any further discussion would only bore you. However we wish to point out that in none of the speeches delivered so far is there any of our recommendation . . .

They will now have the assurance that someone did mention their recommendation in the House of Commons. I go on with the quotation:

. . . that a committee be set up with people representing the executive, the legislative and the judiciary to examine carefully the permanent banishment of an offender and its alternatives. The alternative proposed in Bill C-84 does not stem from careful consideration but can be considered as a deceptive replacement so that capital punishment will be deleted from our legislation. This assertion is based largely on the comments made by the hon. Warren Allmand to the John Howard Society in Ottawa, on April 8 last, when asked that question, that of course a 25-years term was too harsh but that first we had to get rid of capital punishment and then we could all work together to reduce this imprisonment period.

Do you realize the sincerity and frankness of the Solicitor General of Canada? He is an hypocrit and a liar, in my opinion, nothing else, by moving bill to abolish capital punishment, just so he can later reduce the number of years from 25 to 5, 10, 7 or 8 years. The Solicitor General has it in mind, but he is not frank enough to say so here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police goes on, and I quote:

Such a philosophy deeply concerns us because even if the period proposed under Bill C-84 remains in force, it includes a threat and a much graver danger to our society and more particularly to our prison guards.

In view of this philosophy, we submit that the minimum sentence of 25 years as provided in Bill C-84 is a false flashy representation because, in practice, an individual would have the right to ask, after serving 15 years, a reduction of his sentence.

We also believe that a minimum sentence of 10 years in some murder cases is much too severe compared with that of the odious individual who thinks only of killing for money.

No matter where those contract murderers operate, be it in Quebec or elsewhere, they belong to the same kind, to the same rapacious gang, ready to take the life of anyone as long that they get money to do it. I resume the quotation:

What is the protection given to those whose duties are to keep this vicious mafia? A prison sentence merely means that the person who deserves capital punishment will be able to kill at will. Even with retention of capital punishment, the traditional commuting would have the same effect.

Since we, as representatives of police forces throughout Canada, have a knowledge of criminal life accessible to very few people outside our profession, we feel duty bound to express our deepest concern directly to you, our legislator. Furthermore, the police community and even all our society remains certainly perplex after hearing coming from the same breath a plea for the a survival of a political party and the abolition of capital punishment. The conscience of the legislator should not be troubled the least bit concerning capital punishment, since the public itself has expressed time and time again its desire to retain it.

The ministers are well aware of that, even hon. members, particularly those I know well and who are from the province of Quebec. Yesterday, speaking on CJMS radio in Montreal, I said so plainly. I took a riding as an example, that of Montreal-Mercier, where 95 per cent of the population is in favour of retaining capital punishment. How can the member who represents them in this House say: "When the free vote is taken, freely and conscientiously, I vote against 95 per cent of my constituents".

Mr. Speaker, this also applies to the hon. member forBonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine. I challenge the hon. member—

Mr. Béchard: Yes!

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): —to accompany me in his constituency to conduct a poll—

Mr. Béchard: I made one.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): —and find out that the majority favour retention.

Mr. Béchard: I voted four times for abolition.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): —for abolition. What made him change his mind? Are the pressures of the government compelling him to vote for the abolition of the death penalty?

Mr. Béchard: Speak for yourself!

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): He is the undecided type who always follows the party.

Mr. Speaker, I go on with my quote:

If we are convinced, beyond any doubt, that the death penalty has a deterrent effect, . . .

Mr. Béchard: Nonsense.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): The hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine says that it is nonsense. I offer to send a letter to his riding—

Mr. Béchard: I already made a poll.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): —and so to prove to him that the majority of the people in his riding favour the death penalty in Canada. The hon. member rises to tell me

that I lied, if I lied. He knows that I am right, because what I say is right.

The whole population of Canada thinks that way. Not only the constituents of the hon. member's riding, everybody has the same feeling.

Mr. Béchard: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): No, I also speak for Canadians. I am the leader of a national party, I speak for the guidance of the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police goes on:

. . . and we challenge anyone to prove to us the contrary . . .

—to show us that this has become a frightening danger.

. . . the legislator should maybe have on his conscience the killings of police officers and prison guards because of the absence of appropriate protection.

Each member of our association eagerly awaits the day when no punishment will be necessary.

And so do I. Mr. Speaker, nobody likes hanging, not even those who favour the death penalty.

● (1610)

Hanging is for the real and known killer who will never be brought back to a normal or a reasonable way of life, and, Mr. Speaker, we tell them: The killers have been warned and if they kill they know what to expect. But no, the government prefers to protect criminals, even to the detriment of society, and to the detriment of its people. The police officers write on:

Unfortunately, the nature of man is such that there will always be some people who will be hostile to their neighbour and who will be led to commit crimes. The only way to prevent it is by way of punishment. No one would like to see someone condemned for a single mistake and, to this effect, we believe that the arguments voiced by both abolitionists and retentionists could meet in a middle path, mainly that, in the absence of the execution, whether by commutation of the sentence or otherwise, the repetition of a first act of violence such as those now punished by capital punishment, would lead automatically to banishment for life from our society.

We are confident that the democratic principles with which we all want to indentify will come first when you make your decision.

Respectfully yours,

Bernard E. Poirier, LL.L,
Executive Director.

Mr. Speaker, Wednesday we shall vote on third reading, that is on the final stage of Bill C-84. As we are about to vote on this bill, all of my colleagues have spoken, and you will note that with no influence on my part or on the part of anyone else, each one was truly free to express his opinion, and to take a position, and that 11 out of 11 members have voted against Bill C-84, not out of a wish for revenge, but to say to those who might propose to commit crimes or murders: Gentlemen, watch out! Do not take someone else's life or else you will have to give up your own life to pay for the one that you have removed from society. Then, Mr. Speaker, the individual is truly free: It he wants to hang, he can act consequently, and we, the Parliament or the government, shall apply the law so that this individual will be punished exactly like he could expect to be because of his actions. As the Canadian Parliament is preparing to abolish the death penalty we can read in American newspapers, and recently in the *La Presse* newspaper of July 3, 1976:

The Supreme Court maintains the death penalty in the U.S.A.

This means throughout the United States. There are states where the death sentence is commuted to life imprisonnment. There are others, like Florida, Georgia, Texas where the death penalty is still in force. There are rather highly organized mouvements in Great Britain seeking the reestablishment of the death penalty. There are other countries where no thought has been given to abolishing it, for instance in most African countries. The death penalty is still in existence in France, and when the French Minister of Foreign Affairs came to Canada recently, he said: I am in favour of the death penalty in extreme cases. This is what we are asking. We are not asking the Solicitor General to hang all criminals for any reason whatsoever, we are asking him, in extreme cases, in the case of murders committed for gain, to take the criminal and hang him or put him in the electric chair or to use any other means to eliminate him to protect society.

I have often heard the Solicitor General say: There are other means than the death penalty to protect society. I have often asked him: Give us those means, tell us that they are. Mr. Speaker, no means have ever been suggested. The Solicitor General is always saying that there are better means than the death penalty to stop crime, and Montreal has now had murder number 53 or 54 for 1976. That represents an average of over 100 a year and it seems like the Solicitor General does not see or does not pay attention to what is going on around him.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States sees fit to maintain that penalty, if England is talking about reinstating it, if in other countries of the world there is renewed talk of returning to capital punishment that is so because indeed there are criminals for whom there is absolutely no hope. There is hope for some, yes. Murders are committed for which the death penalty should not be applied, yes. But we say that in cases of premeditated, planned, loathsome murders where the guy has his gun fully loaded those people are not going to the St. Joseph Oratory to pray St. Joseph or Brother Andrew. No, sir. They go into a small grocery to kill the guy if he resists. It is going to cost us $15,000 to $20,000 a year to keep those people in jail during 25 years. And that would be reasoning? Mr. Speaker, that is not reasoning. I think the general public reasons better than this government. And I would like to know once more what organization or organizations asked this government to introduce Bill C-84, for all practical purposes an act to abolish the death penalty in Canada.

In concluding, I say we are going to vote conscientiously against Bill C-84, and I ask the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) to convince his leader, before he starts convincing the Liberals, to vote against Bill C-84 and also convince his former leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), to vote against this bill. Then, he may try to convince the Liberals, ministers or others, to vote against Bill C-84 that I consider to be a terrible calamity against society, against the honest citizen of Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on third reading of Bill C-84. I have spoken before on this subject, and rather forcefully, so I certainly do not intend to pursue the matter now at any great length.

I am well aware that this is an absolutely free vote and that it is up to the conscience of each and every member as to how he or she should vote on Wednesday afternoon. I am also aware that the votes of some members of the House are freer than those of others. But we shall wait and see what happens on Wednesday afternoon. I might add that I am not too optimistic of the outcome. Nevertheless, I want to put on record a few points which I believe to be important.

Most of us went back to our ridings over the weekend. I did so myself and I attended four or five different functions. Among them were two funerals. Believe it or not, I was cornered even at the funerals. Notwithstanding the sadness of the occasion, people found it necessary to express their views loud and clear with regard to Bill C-84. I stated my position, in turn, and needless to say it agreed with what a great many of my constituents were saying.

I believe capital punishment should be imposed in cases where the jury has made no recommendations for mercy and when the cabinet, in its wisdom, declines to commute the death sentence. Especially do I think the death penalty is appropriate in the following cases: First, the murder of prison guards in the execution of their duty or while off-duty if the murder is related to their duty; second, the murder of police officers in the execution of their duty or while off-duty if the murder is related to their duty; third, murder committed by persons whose records include one or more convictions for violent acts; fourth, pre-meditated murder or contract murder. I am thinking here of mafia-type murders committed by a "hit man" who knows what he is doing; he is a gangster, he shows no mercy, he probably does not even know who he is killing, but does so because there is a $5,000 or $10,000 payment for his services. Then fifth, where death is directly attributable to a crime of violence where the possibility of death occurring is great and where, in fact, death does occur.

I might say, with regard to that last category, that I am thinking of armed hold-ups where the hold-up men go in with machine-guns and automatic weapons, well knowing what they intend to do. In my opinion, the death penalty should be applicable in such cases.

Let me repeat what I have said earlier. I believe hanging to be a brutal and barbarous way of taking life. I believe executions should be carried out in the most humane way possible. I have suggested that a drug be injected so that the criminal could be painlessly removed from society with as little fuss as possible and as humanely as possible. Those who favour abolition usually talk about hanging, the scaffold, the horror of the rope, and so on. This comes from the press and from the media generally. Most of the news media seem to be abolitionist, bleeding hearts that worry more about the criminal than the victim. I have been surprised to read in editorial pages a great number of letters from citizens of Canada. If the media have received the same number that I have received, I am sure they would agree that the writers favour by ten to one the retention of some form of capital punishment.

● (1620)

When we vote on Wednesday, let us remember that there are 11 men on death row awaiting the outcome of the vote. On that basis I would say we should start afresh following the vote. These men who have gone through terrible agonies wondering whether their lives will be taken or not should have their sentences commuted, and if the bill is defeated capital punishment should be retained from there on for the crimes I have outlined, as well as for high treason. A good many members who are abolitionists at heart, I am sure feel that 15 years in prison—not 25 years—is an inadequate penalty for the crime of high treason, especially in view of the fact that this sentence may be further reduced on the unanimous decision of three judges. The same is true of hijacking or piracy. In my view, the hijackers of aircraft who cold-bloodedly kill the unfortunate passengers who are taken as hostages should also receive the ultimate penalty.

I hope a good many of my colleagues who voted for the bill will seriously reconsider their position when the final, third reading vote is taken. I should like to read into the record a letter I received from a friend of mine who I met a month or so ago. He wrote me a personal letter and and also sent me a copy of a letter that he addressed to the editor of the *Globe and Mail* under date June 24. He writes:

Dear Sir:

Geoffrey Stevens' article "A Day of High Drama" is an example of the hyperbole of which he is capable and further represents the "bleeding heart" socialist that he is.

Yesterday was not a great day for parliament as the vote registered did not represent a "free vote" as publicized but rather the imperious will of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Yesterday was the beginning of the end of any semblance to a democratic state. There may have been free votes to a degree in the opposition parties but within the Liberal party enough coercion was exercised by the Prime Minister who by his "supreme power" can and does reward with position and favour those who agree with him and remove those who do not.

Stevens is wrong constitutionally, ethically and morally. An elected member of parliament is duty bound to present the views of his constituents who did or did not elect him. To indicate that the fundamental duty of an elected member is to make "his own best decision" and ignore the people is also fatuous and without credence. It suggests a feudal state of primitive nature where only the elected have intellectual capacity and, therefore, will think, decide and dictate to an ignorant compliant mass.

The reference to Edmund Burke circa 1765 and his famous or infamous Bristol statement, which along with stating that elected members should make their own decisions (and inferred "to hell with the people"—Stevens) neglected to point out that Burke also stated that "he should be representative not delegate. He should attend to their interest but he must address himself to the general good of the whole community" etc.

It is also a matter of record that Burke made this statement while the elected member of parliament for Bristol but failed to retain the confidence of his constituents and lost his seat. His further re-entrance to parliament was in a "pocket borough" controlled by Lord Rockingham one of the Whig (Liberal) leaders of the time.

I would suggest that all members of parliament who are voting for the "abolition of capital punishment" and by so doing ignored the intelligent wishes of over 80 per cent of all unfettered Canadians be soundly defeated at the polls, whenever the next election is called. I would also suggest that the issue of capital punishment be put to the Canadian public at the same time.

Yours truly,
J. Douglas Wilson

That is one of a great many letters that have gone to the press and to various members of parliament. I appreciate that it is a free vote and that it is up to each of us to decide how to vote and then answer to our constituents. I am hoping that members of parliament will look at it in this way. Needless to say, I am rather cynical as to the outcome, but I hope I shall be surprised on Wednesday and that Bill C-84 will be defeated.

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, we are on the threshold of the passage of this bill and I do not intend to hold up the House for very long. I have a few words I should like to say since I have not spoken in the debate on this bill. There are some things, that have been said throughout this debate, and repeated again today, that I think should be challenged.

First of all, we do have a free vote in the House on this bill and it is a question of personal conscience. For some members of the press and even some members of the House continually to suggest that it is not a free vote I think is degrading and certainly an insult to the members of the House. There is no such thing as coercion or anything else exercised on anyone, to my knowledge, and it seems to me that if that sort of thing were going on on this side of the House I would be one of those approached to change my stand, just as would any other abolitionist. That is certainly not the case.

The point is that in our system the member of parliament is the representative of the people in his constituency. We have a representative kind of government. We come here to represent our constituents who have elected us, each with his own general make-up and morality and everything else that goes to make him or her a human being. They have voted for us because they like everything about us in general. They do not accept everything we say. Perhaps they do not agree with every word we utter or every idea we propose, but in general they accept us as men and women whom they send here to represent them. This does not mean to say that they are telling us we had better vote exactly the way they say we should vote in every instance.

To say that the majority of the people are retentionists and that we should be following the will of the majority oversimplifies this question. In the first place, who says that the majority of the people are retentionists? Gallup polls and the rest. Since when have Gallup polls been the last word on what is the will of the people? In the first place, I suspect the retentionists are far more vocal than abolitionists on this question, and therefore that would throw the poll out immediately. I do not think the majority of the people of this country are retentionists. In my constituency there are a lot of people who have written to me and made representations who are retentionists, but there are also many others who are abolitionists and who made their point of view known.

One group in particular, consisting of the major Christian churches, have officially come out against the retention of the death penalty. This is a very sizeable group, Mr. Speaker. I am not suggesting that everyone who belongs to a church in Canada follows everything that their church says, necessarily, but the majority of the people in my constituency are God-fearing and believe in the religion they pratice. Generally speaking, they follow the ideas put forth by the morality of their particular religion. I feel that those who have expressed their point of view on a religious basis in my constituency are sincere in so doing. Certainly, they believe it is not right to take a life. In my view, no human being or group of human beings has the right to take the life of another human being. That is the principle upon which I stand, and neither pressure nor anything else would make me sell my soul.

• (1630)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is, therefore, on the amendment by the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon). All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

Mr. Blais: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to the order passed on Friday last relating to the deferral of votes until Wednesday there has been a discussion with House leaders, with an agreement that the vote on the amendment be deferred until two o'clock on Wednesday of this week.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There has been no understanding that the amendment would be voted on Wednesday only. We would like to have it now, and if the bill is not negatived today the final vote on abolition will take place on Wednesday.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, and before the question is put on the amendment to the third reading, motion, I would indicate that the leader of the Social Credit Party suggested the proceedings were pursuant to the understanding. It is on that basis that I allowed the third reading motion amendment to be introduced pursuant to standing order.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, we discussed among House leaders Wednesday last, and the agreement was that if amendments appeared on the order paper at that time, votes on them would be deferred until Wednesday or simply cancelled.

The sponsors withdrew them. Namely the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) and the Conservative member that introduced them. But this amendment to defer to three months time the third reading of Bill C-84 was not discussed at the time the House leaders were consulting.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the order—and I am not referring to discussions among House leaders—as agreed to was that all questions would be deferred until Wednesday next. It seems to me that the amendment indeed is a question that would be included in that category.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, obviously there has to be a ruling in respect of the interpretation of the order so we should have all matters before us in respect of this extremely important legislation. We ought to have all possible interpretations before the House in order that Your Honour can consider the matter. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) has put forward one possible interpretation. I should like the House to look at *Votes and Proceedings* for July 9, 1976, distributed this morning, and page 1419 which states:

That, if the debate on all stages of Bill C-84 is concluded not later than Tuesday, July 13, 1976, any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading—

I gather from this that a division of this nature would not constitute the completion of the debate at all stages. I think that is a proper interpretation of the words. The debate at all stages has not been completed. Whatever that may mean in terms of this argument, I think we must realize that the agreement which was worked out by unanimous consent must be dealt with on that basis. I do not think we can slur over this fact and assume that all stages have been completed. I do not believe that is the case. That is my respectful submission to the Chair on this matter.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, references have been made to the order passed on Friday. It is true that one person might interpret it one way, and another person in another way. But, I certainly understood that any votes at the third reading stage would be put off until Wednesday.

May I also remind Your Honour and the House that there was a previous order. I have been trying to locate it, but have not yet turned it up. I refer to the one that was passed by an overwhelming vote and which said that at the report stage and at third reading any divisions called for would not be taken immediately, but would be held at a time to be determined, by recommendation of the House leaders, not more than five days later. I submit that order still holds and that because of that order, if we cannot agree on what Friday's order says in respect of votes on Wednesday, we cannot take the vote now but, rather, that the House leaders have to meet and decide when the vote on the three months' hoist amendment will be taken.

It seems to me that if there is any doubt about what was meant by Friday's order, the previous order was very clear. I am sure I speak for both sides in this debate when I say that we agreed that this debate was so important there should not be a snap vote with the possibility of many members not being here. I submit, therefore, that if there is not unanimous consent that the debate be regarded as concluded at this point, with all votes to be taken on Wednesday, then by virtue of the previous order the House leaders will now have to meet and fix a time within the next five days.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I think the logic of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Center (Mr. Knowles) is impeccable, except for one flaw. That is, of course, that the House order passed on Friday, I suggest to you, sir, would certainly supersede the motion passed on June 27, I think it was—either June 27 or June 29.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): June 29.

Mr. Lawrence: I am sure the House order passed last Friday would therefore supersede and make completely redundant the previous order. There is ample precedent for that. I would draw to your attention once more, sir, the actual order passed unanimously by the House on Friday last which states, in part:

That, if the debate on all stages of Bill C-84 is concluded not later than Tuesday, July 13, 1976, any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading... shall be taken on Wednesday, July 14, 1976—

I remind you, sir, of the point made by the opposition House leader that all stages have not been concluded. This is not a motion that concludes the third reading stage of the bill. If the third reading stage is not concluded, then that order does not apply to the requirement for the vote to take place on Wednesday next. Therefore, there is no House order which would require the stacking of this motion, and therefore the vote should be taken right now in the House. I know of no authority which would permit the chair to postpone the taking of the vote. Certainly, the motion passed last Friday would not be the basis for that authority, in any event.

● (1640)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that the motion introduced last Friday, pursuant to the agreement between the House leaders and the government leader reads as follows:

That if the debate on all stages of Bill C-84 is concluded not later than Tuesday, July 13, any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading and passage stage of the said bill shall be taken on Wednesday, July 14, 1976,...

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this means that the amendment moved this afternoon on third reading has nothing to do with the vote on third reading which has been deferred until 2:15 p.m., next Wednesday. Therefore, under our rules, that motion should be put this afternoon.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that somewhat disappoints me.

[*English*]

The comments of the House leader of the Conservative Party disappoint me. When I discussed with him the procedure which we intend to follow, as I did with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), it was understood that the debate had been completed to all intents and purposes at the amendment stage of third reading and the third reading stage, and in effect everyone had agreed that the vote would be taken on the amendment and subsequently the division would be called on third reading and then the vote deferred. That is why I am most disappointed at this turn of events.

Evidently we must turn now, not to the understanding among hon. members but to the strict legal interpretation of the motions we have before us. I agree fully that an interpretation of the Friday motion could be that recorded divisions would only be delayed until the debate had been completed. It was my understanding, from the indication received from the House leaders, that indeed that was the case. Had it not been for the subsequent declaration by the House leader of the Conservative Party, that would still be my understanding.

In adopting the legal interpretation perhaps I would not be successful in arguing that indeed the vote cannot be deferred until the debate has been completed and that, in fact, the debate may not be completed. But having said that, if that is the interpretation to be placed on Friday's motion, then there is a void. What is to take place in the event that a vote is taken prior to the debate having been completed? If the interpretation of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) is correct, that the debate has not been completed on third reading, that situation is not covered by the order approved on Friday. That being the case, we must now go to the other order to be found in *Votes and Proceedings* of June 29, which reads:

That any recorded division requested during the consideration of the report stage or the third reading stage of Bill C-84 . . . shall be held at a time to be fixed by the House leaders, provided that that time shall be not more than one week after the request for the division.

A division has been requested and the request is now before the House. Therefore, we should have a House leaders' meeting to determine at what time the vote on third reading should be held.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, throughout this debate on Bill C-84 there was a general understanding in the House that there should be no votes by surprise or by trickery. It was felt that this question was so important that all votes should be set at a time which would be known to all members well in advance. It was for that reason that we fixed the date of the vote on second reading; it was for that reason we fixed the date of the votes on report stage; and it was for that reason we fixed the date of the vote on third reading. It was the general understanding of the House, and it was one with which I agreed, that we should run out this debate this afternoon. If it was not known to be on that basis, hon. members would have continued to speak because nobody wanted a surprise vote or a vote by trickery this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: If this motion is to be interpreted as meaning that we are to have a vote, without notice, this afternoon—and I do not know who might win that vote because no count was taken, since nobody expected there would be voting today or tomorrow—I would point out that from the speeches made this morning by hon. members it is evident they expected the vote to be on Wednesday, because they were encouraging every hon. member to be here on that day. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) and many other hon. members stressed that all members should be here for the vote. They could not be here for a vote if a surprise vote were taken this afternoon.

[Mr. Blais.]

I would then refer hon. members to the motion, and ask them what other reason would there be for having any division or divisions if there can only be one vote, that is, the vote on third reading? The intention must have been to include any votes that would wind up this debate.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, this appears to be a difficult question because it encompasses a number of elements, but if the elements are taken one by one it really is not such a difficult question at all. Governing the whole debate is the order of June 29, which provides that all votes are to be deferred, with no exception. The next element in this equation is the order of July 9. That order does not, as the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) would suggest, contradict the earlier order. It specifies it; it provides that certain kinds of votes are to be taken at a certain time. In other words, it is the application of the general order, and in no way contravenes the order of June 29 which still governs the orders before the House for dealing with all stages and all votes on Bill C-84.

Taking both these elements as understood, we come to the fact that I believe the Chair should put the question on this amendment, and the vote on it will be deferred. Then the Chair should resume debate on Bill C-84, at which time we shall ascertain whether there are further speakers on this bill, apart from the amendment. I believe that is the procedure that should be followed. At the time the Chair puts the amendment there can be no agreement as to the date because it is not provided in the order of July 9. But that is not necessary. All that is necessary is that it be deferred and that the time either be established by the House leaders or, if the debate is finished by tomorrow night, that we revert to the order of July 9 which automatically establishes the time for the vote as being on Wednesday at two o'clock.

If you look at these elements one by one, your Honour will find that there is no problem here at all. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has given us the key to this whole thing by referring us back to the order of June 29.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When I was on my feet earlier I had not turned up the wording of the motion of June 29, so I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, your letting me have the floor for a few minutes again. The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) was kind enough to refer to my logic as impeccable, but then he tried to set it aside. May I point out to him that there was nothing in the order of last Friday that sets aside the order of June 29, which states quite clearly—and it was decided by a vote of the House—that any recorded division requested during the consideration of the report stage or third reading of Bill C-84 shall be held at a time to be fixed by the House leaders, and not more than a week later.

This motion for a three months hoist is either one of two things. One choice is that it is one of the divisions required to dispose of the third reading and passage stage of the bill. That is the language of Friday's order; any division or divisions required to dispose of the third reading and passage stage, by Friday's order, shall be taken this Wednesday at two o'clock. If Your Honour rules that this

three months' hoist motion is one of those divisions, it seems to me that you should order that the vote be taken on Wednesday at two o'clock.

● (1650)

The other choice open to you is to rule that it is not specifically covered in Friday's motion but that it is covered in the motion of June 29 in this language: any recorded division requested during the third reading stage. I think the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) and I might have trouble trying to apply the language of Friday's order to achieve what we thought we agreed upon. I certainly was in on that agreement.

Mr. Lawrence: You goofed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If we cannot achieve that by arguing the point, then certainly, so far as the order of June 29 is concerned, there cannot be a vote today until there has been a meeting of the House leaders to recommend a time for that vote.

I appreciate the suggestion of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) that we go on with the debate, but I do not see how we can go on with debate on third reading until we find out whether the bill has been given a three months' hoist. We have to have that vote. This is not like the report stage, where the votes can be stored up. It seems to me we cannot go on with third reading debate until we have made a decision on this three months' hoist amendment. But I appeal to you very strongly, sir, that you have two choices: either you rule that it is covered by the wording of Friday's motion, and therefore it is to be voted on Wednesday at two o'clock or if it is not covered there, it is certainly covered in the motion of June 29 and be taken now; it can be taken only after there has been a meeting of the House leaders to recommend the time for that vote.

Though I happen to be known to be on one side of this whole question, in the discussions we have had and when we meet as House leaders we are divided two and two. We have all taken the view, right through the piece, that a surprise vote would be no way to deal with this important issue. It was our understanding that if the debate collapsed on Friday, we were prepared to call it five o'clock. It was our understanding that if the debate collapsed today, we would be prepared to call it ten o'clock and not sit tomorrow.

I think it is unfortunate that this misunderstanding seems to have developed. But if it comes down to a case of the Chair having to rule, I submit very strongly the argument I am making, that Your Honour has to make one choice or the other: either it is covered by Friday's motion, and therefore it can be voted upon on Wednesday—

An hon. Member: A third choice would be to ring the bells.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What is the third choice?

An hon. Member: Ring the bells.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is exactly the choice Your Honour does not have. There are two orders, and this situation comes under one or the other. There is no possibility of Your Honour calling in the members at this time. It is either covered by Friday's order that it may take place Wednesday, or it is covered by the order of June 29, in which case the House leaders have to meet and recommend the time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) said earlier that there was an agreement to prevent an unexpected or a snap vote. Then, so as not to be accused or have my colleagues accused of a such an intent, I shall say that we have nothing to do with the motion before us calling for a three-month hoist. So there is no bad faith on our part.

Now, as concerns the amendments considered recently, it was not at all at the same stage. We were then in committee and at that time we had moved the amendments which were disposed of only a few days ago. This morning, it is an amendment that is in order and is designed to defer third reading until three months from now. Mr. Speaker, you asked for the "yeas" and "nays". We said "yea" and the others said "nay". Your Honour had decided that the "nays" had it and you said: Call in the members.

Then, the agreements made earlier between the House leaders have nothing to do with the amendment now before us. The amendments that were at an earlier stage were discussed and it was agreed that a vote should not be taken before Wednesday at 2:15 p.m., like on third reading. But this amendment has only one purpose, and it is to defer to three months from now the vote which was to be taken Wednesday. That is why we do not change our position. You asked that the members be called in, and I think we should vote on this amendment immediately.

[*English*]

Mr. Railton: Mr. Speaker, you have heard a great deal of learned advice, some not so learned and some partisan. I would just like to make a plea that on the question of the abolition of the death penalty it has been long understood that there would be a free vote for every member of the House, and when we left last weekend, the date was set for next Wednesday. At that time everybody will be here and will be given a chance to have his or her vote recorded. In my opinion, that would be the only wise thing for Your Honour to accept. It must be a vote on all motions, deletions and amendments, on Wednesday after debate is finished. Everybody has been counting on that. Why should we change it now? I think Your Honour has the welfare of the House and the people of Canada at heart, and the members of this House want their votes recorded.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a principle that this House should apply from now on, and that is consistency. Now, on June 29, we passed a resolution precisely to avoid this type of discussion. And that motion provided that no vote, at any stage should take place, and I quote:

That any recorded division requested during the consideration of the report stage or the third reading . . .

—which goes against the arguments of the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette)—

. . . shall be held at a time to be fixed by the House leaders, provided that that time shall be not more than one week after the request for the division.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything in last Friday's motion which cancels the motion of June 29. Therefore, I do not see how it can now be decided to hold a vote. The House leaders should meet and hold discussions. If they agree and if the vote is held within 10 minutes, that is fine, but I still think we should go by the June 29 resolution which has not been cancelled. This House actually passed it, and I do not really see the purpose of the present discussion.

[*English*]

Mr. Condon: Mr. Speaker, I seem to have caused a little consternation with the motion which I put, which was seconded by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), this morning. I assure the House that it was not my intention to embarrass either the House leaders or any hon. member of this House. My motion was prompted by the way I feel, and I felt it was necessary because of the concern I have for the constituency of Middlesex-London-Lambton. It was my assumption that the vote would be taken on Wednesday as outlined in a previous order. I am in your hands, Mr. Speaker, but I wanted to present this position. When the vote comes, I would prefer—and I am sure the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand would agree—to have all hon. members in the House to express their opinions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak because I cautioned the House about the question of postponing all votes until a specified day. I thought it was wrong then, and the hon. member, whether his intentions were correctly received by the House or not, pointed out clearly how wrong it is. This House has to debate and its members have to stand and be counted at the end of a debate.

● (1700)

As I understand it, the end of the debate on the amendment has come but not the end of the debate on the bill. The debate on third reading can continue. I have not spoken on third reading and I am sure there are other members who intend to speak, but the order laid down on July 9 suggests if—and "if" is a big word—the debate is not concluded the vote will be taken on Wednesday. I suggest to you, Sir, that you have three options: to call it six o'clock and allow the House leaders to meet; to have a vote on the amendment on Wednesday; and the third option is to have the vote on the amendment taken right now.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): As the seconder of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I should like it perfectly understood that there was no trickery in our minds when it was moved. We felt Bill C-84 should be postponed until after the Olympics—that the capital punishment legislation should be in force during that time, and that point was stressed during the debate many, many times.

Having said that, and without having listened to all the argument just now, I assumed that the vote would be taken on Wednesday afternoon as set forth in the order before the House now. I just want to make myself clear. I have no strong feelings one way or the other as to when it is taken, but in fairness to everybody I think it should be Wednesday.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, all we need to know is whether the last motion moved last Friday can change anything to the motion moved by the government House leader on June 29. If that motion, which reflected the views of the House leaders, is still valid, we must wait until Wednesday to hold the vote. But if the June 29 motion drafted by the House leaders is no longer valid because it is cancelled, so to speak, by last Friday's motion, it is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to rule on this matter and decide whether the vote shall take place Wednesday or today. If that motion is valid, because each motion to amend has to be voted on and the date of the vote agreed upon by the House leaders, then, it is up to you, Mr. Speaker, to make a ruling.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think I have received some very valuable contributions from hon. members, although I must say that did not help solve the problem. The House is in a difficult situation at this time. The motion of the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon), which was seconded by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), has come to a vote, and although both members declared it was not their intention to bring about this complication, the Chair cannot rule on their intention, and I have to consider the situation the motion is putting the House in at this time.

[*Translation*]

As far as I am concerned, in answer to the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), I, for one, have no difficulty with the two orders that were passed by this House on June 29 and July 9.

My interpretation of the order of July 9 deals with a specific matter and is merely a notice given to those hon. members who were to return to their respective ridings, so that they would know when the vote would be taken. It could have simply been announced in the House that an agreement had been reached between the House leaders, but it was decided to introduce a supplementary order. Initially, it was decided as a general principle that all the votes on the report and third reading stages of Bill C-84 would be taken only after an agreement was reached and the time decided upon by all the House leaders.

The order was put last Friday by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) in order to make it quite clear, the report stage having been disposed of, that the vote or votes on third reading would be taken on Wednesday, July 14, immediately after the prayers. There is no inconsistency whatsoever in that.

The only difficulty lies in the fact that an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon) and that the debate was concluded on the amendment which proposed that third reading of the bill be deferred for three months. Therefore, the House now finds itself in a dead end. I think that the point made by the Solicitor General—

[*English*]

—to the effect that there has been a general understanding that no snap vote will be taken, is well understood. As far as I am concerned I agree with that principale, but that does not solve the difficulty. I agree with the principle that no snap vote should be called, and on that point I think the point of order raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) was well taken.

[*Translation*]

Although the hon. member for Témiscamingue mentioned earlier that the Chair had said to call in the members, this does not mean that a member cannot rise on a point of order. Thanks to this point of order, I was able to review the general principles set forth in the previous orders passed on June 29 and July 9.

I see no problem in deferring the vote on the amendment until next Wednesday, since the House cannot, according to all precedents, proceed with the debate on third reading without ruling on the amendment now before us. We must therefore look for a way out of this dead end.

[*English*]

I know the minister is trying to stand up, and I shall welcome his suggestion at the end of my remarks.

Now that the question has been put on the amendment, we are facing a dead-end difficulty for a different reason. Members who are not here and who have the right to participate in a vote, if my interpretation is correct, according to the order, cannot be blamed for not being here and would have the right to blame the House for any vote taken in their absence without notice. Any member who was planning to speak on third reading tomorrow might be prevented from speaking if we postpone the vote until next Wednesday.

The fact that the vote is postponed or would be postponed on the amendment, might prevent other hon. members from bringing in amendments to the third reading motion. To delay that vote until next Wednesday, and if at that time the House felt that a third reading vote should be taken immediately, because some members might have planned to go to their ridings or have other engagements, would also cause confusion. But at this time my immediate conclusion is that no vote can be taken immediately if I interpret the two orders correctly.

[*Translation*]

The vote cannot be held right now. Accordingly, it must be deferred until next Wednesday, unless the House unanimously decides to amend the previous orders.

● (1710)

[*English*]

The House is master of its own rules and of its own decisions. Unless hon. members after consultation can bring some definite proposal to the Chair which could be put to the members so that, with the unanimous consent of all hon. members, there might be some modification as to the set time of the vote on the amendment, we cannot proceed any longer and I would have to call it either six o'clock or ten o'clock. We could call it six o'clock so that the House leaders could discuss the question during supper time and, when we reconvene at eight o'clock, suggest a solution. I invite the minister to speak at this time.

Capital Punishment

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in the circumstances, in order to enable those further conversations to which you referred to take place, I move, seconded by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand):

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I know the motion is not debatable; therefore I rise on a point of order. I wonder, before Your Honour, puts the question, if there is not some possibility of our agreeing now, with unanimous consent, to adjourn until eight o'clock this evening to allow House leaders to meet. This motion could certainly be put at eight o'clock. I do not know if that would be contrary to what the minister had in mind. Frankly, I do not know what the minister had in mind, but I think there would be agreement for the suggestion I have made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) will agree that the rules are strict with regard to motions such as the one moved. They are not debatable. I must put the question immediately, unless the minister decides to withdraw the motion.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Its adoption will mean that the House will be called to sit at eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)) which was agreed to on the following division.

(*Division No. 151*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand	Campagnolo (Mrs.)	Faulkner
Andras	Clermont	Firth
(Port Arthur)	Condon	Fleming
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Corriveau	Flynn
Baldwin	Cyr	Foster
Béchard	Daudlin	Fox
Bégin (Miss)	De Bané	Francis
Benjamin	Demers	Gauthier
Blais	Douglas	(Ottawa-Vanier)
Blouin	(Bruce-Grey)	Gillespie
Breau	Douglas	Goodale
Buchanan	(Nanaimo-Cowichan-	Guay
Caccia	The Islands)	(St. Boniface)
Cafik	Dupras	Herbert

Messrs.

Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lang
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nystrom
O'Connell
Orlikow
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Richardson
Rooney
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Turner
Watson—77

NAYS

Messrs.

Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Beatty
Beaudoin
Brisco
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cossitt
Darling
Dinsdale
Ellis
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)

Messrs.

Hamilton
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Hnatyshyn
Horner
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lawrence
Malone
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
McCain
McGrath
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Oberle
Reynolds
Ritchie
Skoreyko
Stanfield
Towers
Wagner—43

● (1810)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock in the morning.

On motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) the House adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 13, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

On the order: Government Orders:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Solicitor General,—That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be now read a third time.

Deferred division on the motion in amendment thereto of Mr. Condon, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand),—That Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day three months hence.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, when I left the House yesterday to attend the commemoration service for the eleven Israeli athletes who were killed in Munich, I remarked to my parliamentary secretary that I hoped I would not see him again until Wednesday, and he smiled reassuringly.

An hon. Member: Change secretaries.

Mr. Sharp: However, some rather unforeseen difficulties seem to have arisen partly because, if I may say, the French version of the House order which had been approved did not accord with the English version. This is a point which perhaps ought to be looked into, but be that as it may, the House leaders met this morning to see what might be the best way of proceeding with the continuation of the debate on Bill C-84. The House leaders are agreed on all points, particularly that we do not in any way want to hamper the debate on Bill C-84. Indeed, our wish is to facilitate it and to bring it to an eventual conclusion.

Our unanimous recommendation, therefore, is that with the consent of the House we proceed now with the debate on the main motion for the third reading of Bill C-84.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to what the government House leader has said, and he has put the proposition precisely. As one of the House leaders I certainly consent, and I commend that arrangement to all members of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is an arrangement to which we also agree.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I think the government House leader forgot to mention one little thing which we also discussed this morning, namely that if the discussion on third reading ends before one o'clock this afternoon, there should be an oral questions period this afternoon.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it understood, therefore, after discussion this morning, that the House will consider it one o'clock if the debate terminates so that there will in fact be certain to be a two o'clock proceeding this afternoon, including a question period and routine proceedings? The recommendation before the House is that, notwithstanding the practices and precedents of the House which would preclude discussion of Bill C-84 as long as the amendment motion remains outstanding, the House give unanimous consent to proceed to use the time today to discuss the main motion for third reading of Bill C-84. Does the House consent to that?

● (1110)

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Was the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I was not apprised of the actual consent for this Procedure until a few moments ago. I wonder if the government House leader would have the courtesy to at least advise me. One of the House leaders did, but I should like to hear it from the one who has to announce it to the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I take it that the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) is not on this occasion withholding his consent but is establishing a plan for the future and a very valid one.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered. Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Monday, July 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84 to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the third time and do pass, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Condon.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I must admit there are times in the House when we have the impression it is absolutely useless to make a speech. As regards the discussion on abolition of capital punishment, I think we can state, if we consider the position of the cabinet, that it would be pointless to extend this debate. However, as the majority of Canadians have already showed that they do not agree with the position of the federal government, we should try once again to give them a little common sense, a little logic and to inform the leader of the government and his staff that the protection of Canadian society is more important than the personal principles of any member of the cabinet.

An hon. Member: Tell that to Mr. Clark.

Mr. Wagner: I already did.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I think before continuing with this debate on capital punishment, and without intending to prolong it needlessly nor to repeat arguments that others have already advanced, I should like to congratulate those members of the House who courageously and persistently have fought so hard both in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs and at report stage in this House for the cause of social order and common sense in advocating the death penalty for premeditated murders. Without discriminating against anyone may I with your permission, Mr. Speaker, single out the determination and the resourcefulness with which the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) has led the fight.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wagner: He has been an inspiration to everyone, and he has sincerely believed in the necessity of keeping capital punishment in order to check and prevent the numerous activities of organized crime.

After a conscious examination of the views expressed in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, I must admit that I remain unshaken in my opinion that, especially because of the existence of organized crime and in order to protect the lives of innocent people and to secure a greater degree of safety for our policemen and prison guards, Bill C-84 must be defeated on third reading.

During this debate I have been particularly impressed with what a convinced abolitionist like the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) said about the necessity of retaining capital punishment for such odious crimes as high treason or espionage in wartime. His experience as prime minister during a difficult period of the cold war and his lifelong devotion to the cause of fundamental freedom and penal reform should have been enough to convince the government to amend this bill on this point at least. It should also incite some members who voted for the bill on second reading to reflect further and, hopefully, to reverse their position and join the ranks of the retentionists.

[*Translation*]

It is no mere coincidence, but the result of a vast experience and constant devotion to the cause of law and order that another abolitionist of international fame, Mr. Jean Imbert, whose book entitled *La peine de mort* is authoritative in this field, also comes to the conclusion that the state must maintain capital punishment for crimes of high treason and those of spying in times of war.

Is it not terrifying, Mr. Speaker, to think that the adoption of this bill would leave Canada without any real punishment for those who would conspire against the security of the state or the lives of its leader and other officials?

[*English*]

As discussion progressed in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs members of the House discovered a series of serious omissions, shortcomings and deficiencies in the legislation, giving the bill all the appearance of having been unduly improvised and rushed to this House. For instance, there is no provision for a more severe penalty—which could be death—for the commission of a second or even a third murder, yet it is not using scare tactics to suggest that the possibility of escape accompanied by murder by hardened criminals, is very real. Nobody can deny that. But under this bill the worst punishment such murderers can expect is to be condemned, for a second time, to life imprisonment. Mr. Speaker, there must be an end to softness or, as we say in French: il y a une limite à la bonasserie.

● (1120)

Had the government been sensible enough to accept amendments providing death sentences for high treason and second murder, I am sure some of the retentionists would have been more inclined to vote for this legislation. But as it stands now I, for one, cannot in conscience accept that the security of the state or the safety of prison guards and policemen should be put in jeopardy by the adoption of Bill C-84.

While I disagree with him, I do respect the views expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the course of this debate. I know that he is sincerely convinced of the rectitude of his position, as I am of my own. But I less than admire one argument brought forward by the Prime Minister when he spoke on second reading. Making his appeal to the House on June 15, as reported in *Hansard*, page 14499 the Prime Minister said:

> It is not open to anyone among us to take refuge in the comforting illusion that we are debating nothing more than an abstract theory of criminal justice, and that it will be the Cabinet's sole responsibility to decide the actual fate of individual murderers if this bill is defeated. I want to make it very clear that, if a majority of hon. members vote against abolition, some people are going to be hanged. Their death would be a direct consequence of the negative decision made by this House on this bill.

Some people have held this statement from the Prime Minister as showing strong leadership. I personally regard it, on the contrary, as an attempt to scare and even to blackmail the opponents of Bill C-84 into voting against their own convictions for fear of being regarded as executioners.

There is something frightening in the Prime Minister's tactics; for members of parliament, while open to compassion, should nevertheless remain above such personal considerations as the ones the right hon. gentleman mentioned. Be it for murder, rape, theft or even a minor offence, we are here to determine the law of the land and

the penalties for misbehaviour. We are in no way responsible for the way citizens respond to legitimate decisions of this parliament; nor should we be influenced in the knowledge that in their disobedience of the law such persons will be imprisoned or put to death. The argument advanced by the Prime Minister in this regard is tantamount to undue pressure, impeding the freedom of thought for those who are about to take a very serious decision.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I totally reject the allegations of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that, should Bill C-84 be defeated, those who vote against it will be responsible for the death of the murderers. None of us, including members of the cabinet, ought to feel guilty for action according to his conscience and enacting legislation to uphold social order and deterring the most hardened criminals from making attempts on the lives of others, especially policemen and prison guards. The first and only ones to be responsible for their own deaths would be those who have cold bloodedly slain their victims in defiance of a law which clearly and plainly stated the death penalty would be imposed for their crimes. Moreover, those criminals, during their trials and through appeals, had every chance to clear themselves and prove they deserved commutation.

The fact that the Prime Minister has thus attempted to personalize the debate, by pointing out to 11 prisoners awaiting the gallows, proves how desperate is the situation in which he has placed himself by trying to impose his own wishes on Parliament and the Canadian people.

However, it is the very same Prime Minister who has created this problem by systematically refusing, since 1968, to implement a legislation which has been twice ruled out by Parliament, during the time he has been a member of the cabinet. Only the Prime Minister is responsible for the situation in which he willingly placed himself and from which he is trying to extricate by setting up a detestable scarecrow to urge us to vote against our deepest convictions.

[*English*]

The Prime Minister knows very well that no member of parliament is asking for a mass execution of those waiting in the death rows. Every one of us, I dare say, would be satisfied to see the government exercise the royal prerogative of mercy in every case where it is warranted. As for the others, they knew the law when they committed their crimes. Moreover, they had been warned in no uncertain terms—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): By the Prime Minister.

Mr. Wagner: —by the Prime Minister himself on May 16, 1973, when his government proposed Bill C-2. I quote what the Prime Minister said on that day, as reported in *Hansard*, page 3843:

> Those who mock the desire of Canadians for an orderly, law-abiding community, those who hold in contempt those restraints on human conduct that enable us to live as free men and women, will be shown that society is not only resilient but that it is capable of protecting itself and of meting out whatever punishment is required.

● (1130)

That is the end of the quotation from the Prime Minister. You remember, Mr. Speaker, during the October crisis how the Prime Minister derided those weak-kneed bleeding hearts who, he said, were afraid to take the necessary measures to protect Canadians against a handful of FLQ members. You remember that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

We also remember, Mr. Speaker, in what anguished terms the Prime Minister at that time—

Mr. Béchard: It sounds like a sermon!

Mr. Wagner: As the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Béchard) says, the Prime Minister's speech did sound like a sermon.

Mr. Béchard: Yours.

Mr. Wagner: That is right. It sounded like a sermon when he was then warning people that the next FLQ victims might be either a bank or credit union manager, or the corner grocer or even an innocent child.

Without echoing the melodramatic tone of the Prime Minister, would I not be even more justified in resorting to the same argument the head of the government used during the October crisis, because bank robbers and hired assassins have given us ample proof that they will never hesitate to kill to reach their ends.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this text, I wish to repeat the warning given on May 16, 1973 by the very distinguished right hon. Prime Minister of Canada to potential murderers of policemen and prison guards, and I quote:

> Those who mock the desire of Canadians for an orderly, lawabiding community, those who hold in contempt those restraints on human conduct that enable us to live as free men and women, will be shown that society is not only resilient but that it is capable of protecting itself and of meting out whatever punishment is required.

Now then, what was the punishment advocated by the Prime Minister, what was it? It was the death penalty for the murder of policemen killed on duty. The Prime Minister cannot deny it today because, on October 24, 1973, he voted for Bill C-2 on second reading. Mr. Speaker, either the Prime Minister was convinced in 1973 of the necessity to maintain capital punishment in some specific circumstances, and if so nothing can explain the automatic commutations of death sentences made since then, or—and Bill C-84 confirms it eloquently—the head of the government was resorting to subterfuges to hide his real intentions from Parliament, and in that case I leave it to the public to judge his actions. As it happens, Mr. Speaker, the great majority of this public want Bill C-84 defeated. We will soon know, in a few days probably, whether the will of the public or the will of Parliament, under the direction of the Prime Minister, under the direction of his majority government, will prevail.

[*English*]

I hope we will not hear any further tales from the government side about the so-called free vote on Bill C-84.

An hon. Member: Yes, you will.

Mr. Wagner: If we do, we shall respond. By moving this bill as a government bill, the Prime Minister has prevented his own colleagues in the cabinet—some of whom in the past have expressed contrary views—from now expressing

their personal views or, to use the words of the Prime Minister, to vote according to their own conscience. Had the Prime Minister wanted a truly free vote, he would have asked a private member to bring in this bill, even on his own terms, and every member of this House could have voted as he wished, whether the member were a backbencher, a member of the cabinet or a member of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Wagner: As regards government backbenchers, had this been a private member's bill, they would not have been exposed to ever possible undue pressure not directly related to the capital punishment issue.

Mr. Speaker, I know that if Bill C-84 is accepted the morale of our policemen and especially of our prison guards will be greatly shaken. Yet I am sure that as law-abiding citizens those peace officers will accept, despite their reservations, their apprehensions and their fears, the will of a parliamentary majority. I hope at last there will not be massive resignations among them, which would jeopardize security in our penitentiary institutions.

But peace officers are men like everybody else. They are not inmune from errors or unpredictable reactions. Thus it is essential that in the performance of their duties they can enjoy the greatest possible serenity of mind. Will it be the case if Bill C-84 is accepted? I doubt it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall what the right hon. Prime Minister himself stated, for it is strange, Mr. Speaker, how sometimes their own statements come back to haunt politicians. Might I remind you that the Prime Minister himself declared in this House on May 16, 1973, when Bill C-2 was under study, and I quote:

> Out of fear for his safety, and the safety of his loved ones, even the most merciful of men becomes unwilling to assist the wayward.

● (1140)

[*English*]

Because of the importance of that statement, I want to read in English the warning expressed by the Prime Minister only three years ago:

> Out of fear for his safety and the safety of his loved ones, even the most merciful of men will become unwilling to assist the wayward and the feckless.

I pray God, Mr. Speaker, that this warning of the Prime Minister will never become a prophecy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, if I take part in the debate on third reading of Bill C-84, I do so not to delay the work of the House but rather to point out, once again, that if the government has reached the point where it introduces a bill to abolish capital punishment, it does so because of its many commutations in the last few years. To my mind, the government, through this bill, wants Parliament to approve what cabinet has done in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at length at this stage because the leader of the Social Credit Party of Canada dealt with the matter yesterday in some detail, and I share his point of view. That is why it would be useless to repeat the logical arguments that can be invoked to oppose passage of this bill.

I also listened very closely to the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) who made a very sensible speech and recalled the words of the Prime Minister, at the time when discussions were echoed by the press throughout Canada, and to a certain extent I support the views expressed by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) on Bill C-84 concerning capital punishment.

I would have appreciated it, however, if the hon. member had been successful in convincing the leader of the official opposition to reconsider his position and go along courageously with those who oppose Bill C-84 for reasons as valid as those advocated by abolitionists. Having said that, I still believe however, that if we could have a really free vote in this House, the leader of the opposition would also enjoy that choice. I do agree on that. But as I said earlier I am not yet convinced that a genuine free vote can be held in the House on that issue. Members of some parties are so used to following the party line that even if the government allows members to express themselves freely, they will not take this opportunity to vote according to the will of the population.

Mr. Speaker, I submit what I indicated a number of times, namely that on the occasion of such an important legislation, the people of Canada should have been consulted through a referendum. Not that kind of plebiscite that was held in 1941, when the Liberal government wanted to get released from their commitment that there would be no conscription across the country. Not a kind of referendum where members of parliament and ministers would appear one after the other before television, to try and convince the people to vote this or that way, but a true referendum, a really democratic one decreed by this House and held without TV debate.

When the people are consulted, they should be trusted to take their own responsibilities. Such a consultation would have given an opportunity for democracy to go through this difficult stage. More trust would have been shown toward the younger Canadians, and they would have realized that our parliamentary system, one of the best in the world, is capable of respecting the people's will and giving them an opportunity to express it when important decisions have to be taken.

The holding of such a referendum was flatly denied for a number of reasons. However, some groups held consultations, and I would take this opportunity to commend the Canadian Police Association for holding such a referendum on this subject. And I refer to the brief dated May 3, 1976 that was submitted to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. May I quote the following excerpt from that document:

> Our association recently circulated through various newspapers a questionnaire on capital punishment. Here is the response of the public to the following questions. Question No. 1: Should capital punishment be retained only for the murder of police officers on duty, or prison guards?
>
> Reply of the public: Yes, 4,855; no, 55,425.

This is a significant reply obtained after free consultation.

Question No. 2: For the murder of anyone while carrying out a premeditated crime? Reply of the public: Yes, 55,374; no, 8,516. Question No. 3: Should the capital punishment issue be decided by a Canadian referendum? Reply of the public: Yes, 55,282; no, 3,444. Question No. 4: Are you against the death penalty because of the means of execution (hanging)? Reply of the public: Yes, 9,954; no, 44,258.

This is significant. The word "hanging" is not at issue, but the whole basis of the question is truly analyzed. People truly went to the bottom of things.

Question No. 5: If yes to question No. 4, what means of execution would you favour? Reply of the public: Electric chair: 2,822. Gas chamber: 2,486. Drugs: 2,911. Firing squad: 856. Any public means: 693. The means used by the murderer: 37.

I will come back to this question later.

Question No. 6: If you are against the death penalty by any method whatsoever, what penalty would you favour? Reply of the public: Psychiatric treatment and rehabilitation: 168. No parole: 11,712. Parole: 194.

The number of respondents represents 87 per cent of the total population. It is therefore with good reason that members of Parliament oppose the passage of Bill C-84. They argue that te majority of the population favour retention of the death penalty. The population is absolutely right if we consider this consultation made by the Toronto Police Association.

● (1150)

Mr. Speaker, we have also received many letters from the public. I shall certainly not read even one of them because they all express approximately the same opinion. But I still insist that this is a very serious situation. We are all Christians. We all need some light and I believe that it would not be improper for the House to ask the Holy Ghost to enlighten us so that we may receive the enlightenment that we need before the vote and be truly able to take an action that will be in accordance with the wishes of the people. A proverb says *Vox populi, vox Dei*, which means that the voice of the people is the voice of God. As Christians, we must therefore have the humility to ask the enlightenment that we need to do what the people wish for the greater good of Canada.

I would like that between now and tomorrow, when we have the opportunity to ponder some more over the seriousness of the choice we have to make, we can so express ourselves that people will rest assured that all members voted conscientiously. That is the important thing to do if we are to restore credibility in the minds of Canadians about the role of members of parliament.

It is current practice for bills introduced in the House, after being dealt with at the second reading stage, to be sent to a committee. Bill C-84 was sent to the justice and legal affairs committee but, unfortunately, I believe the purpose of that committee was distorted because I have always believed that the referral of a bill to a committee of the House aims at giving the public a chance to be heard, to present briefs, to express verbally their approval or disapproval of the bill.

Unfortunately I deplore the fact that the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs proceeded so fast that it was not possible to call witnesses for or against capital punishment so that we might have had the widest consultation possible and be in a position to present amendments that would have made this bill better understood by the public. Canadians could have hoped for the future of our country to have the best possible law and the closest to their expectations.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we depreciated the actual value of committees as the public has been deprived of that benefit. I know that the committee sat but it did so rapidly that it was impossible for the citizens concerned to come to Ottawa and make representations that would have surely been well received by every member of the committee as it is their role to entertain representations from the public.

I am sorry but I think that that kind of procedure is an attempt against democracy and, in the future, I am afraid that the public will not have too much confidence in those committees and that they will neglect to express their point of view in other circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, no need to say that my position has not changed because I am more convinced than ever that we should give to those responsible for the protection of the individual, the protection of our property and the public. I regret that the majority did not agree to offer that protection to which the public is entitled. I am afraid that henceforth the people will not have enough confidence in the protection we can give them and will take the law into their own hands. This would lead to a society of disorder, a society of violence. However, as I said last week, God knows we are well on the path of the society of violence that we accept as a normal evolution. We talk about evolution but what is it? We can have forward evolution but we can also have retrograde evolution. So the word evolution does not mean in our society that we are wiser than our fathers and our great-grandfathers. Fair enough, there must be evolution but if we really want that it be in the right direction, we should take measures to avoid the situations of violence, we should suppress all the causes that lead us to violence. Whether these causes are political, social or economic, as parliamentarians we have the duty to open our eyes, to be well aware of the glaring facts and to take the necessary measures so that there can be more justice in our country and so that we can prevent that idea from springing up in the minds of those who suffer from persecution before justice, I mean that of wanting to take the law into their own hands. Moreover, we should repress those criminals who have the regrettable tendency to attack their fellow-beings, even though they are deterred by the courageous attitude of society and by the parliaments which adopt laws to protect them against themselves.

I think that was our ancestors' aim: to provide that punishment for the criminals in the Criminal Code. We must protect society against those who have this tendency, against those who are prepared to go to any end to seize the property of others by violence, at the point of a gun.

Mr. Speaker, I think we could have found a form of execution for criminals without talking about hanging. I still hope it will be possible to find a humane way of applying death sentences, likely to make those who will be aware of it understand that society is sorry for having to execute the guilty, to deprive him of the great gift of life, but doing so in a human way, society will understand that such action is prompted by a sense of duty, a spirit of justice and at the same time a respect for the great value of human life.

Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude on these words, asking my colleagues to think again about the seriousness of the situation and to trust those who are responsible for administrating and enforcing our laws, for promoting as well the justice we are asking for. These people must have confidence in us. Within a few days, the Olympic Games will take place in Montreal. There will be 16,000 members of the Armed Forces, thousands of policemen who will risk their lives and will be the advanced guard; those people will be there to protect society against those who might wish to take advantage of the situation to cause trouble and disturbances or to take barbaric action. We rely on them to protect us, to ensure public protection. But for God's sake, tomorrow, let us give them the necessary tools to enable them to carry out their duty, which will hopefully prevent us from going through unpleasant events that would damage the reputation of our country, our province and the city of Montreal. Thus, policemen will be able to carry out their duty while feeling protected, and should potential murderers plan to do something, they would act very carefully to avoid being sentenced to death.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that I do not fear capital punishment at all because I do not intend to murder anyone. Now, if the present act is amended, capital punishment will apply only to those convicted of murder. With Bill C-84, all these provisions are removed, there will be life sentencing, and God knows how many life sentences, in the past, have been commuted to a few years in prison only. Then, life sentence is changed again; they speak of 15, 20 or 25 years. This is not even a life sentence, but a specified period in prison.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly vote against Bill C-84 on third reading and I hope that meanwhile, the government will review its position and introduce a better legislation.

● (1200)

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend hon. members who spoke today and yesterday at this stage of the proceedings. I have been extraordinarily concerned with the turn of events in this particular debate. First of all, this bill was advanced, not because there was a demand by the government caucus, nor because there was a demand from the public, but merely as a cabinet relief bill. It was introduced merely to relieve the cabinet of a decision that it has assumed over the years, a practice which I have deprecated, placing itself in the position of the final court of appeal on capital sentences.

As a body, the cabinet is totally unsuited for that position. Nowhere else do we have questions of justice or legal decisions taken by a civil body as a final decision. This is a practice that grew up in the 1960s. Certainly it was the practice when the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was leader of the government. It is a practice that I protested then and during the years following under Mr. Pearson. We know there were political considerations in the determination of whether the sentence against this or that condemned person, whose rights had been fully protected by the courts all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada and in respect of whom the courts had decreed the penalty according to law, should be exacted. There has been this 14 years of practice.

I can understand that the cabinet, having backed itself into a corner as a result of the illogical law of 1967—that is, the limitations on capital punishment at the time, renewed in 1972—is now facing some cases where it actually would have to carry out the law. As a result, the cabinet brought forward this bill under the guise of a free vote.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner), the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), and others in this House demonstrated—and I will not repeat the arguments—just how free the vote really was. This is the biggest hoax on the public in years and, goodness knows, there have been real hoaxes perpetrated on the public in the last few years. The very circumstances surrounding the introduction of the bill, under the principle of cabinet solidarity, ties up the cabinet. The cabinet had no free vote in this regard. There will be pious confidence that as a result of a free debate and a free vote, this House adopted on second reading the principle of abolition of capital punishment. I will speak about the second reading vote in a moment. The suggestion that there was a free vote is the laugh of the century.

Government supporters found themselves, for one reason or another, under various pressures—which were not applicable to members on this side of the House—in spite of the so-called right to exercise a free vote. I could even go to the extent of suggesting that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) was restricted in his role as Conservative House leader in negotiating certain aspects of this debate because members of the Conservative caucus said this was not a party position, and if there were to be arrangements made with regard to the debate they would be made between supporters and opponents of the bill. That was not apparent on the government side.

Yesterday, during discussion on a question of privilege, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe indicated quite conclusively that there were pressures put on certain members, as did the hon. member for Témiscamingue, and no one would dare controvert their positions.

It is now said by some pundits that parliament seems irrelevant to the public scene. Well, I do not agree with that, but certainly this debate can be used as an example. There is no public demand for the abolition of capital punishment. To the contrary. Those hon. members who are honest enough to speak about the reaction among their constituents, either through polls or otherwise, know that there is only a small fraction of the Canadian public which advocates the abolition of capital punishment. Therefore, this long debate on Bill C-84 is not as a result of public demand. The situation is to the contrary.

● (1210)

There is another point on which I should like to comment.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): If junior hon. members of the House—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Collenette: Notwithstanding what we say on either side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I resent the suggestion that there may be some inequality amoung members. We are all hon. members.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It is obvious that my words struck home in that I am taken back to the point which I started making, that certain people like to read many of the speeches that are made. I would say that usually when I refer to hon. junior members of the House, I mean to refer to inexperience. Other than that, we all stand equal.

An hon. Member: Innuendo.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I should like to point out to the hon. member that we are here to debate Bill C-84, and I suggest that he keep to the subject matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, it is the noisemakers who interrupted me. If they are to be permitted the opportunity to make irrelevant interruptions, I have the right to reply.

An hon. Member: Shame.

An hon. Member: We are all equal when it comes to irrelevancy.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): They are also equal when it comes to conforming to the practices of the House so far as reading speeches is concerned. The point to which I wish to come back concerns the so-called principle of the bill. Some hon. members felt at some point in the report stage of this bill that if they were to support certain amendments they would be voting against what had been adopted as the principle of the bill. Nothing could be further from the truth.

It is a fact that in the preparation of the amendments to the rules, or the changes in the procedures in 1969, second reading ceased to be the adoption in principle of a bill. The rules that have been quoted in the House go back to British practice, which also predates changes in their rules. There is nothing like using wrong authorities to support a poor case, and that is what has happened. For instance, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) put out in the debate that there had been adoption of the bill in principle. Occasionally these things are reported in the press and then someone keeps insisting that second reading is adoption in principle. But there is nothing in our rules, as they were changed, to say so.

Second reading is passage of a stage and reference to committee. How many times over the past seven years have bills been brought forward by the government which were controversial, but which were given second reading by the opposition with the reservation that certain amendments would be adopted. This is so the House can proceed to the next stage. Here, again, I should like to make reference to hon. members whose experience is relatively limited. Prior to the time I mentioned, if hon. members wish to go back to the debates they will see what happened when there was a total block on second reading because it was deemed to be adoption in principle of the bill. But to get away from that, to make the proceedings more flexible, it was changed to mean reference to a committee.

We are now at the most important stage of the bill.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It is important all the way.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): But the most important stage, if I may say so, is the stage after which there have been amendments. The minister in charge of Bill C-84 has accepted some amendments and there have been others put forward by members of the House and adopted by the House. Let us look at Bill C-83 to which some 60 amendments were made, if not more. It is the stage at which the House will vote on the bill and either accept or reject it. At that stage we see the embodiment of the law which will be applied in future to govern the actions of the Canadian public. It is not that which is there as a framework on second reading.

There is another point which I should like to make. I challenge the common belief that in an amending bill there is any other principle than that a certain law shall be amended. Bill C-84 contains many provisions which may indirectly have to do with changing the nature of the penalty, and it is merely a bill like others such as Bill C-83, a bill to amend the Criminal Code of Canada. Can anyone tell me that Bill C-83 is a gun control bill, when there are important sections in it dealing with wiretapping and other matters?

This is merely a bill to amend the Criminal Code. If there is to be a principle, it is merely that. The distinction must be made with, for instance, Bill C-79 which set up the whole framework of the Anti-Inflation Board. It started out with the title and proceeded in detail. This bill has no title. If there is a total bill, one can find the principle such as in Bill C-79. What was it? It was an act to create the Anti-Inflation Board and give it certain powers. That is not so with this particular bill. Therefore, I say that the debate on principle is at this stage, and that a vote at the report stage which is contrary in part to the vote at second reading stage is not a vote against the principle of a bill previously adopted by this House. To me it is a fallacious argument to say that on an amending bill there can be a vote against the principle of the bill. The only vote which would be against the principle of this bill would be one which would refuse to amend the Criminal Code.

● (1220)

This subject was brought forward, as I said, by way of a government bill. There recently came to my study a paper prepared by Sir David Stephens, the former Clerk of the House of Lords in Britain. It is available to the procedure committee, particularly to a subcommittee headed by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane). It deals with private members' initiatives and with private members' legislation. There are classic examples of how, in the British House, subjects which are highly arguable from a moral point of view—abortion, divorce, capital punishment, homosexuality, and some others—always come through a private member so that there is a true free vote. The government there recognizes that there is a very deep and fundamental difference among its supporters.

That is how this bill should have come forward. I am sure the government could have found any number of its supporters who would have been the proudest people on earth to act as sponsors of this bill, and possibly the seconder could even have come from somewhere in the opposition. But it would have been a private member's bill and then we would have a true free vote. However, there are other people in this House who decide how things shall be done.

All I can say is that this has been a grievous lost opportunity for actually giving private members in this House the opportunity of expressing themselves and voting according to how they see it, rather than merely being caught up in the party machinery, the caucus machinery and in some other areas where it is said there are powers which have even greater influence on a particular party and its members. I am quoting from a British document which refers to the Trade Union Council, The TUC, which in many instances has to be directly consulted by the British Labour Party and the Labour government in order to determine what legislation shall come forward and what shall be contained in the legislation. I hope we do not have that practice and that we will not turn back the clock in so far as the influence of the private member is concerned.

Rule changes are proposed for this House always under a banner of so-called efficiency. All they do is make it easier for the cabinet. All they do is hack away at the few remaining controls there are; and this is supposed to be a responsible government! Whatever powers there are of examination, of questioning and control of the cabinet by the House go out under the expediency of efficiency.

Then we get the pundits outside complaining about parliament. Parliament itself, under the influence of very overpowering cabinet power, has fashioned its own hair-shirt and has sown the seeds of its own destruction in many ways. To use another simile, perhaps the way has been prepared for the charge that parliament is irrelevant because what is the point of discussion? Government backbenchers sit impatiently because they are precluded from participating in debate—and I have sat on the government side—because cabinet ministers want their legislation to go forward. People are asked blindly to support legislation, not to criticize publicly and not to rock the boat. But that is not parliament. I must say that in this particular debate I was glad to see some hon. members on the government side break those chains and speak independently with regard to this bill.

I and many hon. members have made reference to public opinion. To be subjective, this past weekend I was in Edmonton. I must say that I would not dare put down in *Hansard*, for fear of offending some souls, the nature of the language of the criticism of this bill and of the government which was expressed to me. Only one person, a lady friend of our family, called me and said she was glad that the vote went as it did. I expected that; I have known her as a lifelong abolitionist. I respect her opinion; but she is one of few, and her rights were not being trampled on. Certainly, the government, in insisting on going forward with this bill, is flying in the face of public opinion.

With regard to an entirely different subject, I was rather amused last Thursday when the Prime Minister tried to justify the incomprehensible stand of the government on

Taiwan within the context of the Olympics. He asserted to the right hon. member for Prince Albert that because the government felt there was a strong majority of the people of Canada supporting its "one China" policy, it was correct in going forward as it was regarding Taiwan and the Olympic controversy. The government said, "Public opinion is with us, and therefore we are right". But what about this particular bill, Mr. Speaker? Public opinion is against the government so if the other argument was correct, this one is equally correct and the government is wrong. If in one case public opinion is used as an argument in support of the government's position, then the government must, logically, rely upon public opinion with regard to this matter.

● (1230)

[*Translation*]

There cannot be a law for one's friends and a law for one's foes.

[*English*]

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): There is only one China.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member misunderstood my argument. The argument was used that strong public opinion supports the government. If the hon. member will bide his time—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am a retentionist and I appreciate the speech the hon. member is making. With regard to the policy on China, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has said many times that we recognize only one China, so let us not mix the cards here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. This is not a point of order; it is an argument which can be made at another time.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I will start back at square one, Mr. Speaker. The question is whether there shall be reliance upon public opinion to justify the government's stand. On Friday last the Prime Minister used the support of public opinion to buttress his case with regard to Taiwan in the Olympic context. To be logical, the government must have regard to public opinion on Bill C-84; but in this particular case public opinion is to be disregarded.

We have seen the reaction of the police and prison guards to this bill, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to have recourse to, nor would I repeat the worst threats that have been made. I think policemen and prison guards are reasonable people and they have a very difficult job.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): They have been doing a very difficult job with a law that specifically singled them out for protection, but in effect the law was set aside. Now there is being substituted a longer penalty of 25 years'

imprisonment. We are saying to the prison guard that the only way we are going to protect him from being fatally attacked by prisoners is to keep them under his care for many more years. We are going to incarcerate murderers longer, and if they kill one, two, three, four—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): They can kill one very day, if they want to.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): —all they will get is 25 years. There is nothing to lose.

Mr. Darling: Fifteen years.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Then there is the question of parole. I do not suppose anybody who killed a second time or killed in a prison would get much sympathy with respect to parole. But it is ludicrous to think that long-term sentences of this kind will provide protection for prison guards. Society has a responsibility for the protection of fellow prisoners as well. The fact that a man is sentenced to jail, for whatever crime he may have been found guilty of, certainly is not to be taken to mean that he is being sentenced to exposure of being killed by someone within the prison system. In practice, one might be so cynical as to say that is what some of the abolitionists may hope. It is a very harsh form of attrition, but I honestly think that some people hope that will happen. What a penal system we would have if we were to substitute the lawful executioner and put in his place the unlawful executioner within the prison system!

As the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) detailed the other day, many sections within the National Defence Act still provide for the death penalty. That act says that every person—not merely a serviceman or servicewoman—who commits an offence under certain sections is subject to the death penalty.

What about all the bleeding hearts in regard to the elimination of the death penalty by the cabinet and those who support them? Why were no amendments brought forward in this bill to remove those sections from the National Defence Act? It would have been very simple, if the principle had been to eliminate capital punishment. But certain sections of the Criminal Code are amended to change certain categories of crime, parole is arranged differently, and the death sentence is left in a very important statute of this country to cover certain circumstances. I suppose it would be ironical to say it would be rather strange to see an event happen within the next few months which would bring the perpetrator of a certain crime under those provisions of the National Defence Act. That would be a really interesting situation.

● (1240)

As I said on second reading, the burden of proving that the change is for the better is on those who advocate support for this bill. It is not up to the so-called retentionists to prove their case; it is for the abolitionists to prove it. I will not go so far as to say that they must prove their case beyond any reasonable doubt, but it is their responsibility to prove that the abolition of capital punishment will be a change for the better and that our system of justice and protection of the public will be improved. I submit that the arguments put forward by the supporters of this bill are inadequate. They have not proved their case. They have failed to discharge the burden put upon them by logical debate. For this reason, any in this House who doubt that the abolition of capital punishment will be an improvement in our system of justice ought to reject this bill. I invite my colleagues in this House to do so.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, one of the aspects of this debate which I find most deplorable arose when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) virtually accused all retentionist members of parliament and Canadians of being seekers of vengeance who were not interested in justice. I suggest that was a false imputation and a harsh accusation. I submit there was no justification for so accusing those who in this House and elsewhere favour the retention of capital punishment.

I abhor the fact that some hon. members debated this whole question, as epitomized by the Prime Minister's speech, on the basis of what is a deterrent to murder. Arguments were put forward to show that capital punishment is not a deterrent to murder. I suggest that this debate should not have been conducted in those terms. Certainly, the Prime Minister should not have put the matter in that light. We are considering the imposition of capital punishment only in for a small category of serious crimes.

I agree that not every case in which a human being loses his life as a consequence of another human being's action should be considered as murder punishable by death. That is not the subject matter of this debate, notwithstanding all efforts to make some people believe it is. Mr. Speaker, in essence we are considering capital punishment only in relation to a few serious crimes against mankind and the state. Hon. members who proposed amendments to the bill felt that the offences which warranted capital punishment should include treason, piracy, hijacking and murder by hired killers, by the "kill for pay" people.

I think that most proponents of abolition would find themselves in an uncomfortable position if they were members of cabinet. I acknowledge that if I were in cabinet and had to consider the commutation of the death penalty, I should face a most heart-rending decision. Nevertheless, such decisions fall within the responsibilities of elected members. When seeking election, members know that they may be called on to face such hard decisions. The members of the cabinet must make hard decisions on behalf of all society. Abolitionists would face hard decisions: Any one of us, if we were in the cabinet, would face hard decisions in this regard. They would not be easy; they would be disturbing. Nevertheless, when we were elected we agreed to shoulder our burden of responsibility on behalf of all members of society.

I am concerned about the lives of individuals, and I am absolutely convinced that the abolition of capital punishment will not save lives in Canada. I submit that, on the contrary, it will cost lives in Canada. Perhaps lives will be taken within prison walls, as the previous speaker suggested. Perhaps lives will be taken on the streets. If capital murder were punishable by death, a criminal might think twice before shooting someone during an armed robbery. A criminal would think twice before shooting to kill. The retention of capital punishment would, I submit, save the lives of prison guards and police officers. Whether we shall

save lives is the decision we must make as we vote on the bill.

Another question which must be considered is: Would capital punishment be a deterrent to serious crimes committed in a fit of passion? I suggest that it would not. An individual in the grip of passion acts abnormally. When in the grip of passion, an individual may be driven to commit a crime for which capital punishment is no deterrent. But I submit that capital punishment would deter premeditated acts of murder. The death penalty would save the lives of innocent people on the streets and would be a fit punishment for criminals who murder deliberately. Therefore, those who, like the Prime Minister, suggest retentionists are only seeking vengeance are no longer entitled to the respect of their fellow man. That was a harsh, unfair and improper basis on which to conduct this debate.

There are no statistics to show how well we have rehabilitated those who have been in prison. We know that harsh treatment can sometimes change the mind of a man. Such harsh treatment has been described as brainwashing. We have heard of instances in which brainwashing has been cruel. But, as we know, minds have not been changed. There is no evidence to show that psychology or other forms of treatment can change the minds of hardened criminals who have no inclination to change. There are no records to substantiate success, as might be the case in the scientific world. We cannot measure success in this field with the accuracy with which a mathematician might define a problem. In this field we cannot be guided by laws of nature which work steadfastly and continually in other fields.

In short, one cannot say that men have been induced to change their minds by psychiatrists. I suppose the best example of what I am talking about is to be found in the treatment of those who indiscriminately and unwisely have resorted to the use of drugs. Alcoholics Anonymous have assumed that there is little use trying to correct the behaviour of an alcoholic unless that person really and truly wants to change. The same is true of other psychiatric treatment. When the mind wants to change, it can accept help and benefit from it. However, when the mind of man is determined to remain on course, it is difficult, if not impossible, to treat that mind so that it again fits into the rank and file of society. We are assuming that we can correct a mind that does not want to be corrected. That is an unwise and dangerous assumption. In the long run, it will be proven that it is one that costs lives in this country, not one which saves them. It will be difficult to prove, but I believe that it is the way the mind of man works, particularly that of the hard-core criminal.

● (1250)

I know I am being repetitive and that this has been said by speaker after speaker. However, I am deeply concerned about the lack of concern for the safety of our peace officers in this country. We are being traitors to them when we behave as we are presently doing, and traitors to ourselves and the rank and file of society as a whole. I submit that when knowledge of capital punishment being inevitable is in the mind of a man who premeditates a crime, it is, and must be, a deterrent.

[Mr. McCain.]

This so-called free vote is one of the most capricious things that has been perpetrated upon the people of any country in the name of democratic government. The behaviour of the government and its influential people as this subject has been brought before the House in a pseudo free vote situation is deceitful at best. I believe the people of Canada recognize that there is a free vote only within the limits in which that vote will safely follow the policy of the government. When the safety of the policy of this bill which has been introduced by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is in danger, freedom of behaviour will come to an end.

Suggestions are made as to what it might mean to certain individuals in this House if this bill fails to pass. That is a most regrettable thing. While the Conservative party has not been united in its stand on this matter, and its members voted as they chose, at no time has any prominent member of this party asked any individual, by persuasion, force or other means, to change his vote.

Mr. Sharp: Nor has ours.

Mr. McCain: I submit that the evidence at hand indicates that anybody who makes a comparable claim and sits on Your Honour's right is oblivious of the facts as they are known to the public of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: Tell some more lies.

Mr. McCain: There are some people in this House who knew a great deal more about the professions they practised before coming here than they have learned about the profession they have practised since coming here. The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) indicates that he has learned little. He has not listened and has no awareness of what is going on around him in this situation. Possibly he wishes to be oblivious of the efforts being made to compromise the free vote which has been so vigorously promoted as being the will of parliament.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to remind the hon. member that the whip and myself voted on different sides in this situation. I think the hon. member should refrain from references to a free vote.

Mr. Blais: You should not reflect on a vote in any event.

Mr. McCain: I do not remember asking the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain to rise. I do not remember mentioning the whip.

Mr. Sharp: Whom did you mention?

Mr. McCain: I mentioned that the government exerted pressure.

Mr. Allmand: On whom?

Mr. McCain: You know.

Mr. Allmand: No I do not. On whom? Let us have some names.

Mr. Stevens: How about the Lalonde party?

Mr. Allmand: Were you there?

Mr. MacFarlane: It must have been the same person who gave you the letter out of my files.

Mr. McCain: Let us reflect for about 15 seconds. With regard to whether it was the intention of the government that this was to be a perfectly free vote, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) who preceded me in this debate outlined the method by which that could be done without reflection on the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Has the hon. member completed his remarks?

Mr. McCain: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Rulings have previously been made by the Chair on comments similar to those just made by the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain). According to my recollection, the Chair has held that it is not proper for any hon. member to reflect upon a vote. I think that principle is eminently acceptable. Each and every member of this House is free to exercise his judgment in accordance with his conscience and volition. To indicate that any member could be influenced to vote contrary to his conscience is a direct attack on the privileges of members of this House. I suggest that the hon. member's remarks ought not to have been made.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House provide that an individual should not in any way reflect upon another individual personally. I reflected purely and simply upon the pressure of the government to obtain as many votes as it could for its position in respect of this legislation, and I said that pressure was such that the government could no longer claim that it was a free vote. I did not reflect upon an individual. There were individuals who took offence at my reflection against the government.

● (1300)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have sat here the whole morning and I think the remarks which were made with respect to the matter, if they constitute a point of order at all, arose out of what was said by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The hon. member for Edmonton West said that traditionally in parliament, when a matter was to be proposed upon which the whips would not be applied, it was always dealt with through private members' business. I listened carefully to what the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) said, and it was clear to me that he was leading up to that point, a point a finally made which was in line with what the hon. member for Edmonton West had said immediately before him.

There might be some sensitivity among members of the House with respect to what occurred—and I have no idea what occurred—but surely we have not reached the stage at which discussion of the various methods by which debates are conducted and questions taken and put to members is to be deemed a reflection on a vote such as might be contrary to the rules. If this is a point of order at all, and there is some doubt about that, it is not a point well taken. The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte and the hon. member for Edmonton West stand in exactly the same position; both were speaking from the point in view of methodology. There was no reflection on a vote of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must say my first reaction to part of the remarks made by the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) was to question their relevance. As to the point of order suggesting there might have been a reflection on the vote, I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte implied that pressure was brought to bear, but he did not reflect on the decision reached by the House. This was more or less confirmed by what the hon. member himself just said.

Parliament, after all, is an institution in which debate takes place and in which hon. members seek to convince others by speeches both inside and outside the House. I do not think that to say so is passing judgment on a vote or on the freedom of a vote cast by a member. It is a natural fact of life and the rules of the House permit it. So I do not agree with the point of order raised by the parliamentary secretary. I do not think that, strictly speaking, the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte was reflecting on a vote.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): One o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE QUEEN

BEST WISHES ON HER MAJESTY'S VISIT TO CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provision of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of rather urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II has begun her official visit to Canada and is now in Nova Scotia I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald):

That the members of the House of Commons—

Through Your Honour.

—send best wishes to Her Majesty, et bienvenue au Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prud'homme: In both official languages.

Bilingualism

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Moved by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan), seconded by the hon. member for Kingston and The Islands (Miss MacDonald):

That the members of the House of Commons, through The Speaker, send to Her Majesty best wishes from his House, et bienvenue au Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON DISCUSSIONS WITH NOVA SCOTIA CONCERNING OWNERSHIP OF OFFSHORE RESOURCES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the delay and procrastination which has extended over several years in resolving the question of ownership of offshore mineral resources adjacent to the Maritime provinces, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan):

That the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, or some minister on his behalf, report to the House on motions later today on recent discussions with Premier Regan on this vital issue which could, with the co-operation of the federal government in resolving this dispute, do so much to change the attitude and economic situation prevailing in Atlantic Canada at the present time.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

SUGGESTED DELAY OF PROPOSAL TO CREATE ST. CATHARINES A BILINGUAL DISTRICT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter or urgent and pressing necessity concerning the proposal under consideration that the St. Catharines area in Ontario be classified as a bilingual district, despite the fact that 97 per cent of the population is not French-speaking. I would, therefore, move, seconded by the hon. member for Portage (Mr. Masniuk):

In view of the fact that a copy of minutes, reportedly labelled confidential, of a secret meeting held on this subject at the Constellation Hotel in Toronto by the bilingual districts' advisory board has recently been given to the member for Lincoln on instructions of the President of the Treasury Board, and also in view of the fact that a copy of these confidential minutes are reportedly to be in the hands of a reporter from the *Globe and Mail*, that the President of the Treasury Board is requested to make public the contents of these documents and at the same time that he assure the House that no action will be taken creating the St. Catharines area part of a bilingual district while parliament is not in session this summer.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, cannot be presented to the House without unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

REQUEST THAT TANZANIA AND MAURITIUS REVERSE THEIR DECISION NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN GAMES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I should like to present a motion of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras):

That this House requests the governments of Tanzania and Mauritius, fellow members of the Commonwealth, to reverse their stand and participate in the Olympics in Montreal.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Standing Order 43 requires that before the presentation of such a motion the House give its unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM SOVIET UNION

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may, with your leave, ask hon. members to acknowledge the presence in your gallery of a distinguished visitor in the person of Mr. Patolichev, Minister of Trade for the Soviet Union and delegate here engaged with Canada to continue the very good relationships we have in this field.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

FINANCE

MEASURES TO STIMULATE STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Immigra-

tion I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance, who is one of the few ministers in the House at the present time. Since April, when university students finished their studies, there have been 94,000 fewer young people employed in Canada. It is also apparent that the sole reason youth unemployment is remaining relatively stable is that students simply are not entering the labour market; in short they are giving up. Given this situation, is the minister willing to recommend to the government re-evaluation of the student summer employment program so that students will be encouraged to enter the labour market and thereby accumulate the savings required to return to school next year?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, the minister answered with his usual arrogance, as demonstrated last night.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1410)

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I want to ask the minister a question. In view of the fact that Statistics Canada noted today the continually declining participation rates among young women in Canada which is now around 3.1 per cent, does the minister not realize that lack of savings among this group and any accompanying deferment of education among them can only lead to social inequities in access to higher education, and, if he realizes this situation, is he not willing to concede that this government's student employment strategy requires a complete and immediate review?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I should point out to the hon. gentleman that with regard at least to those young people who will be reentering university in the fall their student summer employment earnings, as well as other financial means, are taken into account. If it happens that a student has not been able to augment his earnings sufficiently during the summer, he will be entitled to supplemental assistance under the Canada Student Loan Program.

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE BASIS ON WHICH LOANS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS TO ACTUAL EARNINGS

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): On July 8 the minister was asked, with respect to the provisions of the Canada student loan plan which bases the loans available not on the actual earnings but on the length of time students are available for work, if he will take steps to have the basis of the plan changed to actual earnings as defined under the Income Tax Act. In view of the fact that he has now had some notice and the opportunity to look into the matter, can he now report to the House if he is prepared to take steps recommended at the time?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I just indicated that the present provisions of the Canada Student Loan Program take recognition of the problem.

REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION TO LESSEN BURDEN OF STUDENTS UNABLE TO FIND SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Recent reports of Statistics Canada have revealed that we are now experiencing the worst record of youth unemployment since statistics were accumulated in 1953, and furthermore, the national and Ontario union of students fears that student unemployment this summer is already running at 20 per cent to 25 per cent and that this could increase. Does the minister have any indication if student unemployment is as high as the national union of students suspects and, if it is, is the minister prepared to introduce emergency legislation to lessen the burden of students who will be unable to find work this summer?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I will be glad to make inquiries to see whether those figures are soundly based.

Mr. Dick: As the Minister of Finance does not seem to know what the unemployment situation is, perhaps I might ask him a supplementary question. A cut-back in the student summer unemployment program was introduced under the guise of restraint. A high level of student unemployment this summer will undoubtedly result in either the deferment of post-secondary enrollment for some individuals or an increased demand for Canada student loans for others, which is not a saving to the federal government. On June 16, the national union of students—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a supplementary question, would he put it.

Mr. Dick: I would ask the minister whether he could confirm in unambiguous terms to the national union of students that he is willing to remove the requirement of summer savings in order that students will be able to get Canada student loans to continue their education?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I have just responded to that question in my reply to the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You did not respond at all.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

SUGGESTED DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL PROGRAM TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT AND CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Finance. Given the fact that the Supreme Court has decided that the federal government has constitutional authority to deal with inflation on a national basis,—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: —foolish as the particular program may be, can the minister say whether the government will consider the development of a national program to deal

with unemployment, and, more specifically, would the minister ensure that unemployment is put on the agenda for the meeting scheduled for this fall of the finance ministers of the provinces along with the federal Minister of Finance, and at that meeting would the federal government submit a national program dealing with unemployment?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): The question was much discussed in the context of the budget and I do not have any further proposals to put before the House at this time. I think it is fair to say that the question was not extensively discussed at the last meeting of finance ministers, and while there is scope for general economic discussion at these meetings, the question was not extensively canvassed. I would be prepared, if provincial ministers wished to discuss it during the course of the meeting.

Mr. Broadbent: I am asking the Minister of Finance to make that specific suggestion himself. I would like to ask him a second question. Since there are still more than 700,000 Canadians without jobs, which in percentage terms represents a year over year increase from the same month of last year, would the minister tell us if the federal government now has any specific programs to expand job opportunities in the country, or will we have to rely simply on the program which was announced earlier by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, which will not come into effect until January, 1977?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I indicated, I do not propose to announce any further proposal at this time.

Mr. Broadbent: I will ask my final question, probably with no better results. Given the fact that in Atlantic Canada, the four provinces considered together, there is an unemployment average running at between 10 per cent at the bottom end to something in excess of 12 per cent at the top, in every case exceeding the national average substantially, could the minister tell us if the government will be presenting to the House any specific proposals to deal with this persistent unemployment in Atlantic Canada?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I just indicated to the hon. gentleman that I have no proposals I intend to put forward at this time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN HOUSING STARTS TO COPE WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

As The Conference Board in Canada has indicated that there will be a marked increase in unemployment in the fall because of lower housing construction in Canada, which is considerably lower in Canada even now, can the minister tell us what he intends to do to stimulate housing or encourage people to become homeowners?

[Mr. Broadbent.]

[*English*]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the hon. member asked this question. I think he would be interested in the housing starts for June, which are at the rate of 275,000 per year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Danson: That is substantially higher than the rate of 235,000 starts which we targetted, and it is 7,000 more than the rate for May, so we are doing a great deal at the present time. The industry is holding up extremely well. The housing starts are for the right people at the right price, and we expect that this level of activity will continue throughout the year and that employment will be maintained at a very high level.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

The minister seems very optimistic but unfortunately he is unaware of what is going on in the province of Quebec where, according to the information from that province, housing construction is slowing down. I do not know whether the minister goes to Quebec from time to time, or whether he knows what goes on there, but that is the case.

I therefore ask the minister whether he can tell the House what he intends to do to stimulate construction, especially in the poor provinces or those where development is slower. Would he say that, in the next few months, the interest rate can be lowered, or that subsidies can be given new owners with regard to interest rates, to a greater extent that is being done now, and so encourage people to own their own homes?

[*English*]

Mr. Danson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. First of all, with regard to Quebec, the starts for June alone are up to 6,900 compared to 4,000 last year, so there is an increase there. We have programs with regard to interest reduction, grants for moderate priced housing and programs to make it possible for people of moderate incomes to purchase housing which is of good quality. These programs will continue. In addition, we have extensive rehabilitation programs going on in the province of Quebec, including rural areas.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MINISTER'S ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF NEW JOBS CREATED—SECTOR OF ECONOMY IN WHICH JOBS CREATED

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. I note that the principal reason for the improvement of the unemployment rate over the second quarter of the year stems from a decline of the labour force in the past quarter, down some 63,000, rather than an increase in employment, which in turn is down 72,000 in the last quarter. Can the minister indicate when he expects the economy to be producing jobs at a rate which would conform to the prediction that he

included in his budget of 250,000 new jobs this year and would he indicate what sector he expects will produce these jobs?

● (1420)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, these are questions that were very fully canvassed in the course of the budget debate. It does not seem useful to repeat them at this point. Of course, it will be difficult to say within the context of any monthly period when they will change or indeed in what aspect of industry. I would just remind the hon. gentleman that we have set out our expectations for the year in a rather comprehensive way.

LEVEL OF UNEMPLOYMENT PREDICTED BY CONFERENCE BOARD—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): A further supplementary to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Noting that the minister has already stated today that he has no new programs that he cares to announce today for job creation, and in view of the fact that the Conference Board of Canada has predicted steadily rising unemployment rates throughout 1976-77, can he identify any factors which in his opinion indicate why the current economic situation would not lead this House and himself to view the forecast put out by the conference board as being inaccurate?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct the hon. gentleman. The conference board substantially agreed with our analysis for the year 1976. Its prediction with regard to unemployment was an unemployment increase with respect to 1977. I think as the year goes on we will want to review the facts as they turn up to see whether or not that seems to be a substantially founded expectation.

Mr. Stevens: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister stick by the budget forecast of 250,000 new jobs for 1976 and would he explain if he means average 1976 figures over average 1975 or January to January figures?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we consider all the statements set out in the context of the budget still to be those guidelines governing the development of the economy.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

POTATO MARKETING SCHEME—DATE OF INTRODUCTION

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture of which I have given him notice, with respect to the important meeting last week with representatives of the potato industry from five of six of the eastern Canadian provinces, at Fredericton. Considering the fact that just prior to the meeting one of the officials of the New Brunswick government indicated that they hoped to have a plan in place for marketing by mid-September for this marketing year, could the minister indicate what progress was made at the meeting, when producers will have an opportunity to study the new revised plans and to vote on representation for a regional potato marketing council?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the meeting that took place. This is an ongoing thing. These meetings of potato producers have been taking place between the provinces for well over a year. They have been trying to formulate a plan for marketing potatoes. I understand that they should soon be able to make recommendations to producers and I understand it will be further discussed at a meeting of provincial ministers of agriculture if they can work it into their schedule at the end of this month in Quebec City. I understand representations are being made by ministers from other potato producing provinces in which it appears the producers are going to be in dire straits again this year.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the importance of these measures to the potato industry in the six eastern provinces and the importance of there being adequate funds and personnel to establish an effective secretariat, can the minister indicate whether a commitment was made by the federal government at this meeting to supply funds and appoint personnel so that the decisions taken by producers and the representative ministers can be put into effect for this marketing year?

Mr. Whelan: We would hope so, Mr. Speaker. It would need the utmost co-operation of all parties concerned so that some kind of plan could be put into operation for the coming crop year. The hon. member will recall that two years ago we spent approximately $16 million during the crop season because of the depressed prices. At that time we said that would be the last time we would put that kind of money into such a program and that they had better find a more orderly marketing system. That is what these meetings have been concerned with. It appears that the provinces and the potato producers, who are represented on the committees, are close to a plan at the present time but I am not in a position to say what it will be. I have not gone over anything since the meeting in Fredericton, not having had the time. I have received verbal reports about the meetings. They realize the seriousness of this matter and I believe they are serious about doing something about it.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

REASON FOR ENTERING INTO TERRASSE DE LA CHAUDIÈRE LEASE-PURCHASE AGREEMENT—CONTROL OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Public Works is with reference to the Terrasse de la Chaudière lease-purchase agreement. I wonder if the minister can tell the House why his department apparently agreed in principle to lease a building on which construction had not commenced, to be built on land which the lessor at the time did not own, in light of the fact that the minister said yesterday that this would be a rather strange lease arrangement.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would agree that to enter into such a lease arrangement would be a strange procedure. The fact of the matter is there have been negotiations—

Mr. Horner: He was a good Liberal.

Mr. Drury: —leading up to the lease-purchase, which is distinct from an ordinary lease, of the building which is to be designed to meet the specific needs of the federal government.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Public Works? In view of the multiplier involved as between the cost of the building and the lease price of the building, a multiplier of about three, does the government have any supervision rights over the construction costs of this building?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, the arrangement if entered into, and it has not yet been, would provide what by extrapolation and calculation would appear to be the most economical method from the government's point of view of acquiring use and eventual ownership of the property.

Mr. Huntington: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the House if the reported $54 million option to purchase Terrasse de la Chaudière covers the entire project or just that portion of the project to be built on government-owned land?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, the part of Terrasse de la Chaudière in which we are interested is merely that portion related to the office accommodation which the government would occupy.

REASON FOR VARIATION IN PRICE OF LAND PURCHASED IN HULL

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Public Works? Has the minister reviewed the situation whereby the National Capital Commission, as agents for the Department of Public Works, paid $86 per square foot last month for the Quebec Hydro property in Hull, when Campeau had been buying adjacent land six to ten months previously at an average cost of $30 per square foot? Can he tell the House why this was done?

Mr. Horner: He was a good Liberal.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, as I think the House is aware, the National Capital Commission in Ottawa is a semi-autonomous body which operates to acquire and control the bulk of the government holdings of land within the national capital area.

[Mr. Huntington.]

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

SOURCE OF ALLEGED DIRECTIVE TO USE CERTAIN COMPANY TO APPRAISE LAND PURCHASED IN HULL

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. Is the minister aware of any over-riding directives which were issued to the staff at NCC to use a specific appraisal company for the evaluation of the Quebec Hydro properties on Rue Principale, Hull, Quebec, which were to be purchased by the National Capital Commission for the Department of Public Works? If so, from which level did these directives come; if not will the minister make inquiries?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the situation is that the purchaser and vendor indicate one appraiser each; a third one is mutually agreed upon so that comparisons can be made and the most satisfactory solution is achieved.

Mr. Darling: That is not an answer.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

REVOCATION OF AIR NAVIGATION ORDER ON USE OF LANGUAGE—CONSULTATIONS WITH PILOTS AND AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Yesterday the minister in response to the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemount confirmed that there should be a regulation supporting the existing rules with regard to the flying and controlling of aircraft, as outlined in section 8 of the memorandum of understanding reached by the minister and the parties to the contract. At the same time the minister stated, in answer to my question, that he would be making changes to the air navigation order of June 30 from a technical point of view. I ask the minister to confirm that the air navigation order which was filed with the registrar of statutory instruments on June 30 has been revoked rather than amended.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the ordinary procedure for amending orders like this is to revoke them and substitute a new text. That has been done in this case.

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister explain to the House precisely what are the technical difficulties to which he referred in his answer yesterday, and will he confirm whether the parties to the agreement, CATCA and CALPA, were consulted before the revocation order was given? If they were not consulted, will he advise the House why they were not so consulted?

● (1430)

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, no, they were not consulted. If the hon. member will refer to the memorandum of understanding, he will see that there was an agreement about proceeding with an air navigation order, but no agreement

about its exact content. At that time we were indeed aware that while we would move forward quickly with a draft, a good deal of further work would have to be done on the ideal form of that order. The general purpose of the order was understood between us as enforcing the existing rules in relation to language. We proceeded immediately with a first draft of the order and have now substituted a second for it. As I indicated yesterday, while the second draft is the one that may come into effect, we are looking at further possible changes prior to its effective date.

Mr. Mazankowski: Can the minister confirm that last Thursday when he met Les Gens de L'Air he gave to them an amended version of the air navigation order or did he discuss the revocation order with them? If so, what form of consultation has taken place with Les Gens de L'Air or what form of consultation does he anticipate? In view of the fact the minister is not consulting with the other parties to the agreement, why is he in fact consulting with the Gens de L'Air?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will talk with almost everyone. What we did at our last meeting was indicate to the Gens de L'Air the latest form of the order. We had indeed superseded the first form with the second prior to that meeting. We therefore indicated what the second was and gave them copies of it. I am pleased to make copies available to others. I am sure the hon. member has one. I am prepared to discuss the further content of that particular order. Indeed, I expressly indicated to the Gens de L'Air that I would be pleased to have their comments on it and that if they saw some specific difficulty, I would be glad to take it into consideration. In particular, there is a special difficulty for the members of the Gens de L'Air if an order like that is used as the basis for disciplinary action within their union because there is less than adequate treatment for the Gens de L'Air within that union at the present time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF GROUP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF ITALIAN OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer greetings to a group of officials from the Italian Olympic Committee who are visiting the House of Commons under the guidance of its head of mission, Mr. Mario Pescante.

* * *

OLYMPICS

SUGGESTION TANZANIA AND MAURITIUS REVERSE DECISION NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN GAMES

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister.

Does the government intend to urge the governments of Tanzania and Mauritius to reverse their decisions and to take part in the 21th Olympiads?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we regret deeply the decision of a number of countries and olympic teams not to participate in the games. There is nothing we can do, however, for Canada has no voice in the policies of the International Olympic Committee. However, we wish indeed that everybody would participate.

* * *

[*English*]

RESEARCH

REQUEST FOR INCREASED FUNDS FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question can be directed to either the Minister of State for Science and Technology or to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the absence of the latter minister, I hope the former one has a favourable answer. In view of the statement of concern that was presented last week to the Minister of State for Science and Technolgy and the Minister of National Health and Welfare by the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges urging the government to change its stance with regard to medical research funding, may I ask the minister, who is looking at me rather hopefully, whether favourable consideration will be given to this request so that there will not be a deterioration in health research, in health education or in the Canadian health care system?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says I am looking at him hopefully. I was hoping that he was not going to be unreasonable. The hon. member is perhaps aware that following the initial allocation of funds to university research through the Medical Research Council, as a consequence of representations made, the Minister of National Health and Welfare was able to find some $2 million of additional funds from within the departmental estimates to transfer to this purpose. In the view of the Department of National Health and Welfare, this should suffice to ensure there is no retrogression in medical research. In so far as the future is concerned, I tried my best to convey to the representatives who came to see me the other day that we really would have to wait for next year.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the statement of concern presented to the ministers last week was made after that $2 million adjustment, will the minister at least consider the request of the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges that an attempt be made to establish an adequate base level of research support with a view to maintaining that level in future years?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the representation that we should endeavour to establish, and agree on, a base level, not only with respect to medical research but in a number of other scientific areas. It is in default of agreement on what is an appropriate base level that some of our current difficulties have arisen.

Oral Questions

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

WITHDRAWAL OF BUS SERVICE IN NEWFOUNDLAND—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Canadian National, by withdrawing its road cruiser passenger service in Newfoundland last night, violated an order of the Canadian Transport Commission in 1968, broke the law of Canada, notwithstanding any dispute they may have with the Newfoundland Regulatory Commission. As minister responsible for the National Transportation Act, does he intend to order CN to resume this service immediately?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, Canadian National only discontinued this bus service when, in the particular legal dispute it had with Newfoundland, its drivers were beginning to be charged by Newfoundland for continuing to operate its buses in that province. That made it as impossible to continue as though barricades had been erected. Those barricades had been erected by the government of the province of Newfoundland. I am hoping that in the almost immediate future some arrangement can be arrived at whereby the legal issue can be resolved for all time. In the meantime, the buses can continue to operate without that barricade in place. I know there are discussions going on between CN and the province of Newfoundland to that end. I trust they will resolve the issue. If not, I will have to reconsider the position I may have to take to ensure that service is given to the people of Newfoundland.

● (1440)

Mr. McGrath: Since the CN has a monopoly on ground passenger service in the province and by withdrawing the service has deprived the people of Newfoundland at a critical time of year of this essential service, in direct violation of the order made by the CTC, may I ask the minister whether he intends to order the buses back into service immediately or whether he intends to provide some alternative service until the dispute has been resolved?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will appreciate that ordering the bus service back into operation, as long as the drivers are being charged for continuing that service, would hardly be an acceptable action. The hon. member will also appreciate that the government of Newfoundland, and its highway traffic board, has jurisdiction in this situation only as a delegate from the federal government. I could obviously take some action by withdrawing that delegation but such a course would have some serious implications in principle not only for Newfoundland but for bus and trucking services across this country. I would want to do that only with great care. My first reaction, therefore, is to suggest that the barriers which I have described and which have been erected by the government of Newfoundland be removed by the government of Newfoundland. The buses would then continue to operate.

REQUEST FOR RESTORATION OF RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE IN NEWFOUNDLAND IN VIEW OF WITHDRAWAL OF BUS SERVICE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): My question is to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that CNR are not abiding by order No. 2673, as indicated by the hon. member for St. John's East, but are taking a very unfair attitude by denying the public the only transportation available, and since the bus drivers are not being denied the right to drive the buses, apart from which the company's action prompts dissatisfaction toward the bus service, would the minister now consider reviving the Newfoundland passenger rail service to correct the piracy which occurred back in 1969?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, any move to reinstitute the rail service would require some planning and I am not sure the people of Newfoundland would see it as an immediate solution in view of the fact that passenger cars are simply not available in adequate numbers to provide the service. Other problems have arisen affecting the railway system configuration since the Bullet was discontinued, which would probably mean even slower service than was the case at that time. I think the only really sensible solution—and I would really urge the hon. member to join me in asking for this solution—is for the government of Newfoundland to make it possible for the bus system to operate. I assure the hon. member that CN is quite pleased to continue to operate the service but does not see how it can do so if its bus drivers are being charged under Newfoundland statutes for doing so.

Mr. Marshall: Under the order of 1969 the CNR was supposed to maintain a railway line between central and western Newfoundland to provide service in an emergency. This service is deteriorating and since it is very obvious that the reason for this deterioration is that the public service commission asked the company to reduce its rate increase from 150 per cent to 30 per cent, would the minister look into this matter in the national interest?

Mr. Lang: I would inform the hon. member that, in effect, the CNR was not objecting to the reduction in its rate increase to 30 per cent by the Newfoundland Traffic Board. It was quite prepared to live with that ruling but there were other conditions attached which made it impossible for the CN to submit voluntarily to what it did not consider to be appropriate or binding upon it. The simple fact is that the Newfoundland Traffic Board seems to have wanted to take advantage of the best of both situations—on the one hand to exercise jurisdiction as though the bus system were provincial and on the other to explicitly ignore the provincial law itself which requires that the rates which are set by transportation systems be compensatory. If they had followed their own law about compensatory rates they would have allowed even more than the increase permitted but, as I say, even with those qualifications CN was prepared to ride with that increase but was not prepared to abide by the other conditions.

* * *

[Translation]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGING DAIRY POLICY

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

Considering that three months ago today the minister announced the dairy policy for the current year which was based on the fact that there was overproduction, may I ask the minister whether he can say to the House if he has valid information that production has sufficiently decreased to enable him to cancel the penalty of $8.60 a hundredweight?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the marketing supply management committee from all the provinces is meeting this week in Ottawa. We know that some of the provinces have done a good job in curtailing production. But we also know, for instance, that La Belle Province has not done such a good job.

* * *

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

PROPOSAL RESEARCH BE UNDERTAKEN TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR SAFE USE OF ASBESTOS IN BUILDINGS

Hon. Martin O'Connell (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Science and Technology. In view of the fact that the National Housing Act and the National Building Code make no provision in their construction standards for the safety or health of home occupants with respect to the use of asbestos in insulation and other processes, and in view of the fact that a federal-provincial task force has urged a wide range of safety and health measures to prevent the irreversible disease of asbestosis associated with asbestos use, will the minister ensure that the National Research Council undertakes research into the health hazards arising from the use of asbestos in federally-assisted housing with a view to introducing safe standards in the National Housing Act and the National Building Code?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for having drawn attention to this problem. The National Research Council has for some time been working at making structures safer for the inhabitants or occupants through the National Building Code. The accent to date has been principally on structural safety and fire precaution. Increasingly, however, the question of the use of materials having toxic properties is arising and research into limiting their use and establishing proper precautions is already under way.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS FOR PURCHASE OF LEOPARD TANKS—POSSIBILITY OF STATIONING CF-5'S IN EUROPE

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister tell us anything new about the progress of negotiations for the Canadian acquisition of Leopard tanks which was announced, of all people, by the Secretary of State for External Affairs? Can he also tell us whether he has yet made up his mind on the question whether any of our surplus CF-5's will be stationed in Europe?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, negotiations for the purchase of Leopard tanks are proceeding very satisfactorily with the Kraus-Mafei Company, the manufacturer. Discussions with the German government are proceeding satisfactorily for the use of Leopard tanks in the interim while ours are being manufactured. These negotiations are all on schedule.

REASON FOR BOOKING PRESS CONFERENCE ROOM FOR JULY 15

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Perhaps the minister will tell me later about the CF-5's. My supplementary question is to the same minister. Is it true the minister has booked the press conference room in the press building for a press conference for this Thursday, at 4 p.m.? Would the minister tell the House of Commons if he booked the room for that specific time and date or did he merely book it for use 24 hours after parliament recesses, thus attaining a new level in contempt of parliament?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the cabinet meets on Thursday as a normal practice and the Lockheed decision is before that cabinet, and possibly future cabinet meetings. I do not know what arrangements may have been made by information services concerning a possible requirement for an announcement. In reply to the earlier question on the CF-5's, we have no plans to move any of the CF-5's permanently to Europe.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

METHOD OF CALCULATING INCREASE IN NUMBER OF JOBS CREATED

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for York-Simcoe relating to the creation of 250,000 new jobs in 1976 over 1975, the Minister of Finance referred the hon. member to his budget speech to see how these jobs would be created and the increases calculated. I reiterate the question: how will the job increase from 1975 to 1976 be calculated, average to average, for the years in question or from December 31, 1975 to December 31, 1976?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Even on the hon. member's own description that is a repetition of an earlier question.

* * *

● (1450)

COMMUNICATIONS

STRIKE AT TELEGLOBE—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO SETTLE

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Communications. I

should like to ask whether the minister can bring us up to date on the strike at Teleglobe; and if it is still continuing, what does she personally intend to do to avoid a further black eye that Canada may get over this whole Olympic situation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the strike, which was to have lasted for a period of 24 hours, is going on and the impression is that it will continue for an indefinite length of time. Through consultations with the president of Teleglobe, I am doing what is necessary to resume negotiations. It is extremely regrettable that these negotiations must be made under pressure because the Olympics are to be held shortly. It is always very difficult to negotiate a solution under such conditions. In any case, I can reassure the hon. member by saying that measures are being taken to ensure essential services for retransmission of the Olympic Games in Europe. Essential services will be maintained. Extremely strict measures have now been taken against any attempt at wilfully damaging the equipment; our main effort, however, is directed at resuming the negotiations.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POLLUTION OF ST. LAWRENCE SHORES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Environment.

Could he tell the House if he is aware of recent complaints made by residents along the St. Lawrence River at Pointe-aux-Trembles about a renewed outbreak of pollution from oil? If so, what does he intend to do to correct the situation? Moreover, has the minister held or does he intend to hold with the qualified authorities in Quebec talks aimed at exercising continued and more efficient supervision to protect the environment in that part of the St. Lawrence River, next to the Montreal urban area?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Acting Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I tried to read most of the files, but I have not become acquainted with this one. I will do so and try to give an answer to the hon. member tomorrow.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

REASON FOR LACK OF PATROLS BY FISHERIES VESSELS ON THE WEST COAST

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet may I offer some more information to the hon. member for Victoria on the question of offshore surveillance in the Pacific. I said yesterday that the *Tanu*, one of our modern vessels, was in refit. That was misinformation; it is under repair because of an unexpected engine failure. The *Laurier* is also under refit. We are using other vessels for surveillance and DND is also giving us a hand. In fact, for this year there will be 495 sea days of fishery surveillance compared to 180 for 1975, this being made possible through the excellent co-operation of the DND and the Ministry of Transport.

* * *

FINANCE

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO EVALUATE EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question was intended for the President of the Treasury Board but in his absence I think the Minister of Finance could handle it very adequately, I am sure.

Mr. Hees: You don't know Donald.

Mr. Halliday: I will try anyway. Now that the government of Canada is rated second highest spender in 1975 for space and time advertising among all businesses and corporations in Canada, according to figures released recently by Elliott Research of Toronto, would the minister tell the House what, if any, money is budgeted to obtain evidence by independent research workers as to the efficacy and success of the $11 million spent by the federal government in 1975?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, that involves a statistical response beyond an answer that I can give today, but I will yet be glad to dig it out and write to the hon. member.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

PROPOSAL TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION OVER IMPORT PERMITS TO DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mr. Frank Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. Is serious consideration being given to a proposal to remove the Canadian Wheat Board's import licensing powers on grains over which they have jurisdiction with a view to having these powers transferred to the import permits branch of industry, trade and commerce?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the general notion of the transfer of power over import control to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce was included in our broad feed grains policy statement in 1973 and 1974, has been repeated since, and it is our intention to do that at some convenient time. We do not consider it either a major change or an urgent matter, because as a practical matter the permit system operates as though the power were residing there. However, it is seen rather as a presentational matter better to have what appears to be a neutral agency in charge of the permits.

ENERGY

PROPOSAL TO USE ELECTRICITY PRODUCED IN LABRADOR IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of his recent visit to the Atlantic area and particularly to Churchill Falls, Labrador, is the minister now optimistic that hydro resources in Labrador can be developed for the benefit of the Atlantic area, and will he ensure that the full force of his office and indeed of the government of Canada is used to bring this about?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

JUSTIFICATION FOR REBUKE OF PRESIDENT FORD FOR STATEMENT ON EXCLUSION OF TAIWAN FROM OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. What was the justification of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for accusing President Ford of being political when he encouraged the U.S. Olympic Committee to protest the exclusion of Taiwan, when Canada's action in its handling of the situation is regarded by many nations around the world as being the most political act in the history of the Olympics?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. gentleman that we have brought no pressure to bear upon Canadian participation on the IOC.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

MEASURES TO INCREASE SECURITY—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. Would the minister please be good enough to advise the House what steps, if any, are being taken or have been taken to increase security measures and staff, including the authority of the staff, at maximum security penitentiaries, particularly in respect to greater security measures for the hardened criminals there?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am still trying to work out something and I hope to make an announcement later today.

TRANSPORT

DATE OF INCREASE IN FUNDS TO ALLOW AUXILIARY COAST GUARD ON WEST COAST TO OPERATE

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which is a follow up to the question asked the other day about the coast guard auxiliary. Would the minister advise the House when we can expect a decision by cabinet regarding the coast guard auxiliary in view of the urgent situation on the west coast right now?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the establishment of the coast guard auxiliary is ongoing and has already begun. The current questions which are before cabinet are rather with regard to the total equipment available for the coast guard itself. The auxiliary role of a variety of vessels not directly associated with the government will always be of extreme importance. On the west coast, the auxiliary organization is now in an important phase of its introduction.

Mr. Reynolds: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the coast guard auxiliary, which was started in Delta and Richmond in my riding, has been stopped now due to lack of funds, can the minister say when there will be a decision of cabinet to put these funds in place so that they can continue to do the excellent work that both he and I agree they do?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it will be perhaps within a matter of days, certainly within a matter of weeks.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF ADVISORY BOARD ON CREATION OF BILINGUAL DISTRICT AT ST. CATHARINES

Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the President of the Treasury Board, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister arising from the consideration being given by the government as to whether St. Catharines and the general area should be classified as a bilingual district. In view of the fact that a confidential document containing minutes of a meeting sponsored by the bilingual districts advisory board in the Constellation Hotel in Toronto has been given to the hon. member for Lincoln and also reportedly, given to the *Globe and Mail*, would the government agree to make this document public so as to enable everybody concerned to learn what happened at this meeting?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it would be my understanding that the body to which the hon. member refers is an automous body that is advisory to the government, and I do not think it would be appropriate for us to put any pressure on them.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister probably misinterpreted my question since it was the President of the Treasury Board and his staff who gave out these documents. That is why I directed the question to the

government. Will the Acting Prime Minister at least assure the House that no action will be taken to create St. Catharines and its immediate area a bilingual district during the summer months while parliament is not in session, with the result that the matter cannot be debated?

* * *

● (1500)

MULTICULTURALISM

INVESTIGATION OF SITUATION IN LONDON, ONTARIO—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State, I should like to direct a question to his parliamentary secretary arising out of the continued notoriety and problems of the London, Ontario, office of the Secretary of State dealing with multiculturalism grants. Can the parliamentary secretary tell the House whether the Secretary of State is aware of the recent statement by the president of the London Folk Arts Council that the investigation being conducted by the Department of the Secretary of State into the activities of its own London office is "a farce" and "an insult to Londoners"? Is he satisfied that the inquiry can be complete and impartial when one of the officials involved in the inquiry has been appointed the next head of the London office of the Secretary of State and other officials involved in the investigation have spent little time if any in London but are content to investigate from their Toronto office?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have not had occasion to speak to the Secretary of State since his return from London, but I will certainly bring the hon. member's representations to his attention.

* * *

ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED

REASON COMPANY FAILED TO OBEY ORDER TO DISCONTINUE DUMPING RADIOACTIVE WASTE AT PORT GRANBY, ONTARIO

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources which relates to the fact that the Atomic Energy Control Board has ordered Eldorado Nuclear Limited to stop disposing of its radioactive residue from its refining operations at a site near Port Granby, Ontario.

In view of the fact that this dumping has been going on for years and that Eldorado Nuclear Limited has had two extensions despite the growing concern about possible seepage of toxic material into Lake Ontario, I should like to ask the minister whether he has ordered Eldorado Nuclear Limited, a Crown corporation, to comply with the order of the Atomic Energy Control Board in order that it may be clear to all that public corporations are subject to the same controls of any regulatory body as are private companies?

[Mr. Cossitt.]

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I did not order Eldorado to comply for one very good reason. I believe the authority vested in the Atomic Energy Control Board is quite sufficient to force it to comply. Indeed, I think it might be most inappropriate if I as minister were to superimpose myself between the agency and Eldorado Nuclear Limited. I am quite confident that the powers of the Atomic Energy Control Board are sufficient to force compliance by Eldorado Nuclear Limited.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that both the Atomic Energy Control Board and Eldorado Nuclear Limited come under the minister's administrative responsibilities, I would ask the minister first of all why it has taken the control board so long to become aware of a situation that has been public knowledge for a long time and, secondly, why he has allowed Eldorado Nuclear Limited to stall on taking action to stop dumping the radioactive waste into a site close to Lake Ontario? The minister surely has some responsibility to see that these agencies under his responsibility act in accordance with public safety for the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Atomic Energy Control Board has acted with expedition. I think it has moved quickly. If the hon. member were to read the release dated July 7 and see the terms that have been set forth by the Atomic Energy Control Board in respect of Eldorado Nuclear Limited I think he would fully agree that this is not just a simple question of saying that Eldorado should clean up its act. There is very much more involved in terms of permanent storage, future storage and the cleaning up of the city as well. I believe the Atomic Energy Control Board has acted expeditiously.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Second Report of Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections in both official languages—Mr. Blaker.

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

* * *

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF REPORT ON INCIDENT AT B.C. PENITENTIARY, JUNE 9-11, 1975

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table, in both

official languages, the report of the commission of inquiry into events at the B.C. Penitentiary from June 9 to June 11, 1975. This commission was under the chairmanship of Chief Justice John L. Farris.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

TABLING OF AGREEMENT AMONG NATIVE GROUPS, GOVERNMENT OF CANADA AND GOVERNMENT OF QUEBEC

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, pursuant to section 41(2) I wish to table, in both official languages, a document entitled "Agreement between the Grand Council of the Crees (of Quebec) and the Northern Quebec Inuit Association and the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada", dated November 11, 1975, with the amendments dated December 12, 1975. Since the documents are rather bulky, they have already been forwarded to the table.

* * *

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR INSTALLATION IN MOTOR VEHICLES OF PASSIVE RESTRAINT CRASH PROTECTION DEVICES

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-444, to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Act (passive restraint crash protection devices).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to substantially reduce the number of injuries and deaths in highway accidents. It requires the installation of a passive restraint system, specifically instantly-inflatable air bags, in all cars manufactured in or imported into Canada after 1980.

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

* * *

CANADIAN AND BRITISH INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT

MEASURE TO PERMIT INSURANCE COMPANIES TO INVEST IN BONDS OF GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

Mr. Bob Kaplan (York Centre) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-445, to amend the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act limits the insurance industry to investing in government securities only of the countries listed in the act. Presently on the list are such countries as Southern Ireland, Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom, Trinidad and Tobago, and so on. The purpose of this amendment is to add to that list the state of Israel so that the industry could also invest in state of Israel bonds which, unlike the bonds of some other countries, have never defaulted or been compromised.

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

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,151, 4,168, 4,399, 4,426, 4,539, 4,541, 4,574, 4,766, 5,146, 5,160, 5,216, 5,217, 5,300, 5,359, 5,410—which is a corrected reply—5,494, 5,495, 5,498, 5,513, 5,514, 5,520, 5,529, 5,547, 5,549, 5,558, 5,565, 5,640, 5,641, 5,655 to 5,683, inclusive, 5,697, 5,711, 5,712, 5,720, 5,741, 5,746, 5,749, 5,800, 5,803, 5,811 and 5,820.

[*Text*]

NEW UNIFORMS PROVIDED TO POSTAL CLERKS

Question No. 4,151—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Were blazers, shirts and ties provided to postal clerks and, if so, who made the decision?

2. (a) In each case, how many were purchased (b) what was the cost?

3. Were tenders called for the supply of such uniforms and, if not, was the contract awarded by the Postmaster General?

4. (a) How long will the clothing issue last (b) what is the estimated renewal period?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. Blazers, shirts or blouses, and ties or scarves were provided to postal clerks who regularly serve the public at postal counters. Under the labour agreement with the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, wicket clerks are to be provided with a clothing entitlement. To enhance the image of the department, management proposed and Treasury Board approved a change in the issue to the style recently introduced.

2. The quantities ordered are as follows:

	(a)	(b) Average Cost
Male Jackets	13,400	$28.97
Female Jackets	8,800	35.50
Shirts	41,900	3.90
Blouses	28,100	3.45
Ties	29,400	1.47
Scarves	20,000	1.56
Identification Tags	15,000	0.33

3. Tenders were called for their provision.

4. (a) and (b) The costs include some reserve stock and the uniforms are expected to last two years.

Order Paper Questions

PSYCHIATRISTS—ONTARIO REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,168—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychiatrists at Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada and abroad (iii) salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): (a) 1970 and 1971—Nil. (i) to (iii) N/A. 1972, 1. (i) M.B., B.S. London, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P, D.P.M., England, M.R.C. Psychiatry; (ii) House Physician, Charing Cross Hospital, Royal Air Force as Medical Officer, 16 years in general medicine and forensic psychiatry, Honorary Senior Lecturer (Psychiatry), The London Hospital Medical College; (iii) Salary Range—1972, $26,800—$35,000; 1973, $28,700—$37,500; 1974, $32,000—$41,600; 1975, $34,500—$44,900. 1973, 2. Case 1, See 1972, Case 2 (i) BSC, MD, CM, University of Montreal, Fellowship of Psychiatry and Surgeon, Canada Certificate in Psychiatry, Royal Surgeon; (ii) Canadian Army Medical Corps Psychiatrist in 1941 Served Post Work regular Army Practice of Psychiatry in Kingston, Ontario Consultant to Department of Veteran Affairs at Queen's University Medical School 1960 appointed as Psychiatrist for CPS on part-time basis; (iii) Salary range 1973, $28,700—$37,500; 1974, $32,000—$41,600; 1975, $34,500—$44,900. 1974, 4. Case 1, See 1972; Case 2, See 1973; Case 3, (i) MD, LMCC, College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, C.R.C.P. (C), F.R.C.P. (C), Diploma in Psychiatry, (ii) Staff Physician—Ontario Hospital, London, Staff Physician—Toronto Psychiatric Hospital, Staff Physician—Toronto Western Hospital; (iii) Salary range 1974, $29,300—$38,700, 1975, $31,700—$41,700, Case, 4. (i) Internship at Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, (ii) Medical Officer, RAF 1953 transferred to RCAF as Staff Medical Officer Internal Medicine at Toronto Military Hospital Staff Officer Medical Services at Maritime Air Command France as Senior Medical Officer in No. 1 Air Division in Europe Armed Forces Hospital, Kingston, Surgeon and Psychiatrist; (iii) Salary range 1974, $29,300—$38,700; 1975, $31,700—$41,700. 1975, 4. Case 1: See 1972; Case 2; See 1973; Case 3 and 4: See 1974. (b) Nil for 1970 to 1975 inclusive.

CLASSIFICATION OFFICERS—OSBORNE CENTRE

Question No. 4,399—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time classification officers at Osborne Centre and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada (iii) individual salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil. Classification action is taken at Stony Mountain Institution.

LIVING UNIT-OFFICERS—FRONTENAC INSTITUTION

Question No. 4,426—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of living unit-officers at Frontenac Institution?

2. Was their education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12 (c) some college (d) beyond a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): For the years 1970 to 1975 inclusive—Nil. The living unit program at Frontenac Institution was implemented as of April 1, 1976.

PSYCHOLOGISTS—DUNGARVON

Question No. 4,539—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychologists at Dungarvon and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada (iii) individual salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): For the years 1970 to 1975—Nil. This institution was activated in 1974 and referrals for psychological services are made to Dorchester Penitentiary.

PSYCHOLOGISTS—WESTMORELAND

Question No. 4,541—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of (a) full-time (b) part-time psychologists at Westmoreland and, in each case, what were their (i) educational qualifications (ii) previous work experiences in Canada (iii) individual salaries?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): For the years 1970 to 1975—Nil. All psychological cases are referred to Dorchester Penitentiary.

DRAGGER CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 4,574—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. Were subsidies paid to companies for dragger construction in 1975 and, if so (a) in what amount (b) to which companies?

2. How much was paid in subsidies to processing plants in 1975?

3. Were licences allocated to companies owning draggers over 65 feet and, if so (a) how many (b) to which companies?

4. How many (a) mid-water trawl (b) herring seining licences were allocated in 1975?

5. (a) What is the composition of the Fisheries Prices Support Board (b) what are its duties (c) in what manner does it function?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Fisheries)): 1. Yes, the following subsidies were paid to shipbuilders for the construction of company owned draggers (trawlers) in 1975-1976: Marystown Shipyard Ltd., Marystown, Newfoundland: Tele-Direct Ltd., Montreal, P.Q., $625,000; National Sea Products Ltd., Halifax, Nova Scotia, $1,533,000; John Penney & Sons Ltd., Ramea, Newfoundland, $900,000. Verrault Navigation Inc., De Mechins, P.Q.: Les Pêcheries du Golfe St-Laurent Inc., Cape-aux-Meules, Îles-de-la-Madeleine, P.Q., $272,000. Pelagic Pacific Industries Ltd., Victoria, B.C.: Pacific Trident Fishing Co. Ltd., Tofino, B.C., $115,000. Ferguson Industries Limited, Pictou, Nova Scotia: Canso Seafoods Ltd., North Sydney, Nova Scotia, $1,988,000. Haste Fisheries Ltd., North Vancouver, B.C.: Haste Fisheries Ltd., $105,000. Jack & Jerry Liddle, Wheatley, Ontario: Liddle Brothers Fishery Ltd., Wheatley, Ontario, $7,900.

2. $19,503,951.

3. Yes. (a) Newfoundland Region, 87 licences; Maritimes Region, 104 licences. (b) These licences are issued in accordance with established licencing procedures and the guidelines developed by the Atlantic Groundfish Licencing Committee. The name of a licence holder, whether it is that

of a company or an individual, is considered to be confidential and it is not the policy to make this information public.

4. (a) Midwater trawl licences included in the above totals are: Newfoundland Region: Midwater trawl only, 1; Maritimes Region: Midwater trawl and Otter trawl combination, 33; Midwater trawl and Purse Seine combination, 7; Midwater trawl only, 6. (b) Newfoundland Region: Herring Purse Seine, 13; Maritimes Region: Herring Purse Seine, 70; of which seven are also licenced to fish midwater trawl.

5. (a) The Fisheries Prices Support Board is composed of six members. They are appointed by the Governor-in-Council to hold office during pleasure. (b) The Board is responsible for investigating and where appropriate, recommending action under the Fisheries Prices Support Act, to support prices of fisheries products where declines have been experienced. The basic principle of the legislation is to help cushion the sharp declines in prices and consequent loss of income due to causes beyond the control of the fishermen or the industry. The Board serves as an advisory board to the Minister. (c) The Board, subject to approval of the Governor-in-Council, is empowered to purchase fishery products at prescribed prices. The Board may also pay deficiency payments to producers of fishery products equal to the difference between a prescribed price and the average price at which products were sold.

INTERIMCO CONTRACTS

Question No. 4,766—**Mr. MacKenzie:**

Has Interimco Ltd. of 1206-100 Bronson Ave., Ottawa, Ontario been awarded any CIDA or CUSO contracts or contracts with any department, Crown corporation or agency since January 1, 1975 and, if so (a) with which department, Crown corporation or agency (b) in what amount (c) for what purpose?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Supply and Services as follows: (a) Canadian Commercial Corporation. (b) $4,583. (c) Farm equipment spares for India under CIDA Grant Aid Program. Several other Departments, Crown Corporations and Agencies: Nil.

STOL AIR TRANSPORT SYSTEM—EXPENDITURES

Question No. 5,146—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. What was the total amount expended, itemized to reflect the purpose of all main expenditures, by the government directly or indirectly on the Stol Air Transport System up to March 31, 1976?

2. As of that date, what further monies have been committed, itemized to reflect the purpose of all main expenditures, with respect to the project?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1.

	$000's	$000's
Expenditures to March 31, 1976		
Capital		
Aircraft, Avionics, Air Navigation and Instrument Landing Systems	7,895	
Stolports	5,442	
Application and Market Studies	1,154	
Technical Trials and Studies	752	
Total Capital		15,243
Operation and Maintenance		
Stolport Operations	2,730	
Stol Evaluation	333	
Public Affairs	536	
Air Transit Operations	5,210	
	8,809	
Less: Revenue (Rental of Aircraft)	702	
Net Operating		8,107
Total		23,350
2. Estimated Additional Expenditures as of March 31, 1976		
Operation and Maintenance		
Stolport Operations	395	
Stol Evaluation	140	
Public Affairs	45	
Air Transit Operations	504	
	1,084	
Less: Revenue (Rental of Aircraft)	35	
Total		1,049

FIRE—GOVERNOR GENERAL'S RESIDENCE

Question No. 5,160—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Was there a fire at the Governor General's summer residence and, if so (a) on what date (b) what is the estimated amount of damage to the (i) building (ii) contents?

2. Was there an automatic fire alarm system on the premises at the time of the fire and, if so, did it fail to function?

3. Prior to the fire, was the government and, in particular, the Department of Public Works and the Dominion Fire Commissioner aware that the system was not functioning and, if so, for what period of time?

4. During the past five years were (a) fire prevention inspections of the premises made by the office of the Dominion Fire Commissioner (b) tests made of the automatic fire alarm system and, if so, in each case, on what dates?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes. (a) Monday, February 2nd, 1976. (b) (i) $1,053,000; (ii) $150,000.

2. Yes, there was an automatic fire alarm system. Yes, it failed to function.

3. Early in November 1975, the system was reported unserviceable. On November 13, 1975, a work order was issued to a company specializing in fire alarms for inspection and repairs. As of the date of the fire, the work had not been performed.

4. (a) An inspection was made by the Dominion Fire Commissioner's staff on February 21, 1973. (b) The auto-

matic fire alarm was tested February 22, 1973, by the Dominion Fire Commissioner's staff. In addition, the system was tested and maintenance carried out by service contract in 1970, 1971, 1972 and 1973. In 1974 and 1975 an annual inspection including testing was carried out by service contract. The last test in March 1975, indicated that the system was in operating condition and no repairs were required.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Question No. 5,216—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. As at March 31 (a) 1946 (b) 1963 (c) 1968 (d) 1974 (e) 1975 (f) 1976, what was the total number of government employees including the following arms of the government, ministries of state and departments, departmental corporations, administrative, regulatory and special funds and agencies, government enterprises, and the Armed Services and what was the total employment under each category?

2. What was the total number working for the government under contract or other arrangement but who are not classed as employees?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by Statistics Canada and the Department of National Defence as follows: 1. The data appearing on the attached table includes only civilian personnel. The only information available for 1946 is a total figure of those employed by departments and departmental corporations. For March 1963, the number employed by administrative, regulatory and special funds is included in the number employed by government enterprises. The number of federal government employees as of March 1976 has not been published as yet, however, we have included in the tabled figures for December 1975 and estimated figures for March 1976. Military personnel was as follows: (a) 212,692; (b) 123,694; (c) 101,572; (d) 81,624; (e) 79,354; (f) 79,073.

2. In so far as Statistics Canada is concerned, the total number of persons working under personal service contracts during the years cited was: (a) No data available; (b) No data available; (c) 10; (d) 36; (e) 42; (f) 21.

Federal Government Employment—Number of Employees

Years		Ministries of State and Departments	Departmental Corporations	Administrative regulatory and special funds	Total — General Government	Government Enterprises	Total
1946	(March 31)	120,557[1]			Data not available		
1963	(March 31)	184,732	14,089			129,819[2]	328,640
	(December 31)	187,479	14,540	4,998	207,017	127,011	334,028
1968	(March 31)	225,248	10,263	7,248	242,759	126,595	369,354
1975	(March 31)	291,861	15,227	12,517	319,605	133,936	453,541
	(December 31)	297,316	16,376	12,888	326,580	132,046	458,626
1976	(March 31)[3]	306,480	15,788	13,000	335,268	132,000	467,268

[1] With the exception of Wartime Prices and Trade Board this figure excludes statistics for other Boards and Commissions and Crown Companies, the personnel of which does not come within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Act.
[2] Includes administrative, regulatory and special funds.
[3] Estimated Figures.
NOTE: Figures for 1974 were reported in the answer to Question No. 3,794.

NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, RETIRED AND HIRED IN 1974-76

Question No. 5,217—**Mr. Stevens:**

In each fiscal year ended (a) 1974 (b) 1975 (c) 1976, what was the total number of government employees (i) discharged or dismissed (ii) retired (iii) hired?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: Statistics are for calendar years 1974 and 1975 and apply to employees subject to the Public Service Employment Act. No statistics are available for 1976. N.B.—The terms used in our answer are consistent with the wording of the Public Service Employment Act.

	1974	1975
(i) Released for breach of discipline or misconduct	95	71
Released for incompetence or incapacity	168	140
Released for abandonment of position	548	447
Rejected during probation	695	685
Revocation of appointment	15	39
Total	1,521	1,382
(ii) Retirement		
at age 65 and over	2,182	1,567
elective at 55-65	2,372	2,763
medical grounds	1,022	744
Total	5,576	5,074
(iii) Appointed to the Public Service	46,567	36,251

I am informed by the Department of National Defence as follows: (a), (b) and (c) Military Personnel:

Fiscal Year	Discharged (Note 1)	Dismissed (Note 2)	Retired (Note 3)	Hired
1973/74	6,375	7	2,638	8,059
1974/75	8,357	5	3,160	9,445
1975/76	8,597	6	2,686	11.099

NOTE 1: Discharged includes voluntary releases without entitlement to an annuity, medically unfit personnel, deaths etc.

NOTE 2: Dismissed means compulsory release due to misdemeanors etc.

NOTE 3: Retired includes service completion or voluntary release with entitled to an annuity.

PUBLIC WORKS—VACANT OFFICE SPACE, VANCOUVER, B.C.

Question No. 5,300—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. How long have the Unemployment Insurance Commission offices at 1155 Robson Street, Vancouver, British Columbia been vacant?

2. How many floors were vacated?

3. What are the plans to re-occupy the premises and by whom?

4. How long is the lease or rental arrangements for the floor space and what is the cost?

5. For how many months has payment been made for rent for the vacated premises?

6. How many government offices have been vacated in Vancouver in which rental payments are still being made?

7. In what location are the offices and what is the cost to date?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. The U.I.C. did not completely vacate the building but reduced their requirements on December 15, 1975 due to the establishment of expanded service elsewhere in Vancouver. Occupancy of 10,455 rentable square feet has been retained on the first floor together with 4,480 square feet rentable in the basement for storage.

2. The entire second floor—10,914 square feet and a portion of the third floor—4,794 square feet for a total of 15,708 rentable square feet.

3. The vacant space was included in the Regional Plan for Vancouver. The present proposal is for Statistics Canada to occupy the area, pending finalization of the Regional Plan.

4. 1155 Robson Street is a Crown-owned building and is therefore not subject to any lease or rental arrangement with the private sector.

5. Not applicable. Please refer to No. 4 above.

6. See statement following.

7. See statement following.

	Lease				Vacancy		
Location	Commence	Terminate	Annual Rent	Sq. Ft.	Date Vacated	Time Frame	Remarks
18th Floor 1050 W. Pender Vancouver, B.C.	1/5/75	30/4/79	$15,532.00	1,451	1/3/76	2 months	Client: M & I Reason for vacancy: (a) change in M & I program (b) being utilized as "swing space" Has been utilized by: (1) Anti-inflation Board (2) Prime Minister's Cabinet Meeting (3) Proposed occupancy P.S.C. Language School May 1/76.

TREATIES

Question No. 5,359—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How many international treaties, conventions, accords, etc., have been signed by Canada but have not been (a) ratified (b) implemented by either the (i) provinces (ii) Parliament of Canada or the executive of the government of Canada?

2. What treaties are involved and on what date did Canada sign them?

3. How many such arrangements has Canada ratified but have not implemented, if any?

4. What consideration is Canada giving to implementing the recommendation of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada (1972) that international treaties be ratified by Parliament rather than the Executive and the Crown?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Ratification following signature is only one of several ways in which an international agreement may enter into force for Canada. Many bilateral agreements enter into force either on signature or on some other date in accordance with procedures specified in the agreement. Most multilateral treaties require either signature followed by ratification, or, if they have not been signed, the deposit of an instrument of accession, approval or acceptance. In considering Canadian treaty procedures it is necessary to recognize the distinction between the treaty-making power, i.e. the power to enter into treaties and thus incur obligations in international law, and the treaty-implementing power, i.e. the power to enact whatever legislation may be required to bring Canada's domestic law into accord with the international obligations embodied in a treaty. (a) This sub-question is concerned with the treaty-making power. In Canada the constitutional authority to enter into treaties is part of the Royal Prerogative which in practice is exercised by the Governor General in Council. Ratification is therefore an executive act. For this reason no treaties, conventions or other international agreements signed by Canada which are subject to ratification have been ratified by either the Provinces or the Parliament of Canada. (b) This sub-question deals

with the treaty-implementing power. Many treaties are in accordance with existing domestic law and therefore do not require further legislative action for their implementation. Other treaties will require legislative action, either federal or provincial, to permit implementation by Canada. The Canada Treaty Register does not contain complete information on legislation which has been adopted by the Parliament of Canada for the purpose of implementing treaties. The Register contains no information on legislation enacted by the Provinces for the purpose of implementing treaties, the subject matter of which falls within provincial jurisdiction. For these reasons it is not possible to indicate the number of treaties which have not been implemented by legislative action of either the Provinces or the Parliament of Canada or have not required specific executive action for their implementation.

2. The compilation of detailed lists of treaties binding on Canada which have not been the subject of specific implementing legislation by either the Provinces or the Parliament of Canada or of specific executive action for their implementation, together with the date of Canada's signature, would necessitate a search of every entry in the Canada Treaty Register and would require an inordinate cost and length of time.

3. Canada has implemented all treaties by which it is bound, whether by signature, ratification or accession. As explained above, legislative action either by the Parliament of Canada or the legislatures of the Provinces is not required where the performance of treaty obligations does not entail alteration of existing domestic law. The number of treaties ratified by Canada which have not required specific legislation by Parliament for their implementation is approximately 296, of which 88 are bilateral agreements and 208 are multilateral agreements. As explained above, no figures can be given for treaties ratified by Canada which have not required implementing legislation by the Provinces because this information is not available from the Canada Treaty Register.

4. No active consideration is being given to this matter.

NAMELESS POSTMARKS

Question No. 5,410—**Mr. Dinsdale:** (Corrected)

1. Has the Post Office Department recently introduced a policy of nameless postmarks and, if so, for what reason have the names of cities and towns been replaced by a code?

2. Does the Department have a policy of replacing all names with numbers and, if so, what is the next planned change?

3. Did the Department examine the experience of the USA Postal Service, which introduced similar nameless postmarks, and which more recently restored city and town names in the face of popular demand?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. The Post Office recently introduced the use of the postal code in its cancellation mark primarily for certain centres where changes in the pattern of mail processing made the continued use of a community name identifier impractical. This has occurred where mail from a number of communities is now gathered into one major processing plant and collectively processed in one stream. In these new mechanized plants it is impractical to keep segregated the mail from different source locations, and rather than select the name of one community to be used for the cancellation of all mail processed through such a plant, it was decided to use the postal code of the plant. For example, the processing plant located in Scarborough, Ontario will process mail from surrounding areas such as Richmond Hill, Willowdale, Thornhill, Markham, Ajax, Pickering and others.

2. No, the Post Office does not have a policy of changing all names to numbers. It is not planned to use postal code postmarks at St. John's, Newfoundland as originally stated.

3. Yes, the Post Office Department is familiar with the United States Postal Service experience. However, the systems are different in the two countries and there is no practical relationship.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—DOCKYARDS, HALIFAX, N.S.

Question No. 5,494—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What is the total value of contracts to private firms for work at the government dockyard in Halifax previously done by employees of the Department of National Defence for each of the past five years?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Nil. No contracts have been given to private firms for work which has previously been done exclusively by Department of National Defence dockyard employees in each of the past five years. The number of manhours worked in the ship repair unit has been stable over the past five years, although the changing nature of the workload has resulted in some alteration in the proportion of the various trades employed.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—DOCKYARDS, HALIFAX, N.S.

Question No. 5,495—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What is the government's best estimate of the number of Department of National Defence employees replaced in contracting out work to private firms at the government dockyard in Halifax since 1970?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): None. For further detail see answer to Question No. 5,494.

NATIONAL MUSEUMS CORPORATION—AUTHORIZED MAN-YEARS

Question No. 5,498—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

1. How many man-years were authorized for the National Museum Corporation in each year 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976?

2. What is the actual number of man-years in each year and, if such man-years exceeded the authorization (a) for what reason (b) who (i) authorized (ii) recommended the excess?

3. How many actual man-years in excess of those authorized were in the (a) administrative branch (b) other branches or agencies of the Corporation?

4. Have any instructions been given to the Corporation or any of its officers to reduce the actual man-years in the year 1976 and, if so (a) by whom (b) what reduction will occur in (i) the administrative branch (ii) other branches or agencies?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Museums of Canada as follows: 1. Authorized man-year

utilization: 1973-74, 696; 1974-75, 741; 1975-76, 949; 1976-77, 997.

2. Actual man-year utilization: 1973-74, 656; 1974-75, 741; 1975-76, 949.

3. Man-years have not exceeded authorized levels.

4. No instructions have been given to reduce the authorized level of man-years for the Corporation for 1976-77 from that printed in the Main Estimates Blue Book 1976-77 of 997. However, all sections of the Corporation have been advised that the man-years authorized for their activities in 1976-77 must be strictly adhered to because the Corporation no longer is capable of providing the flexibility necessary to accommodate over-utilization of man-years in any of its components.

STAFF AT PRIME MINISTER'S SUMMER RESIDENCE

Question No. 5,513—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Since the date Question No. 68 of the 29th Parliament was answered, what are the names, job designations and salaries of all those who have been or are employed at the Prime Minister's summer residence at Harrington Lake?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Prime Minister's Office is concerned: The employees as listed in the reply to question 5,514 may from time to time be employed at the Prime Minister's summer residence at Harrington Lake. In so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned: Since question number 68 of the 30th Parliament was answered no DPW employees have been employed at the Prime Minister's residence, Harrington Lake. In so far as the National Capital Commission is concerned: Stanley Healy: Caretaker and grounds maintenance, $5.69 per hour at current rate or $11,881 pro rated for one year. Stanley Stevenson: Machine driving operator, $4.78 per hour at current rate or $4,159 pro rated for 5 months, spring and summer. Various equipment operators, for snow removal duties, 3 months of the year, estimate per annum is $10,356.

STAFF AT PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL RESIDENCE

Question No. 5,514—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Since the date Question No. 68 of the 29th Parliament was answered, what are the names, job designations and salaries of all those who have been or are employed at the Prime Minister's official residence, 24 Sussex Drive?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Prime Minister's Office is concerned:

Name	Classification	Hourly Rate
MacDonald T.	GS-MPS-10	$5.16 + .59
West, H. (Mrs.)	GS-MPS-4	$4.13 + .25
Lavergne, D. (Miss)	GS-MPS-2	$3.70
Virgo, S. M. (Miss)	GS-MPS-2	$3.70
Vincent, Y.	GS-FOS-9	$6.51 + .75
Chénier, R. (Mrs.)	GS-FOS-6	$5.36
*Schultz, M. (Mrs.)	GS-MPS-2	$3.70
Calder, B. A. (Mrs.)	GS-MPS-2	$3.70 (employed from 15.09.75 to 11.06.76)
Clement, N. (Miss)	GS-MPS-2	$3.70

*working half-days only

In so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned: Since Question number 68 was answered Mrs. Lepage is still employed at the Prime Minister's residence, 24 Sussex Drive as BUS 2 at $3.76 per hour. Mrs. Daviault has been replaced by the following: Mrs. Lucille Grondin, Cleaning Service Woman (BUS 2), paid at $3.76 per hour. In so far as the National Capital Commission is concerned: No individual assignment of any employee. Grounds maintenance and snow removal work is carried out as required by various personnel as available. Estimate per annum is $10,440.

TERMS OF CHILEAN DEBT AGREEMENT

Question No. 5,520—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

1. (a) What were the terms of the Chilean debt renegotiated by the agreement of November 17, 1975 (b) what (i) was the amount of debt outstanding (ii) were the terms for payment prior to renegotiation (c) what are the terms for payment under the renegotiated agreement?

2. For what reason was there no mention of the debt renegotiations made in the 1975 Annual Report of the Export Development Corporation?

3. Is the Chilean debt to Canada now held in its entirety by the EDC and, if not, where else is it held?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Finance and the Export Development Corporation as follows: 1. (a) In accordance with an international agreement signed in Paris on May 6, 1975, Canada together with most other creditor countries agreed to refinance 70 per cent of the payments due in 1975 arising from commercial credits signed prior to December 1973 and with a maturity exceeding one year. It was further agreed that the amount rescheduled (70 per cent) would be paid in 13 equal semi-annual payments starting on January 1, 1978 and that the balance of 30 per cent would be paid as follows: 10 per cent in 1975, 10 per cent in 1976 and 10 per cent in 1977. The bilateral agreement signed by EDC on November 17, 1975 implemented this multilateral agreement; the same terms applied to the amount due to EDC which was estimated at $3.1 million. (b) i) The amount of debt outstanding as of January 1, 1976 was about $18.7 million. ii) The terms of payments prior to negotiation varied with each transaction from 2 to 10 years. (c) The terms of the loans have not been changed since, as is normally the case with multilateral debt

reschedulings, the original loan agreements were not renegotiated. Only the payments due in 1975 were rengotiated. The terms are detailed in 1(a).

2. In 1975 EDC in consultation with the Auditor General changed several areas of its accounting procedures to conform more closely with those of similar organizations. EDC now reports debt rescheduling in aggregate.

3. At present the Chilean debt to Canada is held by EDC, by private firms exporting to that market and by Canadian chartered banks. The amount of these private Canadian credits is unknown. CIDA approved, under the terms of an agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank, two Bank loans (involving Canadian funds contributed to the Bank) to Chile in 1967-68. However under the terms of the above agreement the repayment of these loans is made direct to the Inter-American Development Bank.

SUMMER STUDENT EMPLOYMENT—CONSTITUENCY OF LEEDS

Question No. 5,529—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Were Canada Manpower offices in the Constituency of Leeds advised this year that they would no longer have anything to do with processing of applications for summer student employment with Canada Customs and Canada Immigration within Leeds and, if so (a) what is the name and job designation of the highest government official giving these instructions (b) to what Canada Manpower offices were they issued and on what date?

2. Were Canada Manpower offices in Leeds instructed to forward all applications to Canada Manpower in Ottawa and, if so, what is the name and job designation of the highest official issuing this order and on what date?

3. (a) What are the reasons for this change in policy (b) is it designed to cut down or eliminate the number of university students whose homes are in Leeds from gaining such employment (c) has there been any political influence used by the government in hiring of such summer students within Leeds and, if so, what are all the details (d) is this an attempt to downgrade the work and duties of the local Canada Manpower offices in Leeds and, if so, for what reason?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. Canada Manpower Centres across the country, including those in the Constituency of Leeds were advised this year that they would no longer have anything to do with processing of applications for summer student employment with Revenue Canada—Customs. (a) These instructions were given out by the Director of the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program, under the direction of the Director General, Staffing Branch, Public Service Commission. (b) These instructions were issued on February 3rd, 1976, to Manpower Centres across Canada and in the Constituency of Leeds to the following Canada Manpower Centres: Brockville, Gananoque, Smiths Falls.

2. Canada Manpower offices in Leeds were not instructed to forward all applications to Canada Manpower in Ottawa but to forward them to the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program, Public Service Commission in Ottawa. These instructions were given out to them on February 3, 1976 by the Director of the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program, under the direction of the Director General, Staffing Branch, Public Service Commission.

3. (a) In 1975, all the Customs Inspectors positions (Revenue Canada—Customs and Excise) which were classified at CR 5 were reclassified to the PM 1A level. As the CMC's can only make referrals to positions in the Administrative Support and Operational Categories, they could not refer candidates to the PM 1A positions which are part of the Administrative and Foreign Service Category. Appointments of summer students in positions which are career related or oriented to the Administrative and Foreign Service, Scientific and Professional or Technical Categories, are not delegated to departments or to the CMC's, but remain the responsibility of the Public Service Commission. Such programs are administered by the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program of the Public Service Commission. (b) It is not designed to cut down or eliminate any university or community college students from gaining such employment. As proximity of job location was established as a criterion for selection, only those students whose area of residence was within the immediate area of the border point to be served, could be considered. (c) No political influence was used in the hiring of summer students within Leeds. The merit principle was followed and these selection criteria were used: (1) Canadian Citizenship (2) Eligibility as a student (i.e., be a full-time student and be returning to full-time studies in the fall) (3) Proximity to job location (4) Job experience with the public. (d) There was no attempt to downgrade the duties of the staff of any CMC in Canada (this is a national program). The authority to staff these positions was simply not delegated to either the Department of Revenue Canada, Customs and Excise or the CMC's, and staffing of these positions falls under the authority of the Public Service Commission.

[Mr. Sharp.]

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT BY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

Question No. 5,547—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Minister of Agriculture fly to Windsor, Ontario, on August 27, 1975 and, if so (a) what government aircraft was used (b) did the aircraft have four engines?

2. Was the Minister the only person on board and (a) if so, for what reason was an aircraft with such power used (b) if not, what are the names, addresses and job designations of all others on board?

3. (a) Where did the flight originate (b) what was the cost involved including (i) flying time (ii) waiting time (c) was the purpose of the flight as stated in a letter to Mr. Charles S. Pringle, 500 Ouellette Avenue, Windsor, Ontario, dated October 14, 1975 "to officially open Harrow Fair" and, if so, what are the reasons that the Minister did not take a regularly scheduled commercial flight to Windsor for this occasion?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Minister of Agriculture and Transport Canada as follows: 1. Yes. (a) DOT Viscount—CF-DTA; (b) Yes.

2. Yes. (a) The most suitable aircraft available was used. (b) N/A.

3. (a) Ottawa. (b) (i) $3,117; (ii) Nil. (c) The purpose of the flight was to officially open the Harrow Fair. Official commitments prior to departure from Ottawa precluded the use of a regularly scheduled commercial flight.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT BY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

Question No. 5,549—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Did the Minister of Agriculture write a letter dated October 14, 1975 to Mr. Charles S. Pringle, 500 Ouellette Avenue, Windsor, Ontario and, if so, did this state in part "As you know, in my position as Member of Parliament and Minister of Agriculture I read and sign secret documents and papers and it would be impossible to do so travelling on Air Canada" (a) does the Minister consider this a valid excuse for large expenditures of public funds for his use of government aircraft (b) what are the reasons that the Minister could not sign and read secret documents and papers on Air Canada (c) has the Minister evidence that his activities are under any surveillance when on board Air Canada or that secret documents or papers he might be carrying are in any danger (d) what is the description of the type of secret documents and papers that the Minister claims to carry with him?

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Yes. (a) See also 5,547, part 3c. (b) Documents were of a confidential nature. (c) No. (d) The documents relate to the responsibility of a Minister of the Crown and as a member of the Privy Council.

QUESTIONS REGARDING FIRE PROTECTION

Question No. 5,558—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. In regard to the various questions presently on the Order Paper concerning possible inadequate fire protection in government owned and leased buildings, in recent weeks, have a number of different sets of answers been prepared for the questions and has the Department of Public Works ordered revisions on each occasion and, if so (a) for what reason (b) how many sets of answers have been prepared for each question and for what reason?

2. Was a meeting held by officials of the Department and representatives of the Dominion Fire Commissioner's Office at which time the proposed answers were discussed and, if so (a) on what date and in what location (b) for what purpose (c) what are the names and job designations of all persons in attendance?

3. Were the answers as finally approved transmitted to the Privy Council Office on or about Friday, May 21?

4. What are the reasons for the time taken to prepare the final answers?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): The Government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements.

NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS

Question No. 5,565—**Mr. Woolliams:**

1. How many countries have obtained nuclear power reactors from Canada and what are their names?

2. Does Canada intend to enforce nuclear safeguards on foreign powers who have purchased reactors if the contract and safeguards are breached and ignored and, if so, in what manner?

3. Is there any real safeguard under such circumstances?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Two countries: India and Pakistan. Contracts for the sale of power reactors are in effect with the Republic of Korea and Argentina. Canada has also sold a 40MW (thermal) research reactor to Taiwan.

2. Canada intends to enforce safeguards through the mechanisms provided by the IAEA, and as appropriate, bilaterally. Safeguards required under Canada's policy leave no room for misunderstanding on the use of which Canadian nuclear exports can be put. Use for any nuclear explosives purpose is explicitly precluded. Other elements of Canadian safeguards give a high degree of assurance against any such use. Violations, should they occur, will have to face the reaction of Canada and the international community.

3. The Canadian Government strongly supports the international safeguard system and is participating very actively in efforts to improve that system to which constant technical and legal improvements are being made. Canada is also making efforts on many fronts to improve the international security situation in general in order to lessen the temptation which may be present for some countries in certain circumstances to wish to resort to a nuclear capability for national security.

USE OF CENSUS PENCILS

Question No. 5,640—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Is a special pencil required for filling out the five-year Census?

2. How many pencils have been distributed with the 1976 census forms and what is the cost to the taxpayer for such pencils?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: 1. It is necessary to use a soft lead pencil to complete the Census questionnaire. The Census questionnaire is processed by machine which does not readily read responses coded in ink. Manual processing by Statistics Canada of responses coded in ink is a very expensive operation—given the potential volume involved.

2. Pencils have been distributed to approximately 7,200,000 households at a cost of approximately $198,000.

TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION

Question No. 5,641—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs aware of a memo sent on government stationery by Mr. L. V. Thornton, the Department's Director of Personnel, to all departmental employees on May 14, 1976 promoting enrollment by employees in the transcendental meditation course offered by the World Plan Executive Council for $115 and, if so, does the Minister feel that the memorandum constitutes the promotion of a commercial enterprise at government expense?

2. What was the total number of copies sent to employees?

3. Does the Department sanction and recommend such a course and, if so, what research has been conducted by the Department in support of its recommendations?

4. Is it departmental policy to allow government facilities to be used for the promotion of quasi-religious organizations?

5. Is the Department aware that promotional material for the World Plan Executive Council represents their transcendental meditation course, the Science of Intelligence, as "the basis of solutions to all problems" including providing improved resistance to disease, development of personality and increased normality and improved relations with supervisors and co-workers and promises that "any government supporting the implementation of the World Plan, will bring integrity to its own internal organization, will develop the level of self-sufficiency of the society and will raise the dignity of the country in the family of nations" and, if so, is the Department satisfied that this material does not represent false and misleading advertising?

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. Yes, the Minister

became aware of the memo after it was issued by the Director of Personnel. The purpose of the memo was to respond to a number of enquiries received from employees about the technique of transcendental meditation. It is part of the function of the Personnel Division to inform employees of courses of instruction that could improve an employee's performance of his or her duties. The circulation of this memorandum is not considered by the department as the promotion of a commercial enterprise at government expense.

2. Approximately 1350, one copy to each employee at Headquarters.

3. No, the department did not sanction or recommend the course. The memorandum only brought the course to the attention of employees so that they could make their own decisions about taking the course. Yes, research was conducted on the technique of transcendental meditation by the Director of Personnel. A number of articles were consulted including the Conference Board Record (July 1975), Canadian Business (February 1975), Academy of Management Journal (Volume 17, No. 2), The Lancet (April 1970), Scientific American (February 1972); and a number of books including Transcendental Meditation by J. Forem; Tranquility without Pills by J. H. Robins and David Fisher; The Transcendental Meditation Program for Business People by Robert B. Kory; and TM Discovering Inner Energy and Overcoming Stress by Dr. Harold H. Bloomfield.

4. No.

5. The Department was not aware of these specific quotations and they have been brought to the attention of the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act who has responsibility for the administration of the misleading advertising and deceptive marketing practices provisions of the Act. Under the Act, it is the Director's duty to initiate an inquiry whenever he has reason to believe that there has been or is about to be a violation of any provision of the Act. In view of the subjective nature of transcendental meditation and the fact that no complaints concerning any promotion by this organization have been received in his office, the Director believes that it is unlikely that a court would hold beyond a reasonable doubt that the quotations were in violation of the Act. The Director, however, will examine the organization's promotional material in greater detail and take whatever action is necessary in accordance with the statute.

[*Editor's Note: The following answer applies to Questions Nos. 5,655, 5,658, 5,661, 5,662, 5,665, 5,666, 5,667, 5,668, 5,669, 5,671, 5,672, 5,674, 5,675, 5,677, 5,680, 5,682, 5,683.*]

PROMOTION OF INVESTMENTS

Question No. 5,655—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Algeria since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

[Mr. Lee.]

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,658—**Mr. Caouette (Temiscamingue):**

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Brazil since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,661—**Mr. Caouette (Temiscamingue)**

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Congo (Brazzaville) since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,662—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Ivory Coast since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,665—**Mr. Caouette (Temiscamingue):**

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Guiana since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,666—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Kenya since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,667—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in India since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,668—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Indonesia since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,669—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Jamaica since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,671—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Malaya since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,672—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Mali since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,674—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Niger since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,675—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Nigeria since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,677—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Pakistan since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,680—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Tunisia since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,682—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Zaire since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,683—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Zambia since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

Order Paper Questions

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Canadian International Development Agency is concerned, the reply is as follows:

Chart of CIDA'S involvement in the pre-investment incentive program from 1972 through June, 1976:

* Preamble: CIDA, through its Business and Industry Division, offers a pre-investment incentive program to Canadian companies under stringent guidelines (see reply to Part 3 below). Part of the requirements are that any subsequent investment made must be to the benefit of the developing country, as well as to the Canadian company involved. CIDA does not, directly, promote investment, rather it tries to encourage Canadian investment overseas. It never supports investment financially. What it does do is: (a) Offer funds to reimburse a company, up to a maximum of $2,500, to do a Starter Study in the country of its choice. This is a brief, almost superficial, look into a particular location by a particular company as to whether or not it could possibly establish an enterprise or form a joint venture in a country designated by CIDA as a "developing nation". All companies must submit an application to CIDA beforehand, and these must be approved prior to the Study's commencement. These funds basically cover minimal travel expenses for a period of not more than 15 days. (b) After the Starter Study is completed, the company may decide to apply to CIDA for a Feasibility Study, providing the area of interest looks promising, and this is done in much greater depth. In this instance, CIDA will match funds (50 per cent of the cost) in reimbursing the Canadian company which has made such a Study, to a maximum of $25,000. Upon completion of the Feasibility Study, the company wil then decide to either invest their funds in the developing nation or not. The choice is entirely theirs. CIDA requires a report giving the reasons for their decision. Most of the companies listed numerically in Part 1 of the following chart decided not to invest, thus the discrepancy between the figures in Part 1 and Part 4 of each Question (or country). The grants given are not ongoing from year to year, but rather are a lump sum amount as reimbursement for a particular Study already completed.

---

* For further details, see brochure entitled Pre-Investment Incentive Program, available from CIDA's Information Division.

Question number	Country	Number of Grants	Year Given	Dollar Amount	Company investment	If "Yes", name of Company	Head office	Purpose of investment
		Part I	Part II			Part IV		
5655	Algeria	1	1975	1,939	no			
		1	1976	2,500	no			
5658	Brazil	2	1972	28,737	yes, in 1	Monarch Wear Ltd.	Winnipeg	Industrial development
		4	1973	9,251	no			
		2	1974	4,325	no			
		1	1975	2,500	no			
5661	Congo (Brayzaville)	1	1975	1,748	no			
5662	Ivory Coast	1	1973	2,283	no			
		1	1974	26,108	no			
		1	1975	14,880	no			
5665	Guyana	1	1975	1,050	no			
5666	Kenya	1	1974	1,903	no			
		3	1975	2,799	no			
		1	1976	25,000	no			
5667	India	1	1972	4,536	no			
		1	1973	2,350	no			
5668	Indonesia	1	1972	9,283	no			
5669	Jamaica	2	1972	3,000	no			
		1	1973	5,300	yes	Reliable Toy Co.	Toronto	Industrial Development
		2	1974	2,346	no			
		1	1975	1,813	no			
5671	Malaysia	1	1971-72	5,727	yes	Microsystems Ltd.	Montreal	Electronic Development
		3	1973	15,885	yes, in 1	Electrohome Ltd.	Kitchener	Electronic Development
		5	1974	19,013	no			
		1	1976	1,815	no			
5672	Mali	1	1973	2,500	no			
5674	Niger	2	1972	14,853	no			
5675	Nigeria	1	1971-72	3,954	no			
		1	1972	24,383	yes	Canada Wire & Cable Ltd.	Toronto	Industrial Development

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

		4	1974	8,689	no
		3	1975	5,481	no
5677	Pakistan	1	1974	1,222	no
5680	Tunisia	1	1974	6,029	no
		2	1975	3,497	no
5682	Zaire	1	1975	2,223	no
5683	Zambia	1	1975	1,500	no
		1	1976	1,375	no

Part 3

Eligibility of Canadian business under the Pre-Investment Incentive Program: (a) The program is available to Canadian business and industry defined as individuals, proprietorships, partnerships and limited companies being Canadian citizens, with an established head office in Canada. They must have demonstrated their competency in a particular field and possess adequate resources for investment. (b) The applicant firm must be financially stable and capable of carrying through with a proposed project. (c) The applicant must intend to hold reasonable equity in a resulting enterprise, and the investment should be represented by tangible assets. (d) All types of industrial activity are eligible, provided the above criteria are met.

[*Editor's Note: The following answer applies to Questions Nos. 5,656, 5,657, 5,659, 5,660, 5,663, 5,664, 5,670, 5,673, 5,676, 5,678, 5,679, 5,681.*]

PROMOTION OF INVESTMENTS

Question No. 5,656—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Bangladesh since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,657—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Bolivia since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,659—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Cameroon since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,660—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Chile since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,663—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Dahomey since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,664—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Ghana since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,670—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Laos since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,673—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Nepal since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,676—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Uganda since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,678—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Senegal since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,679—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Tanzania since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Question No. 5,681—Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):

1. How many grants has the government or any para-governmental agency given to various Canadian companies to promote or support certain investments in Turkey since 1972?

2. How much was granted to such companies in each year since 1972 by the government or any para-governmental agency to promote and support such investments?

3. Under what terms and conditions did the government and/or agencies make such grants?

4. What (a) are the names of the beneficiary companies (b) is the location of their head office (c) was the purpose and nature of their investment?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as the Canadian International Development Agency is concerned, the reply is as follows: Nil.

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

RCMP—GASOLINE SERVICE STATIONS, EMERSON, MANITOBA

Question No. 5,697—Mr. Epp:

1. At what gasoline service stations are the RCMP authorized to purchase gasoline, oil and minor repairs in Emerson, Manitoba?

2. Were open tenders called to establish where such purchases could be made and, if not, what criteria were used to determine where purchases could be made?

3. Were open tenders called to establish price per gallon of gasoline and, if not, how was the purchase price determined?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. There are three service stations located in Emerson, Manitoba, Shell rated (B), Gulf rated (E) and Texaco rated (E). The R.C.M.P. are authorized to use any of these outlets, however the higher discount stations are to be used where possible. There is no outlet for the (A) rated company in Emerson.

2 and 3. The R.C.M.P. use the National Credit Card System for the purchase of gasoline and related products for vehicles. The National Credit Card System is administered by Services and Supply Canada and is based on open tenders called by Services and Supply Canada to establish an order of preference based on discounts offered. These tenders are called every three years to establish a Standing Offer Agreement to supply petroleum products for purchase of the products as set out in the Handbook for Users of Government of Canada Credit Cards published by Services and Supply Canada. The handbook lists companies that are authorized to accept the National Credit Card for use in payment of supplies and services provided and discount rate by province e.g., (A) would be best discount and then descend down the scale according to discount offered. As a result of this, the policy of the Force is to use the company which offers the greater discount, however in cases of emergency and after hours any of the approved companies listed may be used.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—UNUSED TRAVEL EXPENSES

Question No. 5,711—Mr. Cossitt:

With reference to the answer to Question No. 5,291 which stated in part that $851.37 was the amount of money owing to the Treasury, as of December 31, 1975, for unused advances for travel by Mr. L. D. Hudon, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, was there an error in this amount and, if so (a) what was the error and for what reason was it made (b) should the actual figure be $2,400?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): The amount of money owing to the Treasury for unused advances for travel as of December 31, 1975 is correctly stated to be $851.37. Travel claims against the amount advanced ($2,400) were outstanding as of December 31. (a) and (b) see above.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—UNUSED TRAVEL EXPENSES

Question No. 5,712—Mr. Cossitt:

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 5,291 which stated in part that $851.37 was the amount of money owing to the Treasury, as of December 31, 1975, for unused advances for travel by Mr. L. D. Hudon, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, was this answer seen by Mr. Hudon before it was given to the House and, if so (a) on what date (b) what are the details, if any, of the part played by Mr. Hudon in the preparation of the answer?

2. Is it Departmental practice that the Deputy Minister approves answers to questions of this kind and, if so, on what date did Mr. Hudon approve the answer?

3. Is it government policy to permit Deputy Ministers to take part in the preparation of answers to *Order Paper* questions that concern themselves?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): The government takes responsibility for the answers it provides to questions and for the process involved in replying to such questions. It is not appropriate therefore to provide information about internal administrative arrangements.

AIR TRANSPORTATION AT FORT FRANCES—MEDICAL SERVICES BRANCH

Question No. 5,720—**Mr. Reid:**

1. What is the policy with respect to the choice of airlines for officials, by the Medical Services Branch Department of National Health and Welfare, the Canada Water Resources Branch, Department of the Environment at Fort Frances, and when was it inaugurated?

2. Has any consideration been given for the contracting and tendering of the air transportation required by the Departments, and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, what are the reasons for the current policy?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): In so far as Health and Welfare Canada is concerned: 1. The use of airlines in Fort Frances is based on convenience to the patients, nurses, private physicians, availability of aircraft in winter and summer, short notice, and the quality of service. Because of the light use of aircraft (to one community a maximum of twice a month) no policy, other than the above has been developed.

2. No detailed consideration has been given to contracting or tendering for air transportation. The Medical Services Branch frequently shares charters to Lac La Croix with other departments and agencies (e.g. Indian Affairs Branch, Canada Water Resources Branch, Children's Aid Society, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Ontario). (a) See 1 above. (b) Not applicable.

In so far as Environment Canada is concerned: 1. There is no specific policy with regard to the choice of airlines for officials by the Water Resources Branch of the Department of the Environment at Fort Frances.

2. No consideration has been given for the contracting and tendering of the air transportation required. (a) It has not been considered because of the very low utilization required, usually about five or six one-day charters per year. (b) Not applicable.

DOE QUESTIONNAIRE "A STUDY OF HOW PEOPLE VIEW RECREATION"

Question No. 5,741—**Mr. Huntington:**

1. How many copies of the Department of the Environment, Fisheries, Marine Branch questionnaire "A Study of How People View Recreation" were distributed?

2. Were copies distributed in all provinces?

3. What was the total cost of (a) preparing (b) printing (c) distributing (d) compiling the results (e) other related costs of the questionnaire?

4. What is the name and address of the company employed by the government to print the questionnaire?

5. How many 12 x 14 inch colour recreational prints were printed to accommodate any requests received from them through the questionnaire and what was the total cost?

6. What is the name and address of the company which printed the colour recreational prints?

7. How many requests were received for the prints?

8. What was the total aggregate cost to study all aspects of the questionnaire?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Fisheries)): This study was a joint undertaking by the British Columbia Provincial Department of Recreation and Conservation and the Federal Fisheries and Marine Service, DOE. It was intended to examine the question of substitutability between natural recreational opportunities and more artificial recreational opportunities of interest to the two jurisdictions.

1. Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to 4,667 households in British Columbia.

2. Copies were distributed only in British Columbia.

3. (a) Preparation costs were approximately $1,00 (estimate of salary time). (b) Printing costs were $3,974.33. (c) Distribution costs were $1,650. (d) The compilation of the results has not yet been completed. This cost has been estimated at $500, part of which will be paid by the Provincial Government. (e) There were no other related costs.

4. A tender for printing the questionnaire was issued through the Department of Supply and Services to Marshall Printing, 367 Water Street, Vancouver 3, British Columbia.

5. The 12" x 14" colour recreational prints were provided by the British Columbia Provincial Government from existing stocks at no cost to the project.

6. Refer to question 5.

7. Approximately 2,400 requests have been received for the colour prints.

8. The total cost of the study was $7,124.33. These costs have been distributed over three fiscal years with preparation costs accruing in 1974/75, printing costs and part of the distribution costs in 1975/76, and the remainder of the distribution costs and the compilation costs being paid in 1976/77.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. G. COUSINEAU

Question No. 5,746—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Was Mr. G. Cousineau removed as Chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission of Canada and, if so, for what reason?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No. Mr. Cousineau resigned his appointment as Chairman of the Unemployment Insurance Commission to accept appointment as Special Adviser to the President of the Treasury Board. His appointment in the latter capacity was preparatory to his appointment on June 8, 1976 as President of Loto Canada, Inc., a Company which will report to the President of the Treasury Board.

Order Paper Questions

SALARY AND EXPENSES RECEIVED BY PRESIDENT OF CANADIAN TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Question No. 5,749—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is the total amount of salary received by the Chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission since the date of his appointment and what was that date?

2. What is the total amount of expenses of any kind whatsoever incurred by the Chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission since the date of his appointment and what general groupings make up this total?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission reports as follows: 1. Assuming the reference to be to the President of the Canadian Transport Commission (there is no office of Chairman of the C.T.C.), the present President was appointed September 1, 1972, and since the appointment has been paid at the rate of DM-3 (presently $54,000 to $66,000).

	Fiscal Year					
	1972/73	1973/74	1974/75	1975/76	1976/77	Total per Expense
Travel						
inside Canada	160.89	2,110.12	2,296.15	1,046.80	559.84	6,173.80
outside Canada	1,262.84	3,360.87	756.15	1,805.90	—	7,185.76
Hospitality Expenses	—	—	670.72	216.50	125.05	1,012.27
Relocation Expenses	1,800.00	—	—	—	—	1,800.00
Total per year	3,223.73	5,470.99	3,723.02	3,069.20	684.89	16,171.83

UIC—BENEFIT CONTROL OFFICERS

Question No. 5,800—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What was the total number of benefit control officers employed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and, by province, what was the breakdown (a) for 1972 (b) for 1973 (c) for 1974 (d) for 1975 (e) as of the date the answer to this question is prepared?

2. For the same years, what was the total number of benefit control officers employed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission in (a) Halifax (b) Montreal (c) Quebec City (d) Ottawa (e) Metropolitan Toronto (f) Kingston (g) Winnipeg (h) Regina (i) Calgary (j) Edmonton (k) Vancouver (l) Victoria?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1.

	(a) 1972	(b) 1973	(c) 1974	(d) 1975	(e) 1976
Newfoundland	5	8	9	13	15
Prince Edward Island	1	2	2	2	3
Nova Scotia	7	9	12	12	17
New Brunswick	8	14	14	12	14
Quebec	110	120	120	133	133
Ontario	131	116	143	149	156
Manitoba	9	16	16	13	14
Saskatchewan	4	14	14	10	9
Alberta	9	29	29	23	23
British Columbia	24	39	41	41	41
2. (a) Halifax	4	4	5	6	8
(b) Montreal	39	41	41	50	54
(c) Quebec City	19	20	20	20	22
(d) Ottawa	7	7	8	9	9
(e) Metro Toronto	54	41	55	58	70
(f) Kingston	3	4	4	3	3
(g) Winnipeg	9	16	13	10	11
(h) Regina	3	7	7	5	4
(i) Calgary	5	14	14	11	10
(j) Edmonton	4	15	15	10	10
(k) Vancouver	13	10	8	8	8
(l) Victoria	3	5	5	6	6

SKI AREA AT SUNSHINE VILLAGE, BANFF NATIONAL PARK, ALBERTA

Question No. 5,803—**Mr. Huntington:**

1. What are the full terms of the lease arrangements between Warnock Hersey International Limited or any subsidiary thereof and Parks Canada or the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in relation to the ski area at Sunshine Village, Alberta?

2. What was the total cost of the four volume consultants' report entitled *Sunshine Village* prepared by Acres Consulting Services Ltd.?

3. What percentage and total cost was paid by (a) Parks Canada (b) the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (c) any other government department (d) Warnock Hersey International (e) any subsidiary of Warnock Hersey International?

4. What are the names of the constituent members of the consulting consortium of Acres Consulting Services Ltd.?

5. What is the total cost of any other studies including environmental and feasibility studies done other than the four volume *Sunshine Village* consultants' report and what government department paid for them?

6. Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Parks Canada or any other government department pay all or any of the cost of the preparation or printing of the booklet entitled *Long Range Proposals, Sunshine Village, Banff National Park* and, if so (a) what percentage of the cost was paid (b) what was the final value paid (c) by what department or agency?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Release of this information would violate the established principle of confidentiality in the normal lessor—lessee relationship existing between the Department and Sun-

shine Village Limited, a subsidiary of Warnock Hersey International Limited.

2. Total cost of Sunshine Village report prepared by Acres Consulting Services Ltd., $50,250.

3. The costs were divided at 50 per cent ($25,125) each between Parks Canada (Department of Indian and Northern Affairs) and Warnock Hersey International Limited, North American Recreation Industries Division.

4. Constituent members of Acres Consulting Services Ltd. Consortium: Acres Consulting Services Ltd.: R. Heychak, S. Toewes, W. MacNeil; A. Raine. Robert McLellan and Associates: R. McLellan, F.F. Slaney and Company Limited, D. Poole, L. Bayrock, D. Baker. Mel Borgersen and Associates: M. Borgersen, E. Borgersen, R. Morse. Don MacLaurin and Associates: D. MacLaurin.

5. No other consultant studies were done. Some environmental, avalanche and traffic studies were conducted by staff of Parks Canada.

6. (a) 50 per cent (b) Information not yet available as costs are ongoing. (c) Parks Canada, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

UIC—OWN PAYMENTS

Question No. 5,811—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What was the number of overpayments in unemployment insurance in (a) 1972 (b) 1973 (c) 1974 (d) 1975 (e) 1976 to date?

2. What was the amount of overpayment in each case?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. (a) 1972, 160,322; (b) 1973, 263,142; (c) 1974, 283,163; (d) 1975, 327,868; (e) To May, 1976, 176,600.

2. (a) 1972, $20.1 million; (b) 1973, $35.4 million; (c) 1974, $39.6 million; (d) 1975, $48.2 million; (e) To May, 1976, $26.5 million.

OFFICE SPACE—BESSBOROUGH HOTEL

Question No. 5,820—**Mr. Benjamin:**

1. Did the government advertise for the space for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in Saskatoon and, if so, in what newspaper did the advertisement appear and on what dates?

2. Did the Bessborough Hotel meet all the specifications required in the advertisement?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes. The Department of Public Works placed and advertisement for space in Saskatoon for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the *Saskatoon Star Phoenix* on January 18, 1974.

2. Yes, the Bessborough Hotel met all the specifications required in the advertisement.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

● (1510)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 5,189, 5,299, and starred question No. 5,386 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

GOVERNMENT OFFICE SPACE RENTALS

Question No. 5,189—**Mr. Coates:**

1. (a) What are the names of the firms that have rented office space to the government in either Ottawa or Hull or the National Capital Region (b) in each case, what is the amount of space rented (c) what is the dollar value of each contract or lease and what is the term, in years, of each?

2. Of the rental agreements or leases presently in existence, how many have an escalation clause associated with inflation and, in each such case, what is the length of the lease?

Return tabled.

APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS

Question No. 5,299—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. In how many provinces and territories were Electoral Boundaries Commissions appointed for 1975-76?

2. (a) How many served on each commission (b) what are their (i) names (ii) addresses by province and territory?

3. What were the financial arrangements for each commission member, i.e., salary, expenses and for how long?

4. By province and territory, how many hearings were held and, in each case, how many separate representations were made?

5. What was the total cost for (a) Canada (b) each province and territory (c) each hearing, by province and territory?

6. By province and territory, what is the projected cost for meetings of commissioners following debate on redistribution in the House of Commons?

Return tabled.

MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL—APPLICATIONS

Question No. 5,386—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. What was the total amount of money requested by those applicants to the Medical Research Council whose projects were given a rating of 6 or above by the review committees at the last March competition and what was the total sum granted to these applicants?

2. In each case where an amount over $4,000 was involved in the initial request (a) who were the applicants by name and address (b) what was the amount of money requested (c) granted?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the parliamentary secretary had the intention, after the corrected answer to question 5,410, to answer also question 5,462?

Mr. Blais: No, Mr. Speaker.

Order Paper Questions

STARRED QUESTIONS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Would you be so kind as to call starred questions Nos. 5,461 and 5,463?

[*Text*]

*UNIFORMS PROVIDED INSIDE POSTAL WORKERS

Question No. 5,461—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Were inside postal workers provided recently with uniforms and, if so (a) at what cost (b) for what reason?

2. How often are such uniforms issued?

3. Since the policy was initiated, have any complaints been received from (a) the public (b) postal employees and, if so, in each case, how many?

4. Is the wearing of the uniforms compulsory and, if so, how many employees have refused to wear them?

[*English*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. (a) $1.040 million (b) New uniforms were provided to ensure that counter sales staff are dressed as smartly as possible to project a favourable public image.

2. The uniforms are issued on differing criteria. Full-time employees were supplied with a full-time issue as outlined below, and then on the basis of one-half of the full-time issue every year commencing in 1978. "Each employee serving the counter more than 25 hours per week is entitled to the following issue: 1—male or female counter jacket, blue 1—male or female counter jacket, maroon 6—blouses (female) or shirts (male), white, long or short sleeve 4—scarves (female) or ties (male) 1—identification tag. Part-time counter employees are supplied with an issue every two years of the part-time accessories and jackets as outlined below: "Each employee serving the counter more than 10 hours per week is entitled to the following: 1—female or male counter jacket, blue 3—shirts or blouses (long or short sleeve) 2—either scarves or ties 1—identification tag.

3. (a) 15, (b) 5.

4. The uniform is to be worn while on duty, except where heat and humidity make wearing the jacket uncomfortable for an individual employee. Under these circumstances the requirement for the wearing of the jacket may be waived.

[*Text*]

*CGSB ROLE OPERATIONS

Question No. 5,463—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. How many copies of the book entitled: "Canadian Government Specifications Board—Role and Operations" were printed by the Department of Supply and Services in March 1976?

2. Were approximately 125 boxes of the book placed on the street on April 30, 1976, behind the Royal Trust Building in Ottawa for garbage disposal and (a) if so, was it done after dark and for what reason (b) if not, on what date and at what time were they placed on the street?

3. What is the identity and job designations of (a) those who placed the material on the street (b) the highest ranking person giving the instructions to place the material on the street?

4. Were the books picked up and disposed of by the garbage collectors some time before 4.30 a.m.?

5. What are the reasons that this newly printed material was destroyed?

[Mr. Blais.]

6. (a) What is the name and address of the printer of the material (b) what was the total cost of printing?

7. Is the booklet being reprinted and, if so (a) on what date (b) by whom (c) at what cost?

8. Were all copies originally printed disposed of in Ottawa on April 30, 1976 and, if not, where are the remaining copies?

[*English*]

Mr. Walter Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): 1. 13,820.

2. No. (a) No; (b) On April 26, 90 boxes were placed on the street between 2 and 3 p.m. to make room for the corrected version which arrived that day. (Approximately 40 boxes had been disposed of earlier). The Metcalfe Realty have a contract with Tricil Waste Management Ltd. for pickup and disposal of waste. This service is included in tenant lease arrangements.

3. (a) and (b) The two staff members involved were from the Central Registry Office and are designated as CR2 and CR4.

4. Normal pickup arrangements were followed. Precise time of garbage pickup not known but pickup arrangements by Tricil call for pickup between 6 a.m. and 6:45 a.m.

5. Misprints on cover and title page.

6. (a) Tri-graphic Printing Ltd., 465 Industrial Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario; (b) $9,340.

7. Yes; (a) Completed and delivered on April 26; (b) Tri-graphic Printing Limited; (c) $5,570.

8. All but 10 or 12 copies were disposed of on or before April 26. Those known to be holding copies have been asked to destroy them.

[*English*]

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

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, my point of order goes back to a question placed on the order paper on October 14 of last year, No. 3,140. In this question I asked four things: I asked for the amount of legal business given a lawyer named N. Dwayne Dixon, of Smith Falls, within a year of his being appointed president of the Leeds Liberal Association. It also asked for a breakdown of his business. On December 5 the question was answered, in part, that he received within one year $15,585 worth of business. Then it said the following:

Information will be communicated at a later date to the hon. member in regard to what this business was.

That was seven or eight months ago. The information has not been communicated to me. Accordingly, on May 4 I put two further questions on the order paper, Nos. 5,425 and 5,427, asking why this information was not forthcoming and also asking if it was government policy to award lucrative government business to those who had served the Liberal party as presidents of ridings.

None of these questions has been answered although I have been promised this list for seven months. I think it is legitimate to raise the question, as parliament is about to adjourn for the summer, as to where this list is, why the government is not willing to make it available, and why this man got $15,000 worth of business shortly after he became president of the Leeds Liberal Association.

I think this is a legitimate question and either the parliamentary secretary or the President of the Privy Council should be willing at this time to rise in the House and explain the reason this information is not being given, so that the matter will not stand in abeyance until the fall and be put off and put off like everything else this government does when it does not want to tell the people the truth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Leeds was just recognized. He had the floor and completed developing his point of order. Then he sat down. Surely nothing could have happened in the interval that would give rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. Cossitt: Yes, Mr. Speaker, something did happen in the interval. The hon. member for St. Boniface asked me, across the floor of the House, how much money I received as president of the Leeds Liberal Association. I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): No way.

Mr. Cossitt: I also ask him—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Are you prepared to say how much you got?

Mr. Cossitt: I am prepared to say I never received one cent. I resent the implication, and I demand—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. No unparliamentary language was used or alleged to have been used in the exchange that has taken place. Besides that, the hon. member accepted the occasion to take the floor and put on the record whatever statement he wanted to make in response to the question.

Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the third time and do pass, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Condon.

Capital Punishment

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, the debate on Bill C-84, the famous and notorious bill to abolish capital punishment, seems to be nearing a close. I spoke on this subject and on this bill early in the debate on second reading, and at that time I presented what I thought were reasonable and logical arguments for retaining capital punishment and for sincerely opposing Bill C-84. Since that time many pages of *Hansard* have been filled by those who have participated in the debate, some pros and some cons. A large majority of my constitutents have made it quite clear to me by petitions, by letters, by telegrams and by personal calls and contacts that they support capital punishment for all premeditated murders. I sincerely believe the great majority of Canadians all across the country think the same way, and that opinion should be reflected in this House. There has been no hue and cry from Canadians to introduce a bill to abolish capital punishment, let alone Bill C-84. On the contrary, there is an open and very clear demand on the part of the vast majority of Canadians to enforce capital punishment not only for the slaying of policemen and prison guards but also for all premeditated murders.

● (1520)

There is no question in my mind that all the avowed statements and pleas about there being a free vote on this subject are a lot of hogwash. There has not been a free vote. It would be naive for any person to say that all members of parliament exercised a free vote without fear or the threat of being affected regarding their desire for promotion within the political party system. I have no hestitation in pointing out quite clearly that I have a free vote, and I am proud to vote freely on all matters. There is only one influence which affects my votes and decisions, and that is the collective majority of opinions and views of Canadians generally, in particular the collective majority of opinions and views of the citizens of the federal constituency of Moncton.

Quite frankly, if I, as a member of parliament, were to support Bill C-84 to abolish capital punishment, it seems to me that I would be sorely irresponsible and would be responsible for the slaying of future police officers, prison guards and citizens generally, because by supporting this bill I would be an accomplice before the fact.

Let us think about this very seriously. Those who support this bill are vested with a serious power of judgment and should vote uprightly and impartially without any personal consideration or consideration for the political party system. They must divest themselves of prejudice and preconception they might have because of the party system. They must not be motivated by stubborn pride of opinion, nor should they be too facile in yielding to the views and arguments of their fellow members of parliament.

I suggest that responsible members of parliament in a democratic system based upon democratic principles should be prepared to adhere to public opinion. Members of parliament are supposed to be responsible. We are supposed to be representatives of the people, not necessarily of a party. People should be first. As members of parliament we are representatives of and responsible to the people, and we should be a government and a parliament of the people, for the people and by the people.

Canadians are urging those who supported the bill on second reading to reconsider their position. They are asking members of parliament who supported it on second reading to oppose it now. Believe me, public opinion is important and must be taken into consideration. When public opinion on this bill is so clear and of such significance, it is no time for concern for personal promotion within party ranks or for considering personal opportunities. It is contemptuous not to adhere to public opinion in a situation of this kind.

Now is the time to vote to kill this bill, and for the government to bring forward a bill for the complete reinstatement of capital punishment for premedicated murder and to show a proper sense of direction, responsibility and stability, for a change. It occurs to me that probably the only way to obtain a free vote would be for the hon. member for Moncton, yours truly, to present a bill for the reinstatement of capital punishment at the next session. Then, just maybe, we might have a free vote because I am the one member of parliament in the House today who, by virtue of the exercise of freedom of choice, would have a non-partisan vote.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker,—

An hon. Member: You are slow on your feet.

Mr. Caccia: A new speech, please.

Mr. Stevens: In speaking at third reading on this bill I would first like to say, in reply to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), that I would be very interested to hear him make a speech trying to justify his position on the vote at second reading.

Mr. Caccia: I did.

Mr. Stevens: The fact is that the hon. member is a very ambitious member in the Liberal caucus and he knows only too well that he must toe the party line with respect to this bill, rather than show any free will or free conscience.

Mr. Dinsdale: All we hear is his master's voice.

Mr. Stevens: I referred to the hon. member for Davenport, but I could refer to several hon. members from metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) knows well enough how we on this side of the House have voted, as well as hon. members on his side of the House. By imputing to us motives as to how we voted, he is really not doing justice to the spirit with which we have approached this debate, namely, to try to find the answer we think is best for the country. I think he should at least withdraw the comment he just made as to the motives which inspired the intervention I made at second reading and the way I voted. I do not think that this is within the spirit and the direction of the rules which govern debates in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Jones.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) that he is skating on thin ice again. I think he should withdraw that last remark.

Mr. Stevens: If I may ask, Mr. Speaker, what last remark?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member did impute motives. He implied that there was pressure applied to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia).

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that just prior to our lunch break this question came up with regard to another hon. member who suggested that there was pressure brought to bear on hon. members opposite with respect to their votes, and Mr. Speaker at that time held quite clearly that that was just a question of debate and that this is a debating chamber. That is what parliament means.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: It is only natural that hon. members, especially in a so-called free vote, might apply pressure upon one another in order to try to influence them to their way of thinking. My comment was simply provoked by the hon. member for Davenport who made a comment when I rose to speak. I am simply challenging him. If he wishes to speak and try to persuade hon. members as to why they should vote for abolition at third reading of this bill, as opposed to what I suggest, which is retention, he should do so.

Mr. Caccia: I must repeat the same question of privilege, because earlier the hon. member for York-Simcoe imputed to me motives and ambition as guiding elements and factors in my making a speech at second reading and my manner of voting. Therefore, he has imputed motives with regard to my pattern of voting. I again ask Your Honour to ask the hon. member to withdraw his comments.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I suppose every day in this House motives are imputed to hon. members. One of those motives may be to curry favour with authority. There could be a motive, from time to time, to curry favour with the Chair. There could be a motive, from time to time, to vote in accordance with one's conscience, or it might be a motive to vote in accordance with the wishes of one's constituents. There may be a motive to speak and act in order to get out of this place early, or to stay late, depending upon one's point of view. This House operates, and hon. members make up their minds with respect to motives, and the imputing of motives is certainly not contrary to the rules. It is contrary to Standing Order 35 for any member to reflect upon any vote of the House; not upon individual members in the House but upon votes of the House of Commons.

● (1530)

I am repeating something I said before the luncheon break to the hon. gentleman who then occupied the chair and who ruled, as the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr.

Stevens) indicated, that this is a debating House and that we can reflect, subject to the use of abusive language, upon the motives or anything else of the debating member although we cannot, as the rules say, reflect upon any vote of the House of Commons, which is a quite different thing.

I have listened to what has been said and I would not enter into this discussion if I thought anything improper had been imputed to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia). I would not get into this question except, perhaps, to go to the defence of the hon. member for Davenport. Nothing has been said about the vote of the House of Commons, however, but only what may, correctly or incorrectly, have moved the hon. member for Davenport. I respectfully suggest that the hon. member ought not to be so sensitive, but should get on with the business before this House so that he will have an opportunity, for whatever motive he might have, to cast whatever vote he wants with respect to this particular bill.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, the principle that is being advanced by the House leader of the official opposition has not been ruled upon by the Chair. The proposition of the opposition House leader ought not to be left unchallenged, although at this time I do not think the matter should be decided by the Chair because it is not before you, Mr. Speaker.

The point is that Standing Order 35 applies only to reflections upon the vote of the whole House. That, to my mind, is not the proper interpretation of that particular Standing Order. It is improper to reflect upon the vote of the House or upon any member within this House. To impute motives on the way an individual member casts his vote, or what those motives may have been, is not acceptable.

I fully agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) was treading a very thin line when he indicated that the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) was toeing the party line on this particular issue. I say that on two bases. If there is one independent member in this House, it is the hon. member for Davenport. Mr. Speaker, if the comment was made about the intervention of the hon. member for Davenport that he may have been espousing certain arguments in his remarks that were espoused by the leader of his party and espoused and advocated by me, that may have been the interpretation of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens).

Having said that, I am sure the hon. member for York-Simcoe would not impute motives to the hon. member for Davenport on the way he cast his vote at any stage of the debate on Bill C-84.

Mr. Elzinga: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on this point of order. If I interpret correctly what the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) said, it was that he had no ambition. If he has no ambition, I think it is only fair that he make his constituents aware of that. I am sure they would like to know what kind of member represents them in this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I believe we are getting into discussion and debate. I suggest we return to Bill C-84.

Capital Punishment

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, to continue with my remarks on Bill C-84, I should like to touch on ten separate points which I feel are relevant before we come to the end of this important debate. One of my colleagues to the left suggested, "Keep politics out of the House of Commons". Mr. Speaker, certainly I am the last to introduce politics as far as debate is concerned on a matter as important as this question of retaining or not retaining the death penalty.

I wish to put a very basic question to hon. members. Is the retention of the death penalty in fact a deterrent? I believe most members would say it is a deterrent, as far as they personally are concerned, if there were any question of their committing a crime that might result in the loss of somebody's life or a crime that would be punishable by death. Certainly it would be a deterrent to me, and I believe most other members would say it would be a deterrent to them. The simple premise is that, if convicted, they might lose their own life. Surely in that case few could argue there is no deterrent.

There is considerable evidence, based on the statistics supplied by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), gathered over the last 16 to 18 years, which would indicate that the death penalty may be a deterrent. I say that bearing in mind that for the six-year period ended in 1962 we found that the murder rate in Canada was approximately one per 100,000 people and it has gone up steadily since. Is it simply a coincidence that since 1962 the death penalty has not been imposed? Is it just coincidence that by 1974 the rate was 2.4 per 100,000? I think that says that perhaps the death penalty was a deterrent, and I think we have to face third reading of this bill with the assumption that in all likelihood the death penalty is a deterrent.

When we reach our decision on how to vote tomorrow, we should recognize to a greater extent than we have to date that public opinion in Canada favours the death penalty. Many estimates have been made on the degree of acceptance. I would say that in my area 75 per cent, or maybe 85 per cent, of the people would answer "Yes" if asked the simple question: Do you think the death penalty should be retained for at least some crimes? I hear my socialist friends to the left saying, "No." If they are so sure my figures are incorrect, then let us have a plebiscite. Let us find out in an accurate way, preferably at the next general election, whether Canadians feel the death penalty should be retained or not.

I find it interesting that the more you see this Liberal-Socialist alliance, the more you see the Solicitor General proposing a bill in effect seconded by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) as this one is, the more you can sense that there is nobody in this country so intolerant of public will—if public will happens to be against their views—than the Liberal-Socialists we have in this House. That is the simplest interpretation one can make of the fact that the government, aided and abetted by its Socialist friends to my left, has, by bringing forward this legislation, ignored the public will. If they do not believe that between 75 per cent and 85 per cent of Canadians favour retention of the death penalty, why can we not find out? Let us consult the public. Is there anything wrong with consulting the people, in a democracy, to learn if they think we should pass legislation abolishing the death penalty?

● (1540)

My third point is this. How does Canada stand in comparison with the rest of the world on this question? If we become an abolitionist nation, will we be in step with the rest of the world, or will we make ourselves a veritable island among nations which have retained the death penalty? There can be little doubt about the facts. United Nations' figures show that the world trend is increasingly to retention. More and more states are retaining the death penalty. It is clear, if one examines what is happening in the United States, that the trend in that country is to reimpose the death penalty. It is not in favour of more and more abolition.

When the United States Congress in 1974 passed anti-hijacking legislation dealing with air piracy, it specifically provided for the death penalty for air piracy. Yet we in this country, by passing Bill C-84, will do exactly the opposite of what has been done in the United States. Also, Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress is not alone in reinstituting the death penalty. Earlier in this debate I said that the United States supreme court had made it clear that the death penalty may be introduced in the states of the union and that it is not against the United States constitution. We began debating this question in the twenty-ninth parliament when this country began moving in the abolitionist direction. It is interesting to note that since 1972 no less than 35 states of the United States have introduced legislation which would make the death penalty mandatory or an alternative option, for many crimes, to life imprisonment.

Let me put on record which states south of the border have reintroduced the death penalty, together with the date of passage of the legislation. I wish to make it clear that the states I am about to list reintroduced the death penalty for one or more crimes. Mr. Speaker, Alabama passed such legislation on September 9, 1975, when it became a retentionist state. Maryland passed such legislation on July 1, 1975; Missouri, on June 23, 1975; Virginia, on October 1, 1975; Washington passed such legislation last year; Arizona passed it on August 8, 1973; Arkansas, on July 24, 1973; California, on January 1, 1974; Colorado held a referendum on November 5, 1974 and passed legislation on January 1, 1975; Connecticut passed it on October 1, 1973.

I emphasize that the dates mentioned are those on which legislation reimposing the death penalty was passed or became effective. Delaware passed the law on March 29, 1974; Florida, on December 8, 1972; Georgia, on March 28, 1973; Idaho, on March 27, 1973; Illinois, on July 1, 1974; Indiana, on April 24, 1973; Kentucky, on January 1, 1975; Louisiana, on July 2, 1973; Mississippi, on April 23, 1974; Montana, on January 1, 1974—and amendments were subsequently passed, effective later in 1974. Nebraska passed its law on April 20, 1973; Nevada, on July 1, 1973; New Hampshire, on April 15, 1974; New Mexico, on March 20, 1973; New York, on September 1, 1974; North Carolina, on April 8, 1974; Ohio, on December 22, 1972; Oklahoma, on May 17, 1973; Pennsylvania, on March 26, 1974; Rhode Island, on June 26, 1973; South Carolina, on July 2, 1974; Tennessee, on February 27, 1974; Texas, on June 14, 1973; Utah, on July 1, 1973; and Wyoming, on February 24, 1973.

[Mr. Stevens.]

In short, since 1972 no fewer than 35 states of the United States of America have brought back the death penalty. The United States Congress in 1974 brought back the death penalty for air piracy. Therefore, who is out of step with whom? Can we be absolutely assured that by abolishing the death penalty tomorrow, if hon. members so choose, and making this an abolitionist state, we shall move in the right direction? Will we not be out of step with the rest of the world by joining the mere one per cent of the population of the world which is abolitionist in the sense in which we shall be abolitionists if this bill carries tomorrow?

Let me now touch on the question of the misrepresentation that there is a free vote on this bill. It should be drawn to the public's attention that of the 133 members who supported the bill on second reading, 27 were cabinet ministers who voted en bloc. Clearly, since more than 10 per cent of the members of this House voted en bloc, according to a previous understanding, the vote was not entirely free. If you were to ignore the vote of the cabinet, the members of which voted en bloc, the net result of a truly free vote would have been that retentionists would have cast 125 votes, as against 106 abolitionist votes. In short, I believe the government intends to make this an abolitionist state; otherwise it would have allowed a truly free vote.

I suggest that the proper procedure would have been to allow a private member to introduce the bill and then to allow each member to vote on it according to his or her conscience. There should have been no suggestion of government involvement. I remind hon. members of that moment in this House, when he voted on June 29, when the question arose as to what extent the rules should be warped in order to allow us to finalize the vote. Hon. members will remember that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) rose and indicated to all members on his side of the House that they should vote in accordance with his wish. Was the vote free?

Mr. Allmand: That was a procedural matter.

Mr. Stevens: The Solicitor General says it was a procedural matter. But it was a procedural matter touching on what was supposed to be a free vote in this House.

I next touch on the suggestion raised by abolitionists that in place of the death penalty the sentence for murder should be true "life" imprisonment. I challenge that. I do not think there is such a thing as life imprisonment as that term is generally interpreted. Certainly, we shall not impose the kind of life imprisonment whereby we can say to a prisoner that he will never regain his freedom, never be released on parole and never see his sentence lessened.

We must be honest with the Canadian public. In place of the death penalty we say that we shall impose life imprisonment for 25 years, but the sentence can be reviewed after 15 years and there is a possibility for the prisoner to be absent from prison for various periods, with escort. That sort of sentence is to be the alternative to the death penalty. Tomorrow, when hon. members cast their vote, they should remember this. I want to make it clear to the Canadian public that we are not substituting life imprisonment, in the true sense of the word, for the death sentence. It is simply life imprisonment for 25 years, open for review

certainly after 15 years. In any event, from day one it is subject to the privilege of taking an absence from prison with an escort at any time for various periods of time. That is something I feel many are not cognizant of or are weighing properly.

● (1550)

Again I must take exception to the committee proceedings which took place with respect to this bill at second reading. Quite rightly, we were urged to allow the bill to go to committee so we could have intensive study, a review of the bill and proper discussion. I believe that most of my colleagues will support me when I say that in committee we were subjected to a majority of Liberal members who, by coincidence or otherwise, happened to be mainly abolitionists. They insisted, first, that we should have no witnesses before the committee and, second, that our time be limited as far as study of the bill was concerned. On this type of issue I do not think that is fair to the Canadian public.

I ask hon. members to record the number of people who have written to them requesting that they be heard before the committee, or to say how disappointed they were that they were unable to come before a committee of this House to give their evidence concerning this important matter. I have received letters. I can only assume that many other members have received letters from people who have taken exception to the fact they were not given an opportunity to appear before the committee which presumably was to look in depth at the desirability of passing the bill in the form that was submitted.

The seventh point I wish to touch on, very quickly, is with regard to air piracy. Even if you are an abolitionist, surely the fact that every nation surrounding us has air piracy laws providing for the death penalty in case of death ensuing as a result of air piracy requires us to keep the death penalty for piracy. Until other nations on this continent and nations such as Japan, Russia and Ireland, for example, do away with the death penalty, it would be unwise for us to do away with the death penalty with respect to air piracy, at least. Why should we make Canada one of the most hospitable countries for an air pirate when other nations have the death penalty for such a terrible crime? I hope those who vote on third reading will give consideration to that point.

If you like, be an idealist and say that in concept we should be an abolitionist nation. However, we must be practical and realize that many countries of the world are not at that stage. Until we get to that stage, let us not jeopardize Canada needlessly and act irresponsibly by saying we should do away with the death penalty, come what may; that we are not worried about air piracy or any other terrible crimes being committed. That is irresponsible. I hope members who feel otherwise will reassess their position.

The eighth point I wish to touch on is what I feel is a type of distortion by abolitionists. I refer to the argument as to the method of execution. In a sense, the abolitionists like to use the hangman's noose as their symbol. That is not the important question. The important question is whether there should be the death penalty. Once that is decided upon, the method of execution is a very secondary thing. I feel that whatever is the most humane method of execution is the one that should be followed. My colleague, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), suggested that this could be left to the cabinet: they could decide by regulation the method of execution.

I supported that proposed amendment because I believed it would be a humane way of handling it. It is handled by regulation under the National Defence Act. That is how executions are prescribed. It is not laid down that it must be by hanging, firing-squad or any other way. It simply states in the National Defence Act that by order in Council the cabinet can determine the method of execution in any particular case. Let that be clear. When we speak about the death penalty and its retention we are not necessarily saying that the hangman's noose should be retained; we are saying that, regardless of the method of execution, let us make sure that capital punishment remains a deterrent to crime the way it was in former years.

The ninth point I wish to touch on is one I really believe is related. I am pleased that the hon. member for York South (Mrs. Appolloni) is here. If this legislation passes tomorrow, a new drive will be commenced by those who have been abolitionists, and I do not fault their motives. For some odd reason there seems to be a relationship between the pro-abortionists and the abolitionists. There will be a new drive to make our abortion laws still easier. That will be a retrograde step for Canada. I hope the attitude that is moving some people to support this bill will be arrested short of new legislation to make abortion on demand virtually the rule in Canada. That would be most regrettable.

Mr. Stollery: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As a member of the House who happens to be an abolitionist, I resent the implication the hon. member is making, somehow linking my position as an abolitionist with the abortion movement, on either side of the question. The hon. member should retract that kind of comment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest the hon. member should now get back to the point of debate.

Mr. Stevens: My tenth and final point is this. For many of the reasons I have outlined, if Bill C-84 is given third reading tomorrow I can assure hon. members that the subject will not be ended in Canada. New legislation will be demanded by the Canadian public. They will demand the return of the death penalty. I would guess that within a decade the death penalty will be restored in Canada because of public demand.

I intend to make sure, in my area, that in the coming election, whenever it is called, the cards are laid squarely on the table to show who stood for what in so far as the retention of capital punishment is concerned. Basically, on this side of the House this has been a free vote. It is to the credit of the official opposition that it has been free. It is to the discredit of the government that they have faked their free vote. That is why I am so confident that if we go to the Canadian public and spell out the truth concerning this important issue, they will respond with their votes to ensure the death penalty is reinstated in this country, come what may tomorrow.

Capital Punishment

● (1600)

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly very pleased with the summary which has just been provided by my hon. friend, the experienced member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) who in my view has completed a careful, point by point analysis of the issue before us. Frankly, I do not expect to persuade anybody to my point of view, and bearing this in mind I intend to be brief. Nevertheless, at third reading there are certain areas of concern I should like to put on record. Not too long ago I received a letter from a professor of human behaviour at the University of Notre Dame in Nelson, British Columbia—Professor W. A. Forsyth. I took the liberty of marking some of the points he made. He followed a line of reasoning which I felt to be original and genuine. Among other things, on this issue of capital punishment he said:

> The state has a responsibility to indicate its degree of disapproval by assessing and carrying out a just punishment.
>
> That certainly applies to any criminal action.
>
> The arguments for abolition of the death penalty seem to be based on the question whether the state has more right in applying equal justice for all than the individual has to make his own decision to kill anyone he chooses for whatever reason . . . If the murderer finds less disapproval of his act of murder than he finds of the imposition of the death penalty, then he knows that, officially, it is not that bad. This is where the lack of a deterrent is centred.

Mr. Forsyth went on to say:

> Some members of parliament focus their attitude upon the taking of life by the murderer rathern than upon the legal act of justice.
>
> If we are afraid an innocent person will be executed, let us improve our judicial system. But let us not protect those proven guilty. The death penalty is final, but not a bit more final than was the unjustified act of murdering an innocent victim . . . Let us make it clear that we disapprove more of the taking of another's life by the individual acting on his own judgment and desires than we do of the death penalty as just punishment for the murderer.

In my opinion, the professor has made an excellent point. He is certainly skilled on the subject of human behaviour.

I should like to move on to quote from a document provided by Statistics Canada two relevant passages from "Homicide in Canada" which appear at pages 162 and 163. The report states, in summary:

> In all, there have been 29 persons in Canada between 1961 and 1974 who after being charged with murder and receiving a court decision on their cases were again involved as suspects in a homicide incident. In 12 of these cases the person is legally definable as a repeater of the offence of homicide. Of this group, five were convicted murderers who killed again, three while in prison and two while at large following an escape. There were seven men initially convicted of manslaughter who were convicted for another homicide after this first conviction. Four of them received life sentences for the second homicide offence. Of this group, two were on parole, one was an escapee and one killed again while in prison. Another seven persons who were initially convicted of manslaughter or another lesser offence were charged with murder in a new homicide incident. Six of these men were not convicted of any offence for a second incident.

The report goes on to say, on page 163, that there is another type of repeater murderer. We read:

> This consists of persons who murder more than once in separate incidents before being apprehended and charged. With these persons, the police and courts did not intervene until after two or more murders are committed by the suspect.

I suggest that the words in that sentence are poorly chosen.

[Mr. Stevens.]

> In any event, between 1961 and 1974 there were 31 suspects who killed more than once on separate occasions before being apprehended. Between 1961 and 1974 there were 31 suspects who were involved in more than one murder incident for which they were charged with murder. These were charged with murder for as few as two and as many as seven incidents.

There is one set of figures simply not available to us in this context. These are the statistics with reference to those who have murdered and murdered again, and will murder yet again until they are apprehended. We do not know how many of these people are presently on the loose, whether they be insane, whether they deal in contract murder or whether they are in yet another category.

There is one further comment I should like to make. I can only say I am sorry, in making this reference, that the members to whom I wish to refer are not present in the chamber this afternoon. But I find it more than passing strange that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) should have done a complete flip-flop on the second, third, fourth and fifth votes in connection with the amendments we dealt with the other day. I also find it passing strange that the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. Pearsall)—

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This matter was raised earlier today. The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) is reflecting on votes which were cast by hon. members, and that is contrary to Standing Order 35. I am sure he would not want to argue that he is entitled to reflect on the way in which other hon. members voted at any time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Perhaps I should quote the Standing Order. It reads, in part:

> No member may reflect upon any vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

I suggest that the hon. member refrain from mentioning the voting.

Mr. Brisco: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I only wish I was in a position at this time to move that the votes of those members be rescinded. However, since the hon. member across the way has risen on this point of order—and it is a valid point of order—I shall not go on to mention other members from British Columbia about whose voting record I am rather concerned when this matter was before the House and the committee. But I should like to reinforce the comments made by the hon. member for York-Simcoe. There is a very grave concern among Canadians that a gaggle of cabinet ministers has clearly demonstrated to all Canadians, certainly to the members on this side of the House, that we have not truly seen a free vote.

● (1610)

I should like to conclude by saying that throughout the lengthy debate on C-84 I have had an opportunity to read the speeches of various members of the House, and I have found there are three classes of members who speak or vote according to their particular persuasion on this vital issue. We have those who for very genuine and real reasons support the retention of capital punishment. We have those who for very genuine and real reasons support the abolition of capital punishment. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have those who for reasons best known to themselves have

waffled on the issue. They have not demonstrated to the people in their ridings that they have a firm and true conviction regarding where they stand on this issue. Indeed, the record shows that there are those who stand squarely in the middle of the fence, and I only hope that the fence is a picket fence.

I was particularly impressed by the contribution to this debate of the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga). In the brief period that this member has been in the House of Commons much of what he has said has made not only good sense but good reading. The hon. member happens to be a retentionist, and although I am quite prepared to speak favourably on behalf of any member who may support the other point of view, I just wish to go on record as saying that I have been particularly impressed with his contribution.

I should also like to single out for special mention the contribution made by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), and also the very singular and dedicated manner in which the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) has conducted the fight for those who, like myself, firmly believe in the retention of capital punishment.

I recognize that members on both sides are most anxious to see this debate come to a conclusion. Frankly, I do not believe that anything I have said, or for that matter anything many other members have said on this side, is going to change the thinking of any other member of the House; indeed I would be surprised if it did. But at least, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada know where I stand; the people of Canada know where we all stand.

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, prior to getting into my comments I should like to pay special tribute to the member who has just concluded his remarks on third reading of this very important piece of legislation, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco). In regard to this issue and in regard to the majority of issues on which he has shared his views with the House, he has always given an extremely fair analysis. I am sure the constituents of Kootenay West are truly proud of him and happy to have him represent them in this chamber.

Since I spoke on this issue when it was before the House on second reading, my remarks will be extremely brief. I should like to go back to what I said on second reading when I questioned the about-face of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I asked the minister whether he would be kind enough to explain to this House and to his constituents what prompted him suddenly to support abolition when at every other time he had supported retention in this chamber. To this date, Mr. Speaker, he has not shared that information with us, and that is his right. But I think we also have an obligation to share our views and concerns with the country as a whole.

I believe that if this piece of legislation is passed tomorrow in this chamber, it will truly be a sad day for Canada. I say that because in essence what it will mean is that the government has demonstrated there is no such thing in Canada as participatory democracy. I think surveys have indicated that close to 75 percent to 80 per cent of the Canadian people are in favour of capital punishment. I ask the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) what makes him feel that his conscience is so much wiser than the collective conscience of his constituents. It will indeed be a sad day for participatory democracy in this country; it will take us back into the dark ages when we almost lived under a dictatorship.

Those members who support the abolitionist stance say the reason they do so is that the country will be totally abolitionist. If this bill passes, Mr. Speaker, Canada will still not have total abolition. I had hoped to be recognized today during the question period to ask the defence minister whether he could give the House any indication of what the government's plans are regarding the introduction of amendments to the National Defence Act. As I understand it, this act presently provides capital punishment for 36 offences, some of them as strange as an individual getting drunk on watch. We will not have total abolition, since these provisions are still contained in the National Defence Act. I would appreciate very much some indication from the government side of the House as to what the government's plans are in this area, whether changes are planned or whether we are going to have a certain segment of our society that has a special responsibility to Canada, in a sense discriminated against; a situation where for the ordinary citizen there will be total abolition, but for military personnel there will not.

Let me conclude by emphasizing once again that if this bill passes tomorrow, it will be just one more sign that this government has no concern for the will and wishes of the people of Canada—and that will be a sad day for participatory democracy.

Hon. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, four times since I have been a member of this House the subject of the death penalty has been debated in this chamber. Until now, on each occasion I have, for one reason or another, not been able to participate in the debate, even though on the first occasion I was one of the movers of a tripartite resolution for abolition during my earliest days as a freshman member. Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to speak briefly and to state my position in what I hope sincerely will be the last and decisive debate on this subject in this parliament.

● (1620)

My concern about the death penalty extends back not only a decade but goes back about 30 years to the time when, as a teenager, I took time off high school to attend the first murder trial I have witnessed. It was a trial of a very poor, friendless man who was accused of a very heinous crime, the killing of a young girl and the disposal of her body in a furnace. It could hardly have been a more horrible crime or one calling more for the ultimate penalty. The accused was convicted, and he was executed. Only a few months after his execution it became apparent that his defence was entirely inadequate, if not incompetent, and there was grave doubt about his guilt. From that day forward I have been asking myself what possible rationale there could be for such an irrevocable penalty in our law. Whatever the arguments for capital punishment, and there have been many persuasive ones put forward in this House, we must bear in mind that the death penalty is the one penalty that is irrevocable. There is no way we can

correct the errors of our human legal processes, and they are human and fallible.

Many thoughtful speeches have been made during this debate and the debates during these past ten years or more in the House on this subject. I will not try to repeat the arguments which have influenced my thinking. Many of my constituents have written me, telephoned me and discussed with me in person this issue over the past ten years. If there is any member of this House who has attempted to consult his constituents, to stimulate their participation in the democratic process and their commentary on current affairs and national issues, I hope I am one. I have felt that it is my duty as a member of parliament, a duty given me by those who elected me, to study an issue of this importance as deeply as I can and to reach a responsible and conscientious decision based on the facts as I found them. During these past ten years I have searched for evidence that would persuade me that the death penalty is a necessary part of our law. In the process of this consideration I have, perhaps incorrectly but in my own mind correctly, eliminated every other justification for the death penalty but one, and that is the protection of society.

In all the debates and all the evidence in this House during these past ten years I have not been persuaded that the death penalty has anywhere in the world been effective in reducing the incidence of capital crime. If it were otherwise, I would not hesitate to accept capital punishment. I do feel that the state has the right to levy such a punishment, but only where it is clearly demonstrable that society achieves some protection as a result. I have not been so persuaded and I am, therefore, still very much convinced that capital punishment should be removed from our statute books.

What is the responsibility of a government in this respect? Much has been said about that in this debate. For me, this is a free vote, but I must say I do not think it should be. I feel that a free vote in many ways is an abdication of responsibility on the part of the government. Why capital punishment should be less a matter of commitment on the part of any government than bilingualism, than divorce, than any other subject which is constantly put before this House by a government, for which a government takes responsibility, I do not know. I would have much preferred that the government had not only put forward a bill in the terms which met its convictions, but that it had been prepared to stand or fall as a government on the way in which this House dealt with it.

The government initiative on which we are now about to vote is long overdue. I regret that the impression has been allowed to build over the last few years of an almost routine commutation of death sentences. The cabinet, I have reason to know, takes each case very seriously and considers the merits of each one. However, the longer the government put off committing itself to abolition and carrying out its intentions in the most direct way, with the approval of parliament, the greater the chance there has been that the public would lose confidence not only in the government but in the processes and administration of the law. I welcome this initiative for abolition. I wish it were an initiative on which the government were prepared to take full responsibility as on other important measures, but I am prepared, as an individual member, to take my responsibility as will all other members when they vote tomorrow.

It has been suggested that as members of this House we must vote according to our estimation of what our constituents want. I believe in consulting my constituents. I believe in their wisdom, and what they tell me influences my thinking a great deal. However, I believe members of parliament are here in the best British parliamentary tradition to take responsibility for their own decisions and not to pass the responsibility for those decisions to those who sent them here.

● (1630)

I believe it is incumbent on each member to satisfy himself or herself about the wisdom of a decision that he or she is called upon to make, and if they do not do so they are short-changing those who sent them here. So I will cast my vote, as I have in the past, bearing in mind what my constituents have told me on various aspects of this matter, bearing in mind my own feelings and conscience but, most of all, I will base my decision on the facts as I have found them to be and on the judgment that I can bring to bear as a responsible and conscientious representative of my electors.

Probably all members have received a letter from a man in Biggar, Saskatchewan, who wrote very movingly about his 17 year-old daughter who was killed in 1973. This man wrote:

> Courtrooms, laws and even the hangman's noose seemingly provide no influence or restraint whatever over an anxious, distressed or afflicted mind.

He suggests that hanging is meaningless and even disgraceful for this day and age. The noose, he says, will only serve to indicate our backwardness. He goes on:

> You and I have an obligation in attempting to erase as much of human suffering and punishment as is possible. We, the Canadian people look to you as a member of the Parliament of Canada for the required leadership toward such an end.

I hope that on whatever side of the matter members find themselves, we will attempt not simply to reflect the mass feeling of the moment but that we will exercise our conscientious judgment, bearing in mind the interests of society as a whole, not simply those who might be under sentence of death now or in the future, and that we will put our emphasis on the prevention of crime and suffering and on respect for life; in short, that we will exercise leadership. In so doing, I hope sincerely that tomorrow we will dispose of this question in the Canadian parliament once and for all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It appears that the debate on third reading of Bill C-84 has been concluded, as no other hon. member is seeking the floor. However, the House will recognize that it would be improper for me to put the question on the motion for third reading until the House has pronounced itself on the amendment. Does the House agree that the debate on the motion for third reading of Bill C-84 has now been concluded, and that the question will be put, if necessary, immediately after disposal of the question on the amendment which has been deferred until tomorrow?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, during the discussions that took place among the House leaders who had also consulted the various members who had taken an active part in this debate, we had an understanding that if the debate should conclude before closing time tonight no other business would be introduced.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the minister permit a point of order before he moves any motion?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The minister is quite correct that in our discussions it was agreed that if we concluded this matter before ten o'clock tonight, no other business would be put forward. But it was also discussed at our meeting that if there could be unanimous consent to dealing without debate with the finalization of Bill C-242, that would be a possibility. Bill C-242 is a private members' public bill having to do with the prohibition of smoking in certain vehicles of transport. I think I am stating the case correctly, that if there was to be any debate the government was not prepared to bring it forward, but if there was a possibility of completing the debate on third reading of that bill and passing it without further debate, this could be entertained.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. As the House will recall, there were two, or perhaps three occasions when the official opposition indicated that if this matter could be considered and called as a government order, we would be prepared to deal with it. This is still the situation. There was some question about it as private members' business, as I explained to the House on another occasion and to many people across the country. But as a government order we would be prepared to deal with it.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, so that the record is quite clear, I should like to say that I agree entirely with what has been said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and by the House leader of the official opposition. However, at no time have I ever been given any understanding that if this motion were brought forward on any basis, it would be approved without debate. I was not able to get that assurance from either side.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the minister ask for it now?

Mr. Sharp: I was just going to say that if the House were disposed to approve Bill C-242 now without debate, we would have no objection.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Is it the intention of the government House leader to bring forward this bill now as a government bill? We have indicated on a number of occasions that we are quite prepared to do that, but we have explained the difference to members of the House and to others. The difference is well known to the government House leader and to others. If the government House leader is prepared to say that the bill will come forward as government business, we are prepared to deal with it. If it is private members' business, then the government House leader knows even better than I do that House leaders have no place messing about in private members' business. That has been a long-standing tradition of this House.

Mr. Sharp: It is not the intention of the government to bring forward a government bill to replace Bill C-242 which would have to go through all the stages. Therefore, I think this is a hypothetical case. I would, therefore, like to conclude the remarks which I began. It was agreed among us that apart from the question of Bill C-242 which was raised in the way it was, if we did conclude the debate on Bill C-84 there would be no other business introduced by the government.

● (1640)

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if you would now call it ten o'clock there would certainly be no objection from this side.

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear, with regard to Bill C-242, that if the government had been prepared to introduce it as a government measure this afternoon, we on this side of the House would have been prepared to complete it at all stages without debate.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to call it ten o'clock and, I suppose, eliminate the adjournment debate, because I would think that no hon. member has received due notice?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being ten o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at two o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 4.42 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, July 14, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed, from Tuesday, July 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84 to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the third time and do pass, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Condon.

● (1410)

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to order made Friday, July 9, 1976, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division of Bill C-84, an act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences and the deferred division on the motion in amendment thereto of the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon).

Before doing so, perhaps I could inform hon. members that, through an error in the Printing Bureau, some text was omitted from the last page of yesterday's English *Hansard*. The French text is complete. The members concerned in respect of the omission from the English text have been supplied with photo copies of the text that has been omitted. A complete corrected page will be printed in today's *Hansard*.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF HON. KENZO KONO, PRESIDENT OF THE JAPANESE HOUSE OF COUNCILLORS

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before proceeding with the deferred division I wonder if I might ask hon. members to join with me in recognizing the presence in our gallery of an extremely distinguished visitor who, I might add, in his official capacity as President of the House of Councillors of the Diet of Japan, had occasion one year ago to cast a deciding ballot with respect to a tie.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Kenzo Kono, President of the House of Councillors of the Diet of Japan, and Mrs. Kono are here on this occasion in Mr. Kono's capacity as the leader and President of the Japanese Olympic delegation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURES RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the third time and do pass, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Condon.

Mr. Speaker: The question will be first upon the amendment of the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon). Call in the members.

Before the taking of the Vote:

● (1430)

Mr. Speaker: The question for deferred division at this time, pursuant to an order made on Friday, July 9, 1976, is on the motion of Mr. Allmand and on the amendment of Mr. Condon. In accordance with the practice throughout the deliberations on this bill we will take the votes by row on each side of the House.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Condon), which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 152*)

YEAS
Messrs.

Allard	Dionne (Kamouraska)	Howie
Andre (Calgary Centre)	Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Huntington
Balfour	Ellis	Hurlburt
Bawden	Elzinga	Jarvis
Beaudoin	Epp	Jelinek
Brisco	Fortin	Jones
Cadieu	Fraser	Kempling
Caouette (Villeneuve)	Friesen	Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)	Gauthier (Roberval)	Korchinski
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)	Halliday	Lambert (Bellechasse)
Coates	Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)	Lambert (Edmonton West)
Condon	Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)	La Salle
Cossitt	Hargrave	Lavoie
Crouse	Holt (Mrs.)	Lawrence
Darling	Horner	MacKay
Dick		MacLean
Diefenbaker		Malone
Dinsdale		Marshall
		Masniuk

Messrs.

Matte
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Parent
Patterson
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Schumacher
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Trudel
Wagner
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams—89

NAYS
Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Basford
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Caron
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clermont
Collenette
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Ethier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Hees
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the
Islands)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
Maine
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McGrath
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nielsen
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Paproski
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Roy
(Laval)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Symes
Tessier
Trudeau
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—158

● (1440)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the amendment lost.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Allmand) which was agreed to on the following division:

[Mr. Speaker.]

(*Division No. 153*)

YEAS
Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baldwin
Basford
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Chrétien
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Collenette
Corbin
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Ethier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gillies
Goodale
Goyer
Grafftey
Gray
Guilbault
Haidasz
Halliday
Harquail
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Holmes
Jamieson
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Lachance
Lalonde
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
MacDonald
(Egmont)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the
Islands)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Macquarrie
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McGrath
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Philbrook
Pinard
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Saltsman
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Stollery
Symes
Trudeau
Whelan
Yanakis—130

NAYS
Messrs.

Allard
Anderson
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beaudoin
Blouin
Brisco
Cadieu
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caouette
(Témiscamingue)
Caron
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Clermont
Coates
Comtois
Condon
Corriveau
Cossitt
Crouse
Darling
Demers
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fortin
Francis
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hees
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lajoie
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
Landers
Langlois
La Salle
Lavoie

Messrs.

Lawrence	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)	Schumacher
Leblanc (Laurier)	Murta	Scott
Lee	Neil	Skoreyko
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)	Nielsen	Smith (Churchill)
MacKay	Nowlan	Smith (Saint-Jean)
MacLean	Oberle	Stevens
Maine	O'Sullivan	Stewart (Marquette)
Malone	Paproski	Tessier
Marshall	Parent	Towers
Masniuk	Patterson	Trudel
Matte	Pearsall	Turner
Mazankowski	Portelance	Wagner
McCain	Reynolds	Watson
McCleave	Ritchie	Wenman
McKenzie	Roche	Whiteway
McKinley	Rondeau	Whittaker
McKinnon	Roy (Laval)	Wise
Mitges	Rynard	Woolliams
Muir	Schellenberger	Young—124

● (1450)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Bearing in mind the terms of the order of this House made July 9, 1976 and before making reference to the provisions of that order which called for the adjournment of the House, may I say it is one of the more pleasant duties of the Speaker at this point to extend the customary invitation to members of the House, members of the press gallery and to those other officials too numerous to mention but who have been recipients of the invitation in the past, to join us all in celebrating a much needed rest from the travails of this place in room 16 at the moment of adjournment. Pursuant to the same order of July 9, and in conformity with every and each of the terms of that order, this House stands adjourned until October 12.

At 2.59 p.m. the House adjourned until October 12, 1976 pursuant to special order made July 9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, July 16, 1976

The House met at 12 p.m.

[*English*]

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received, which is as follows:

Ottawa, July 16, 1976

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that his Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 16th day of July at 12 noon for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills;

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière
Administrative Secretary to the
Governor General

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that Messages have been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed the following bills without any amendment:

Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Medical Care Act;

Bill C-58, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act; and

Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences.

Order, please. By way of communication the hon. member for Montreal-Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) drew to the attention of the Chair a problem respecting the recordings of his own vote on Vote No. 149 held on Thursday, July 8, 1976. Several motions were voted upon that day and with respect to all except Motion No. 12 the hon. member is recorded as being present in the Chamber and voting. It is his recollection clearly and that of other hon. members near him that day, that he also voted with respect to Motion No. 12, casting his vote against that motion; but, for some reason, he was missed with respect to that particular motion. On investigation, it seems certain that he was missed through error. The hon. member has brought this to our attention and properly is entitled to have it recorded, as it will be as a result of the remarks I am making, that he was present in the House and cast his vote against Motion No. 12, although at this stage no further reflection can be made, nor can any amendment be made to the *Hansard* record of that day.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency, the Governor General, had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-84, An Act to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences.—Chapter No. 105.

Bill C-58, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.—Chapter No. 106.

Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Medical Care Act.—Chapter No. 107.

Bill C-20, An Act respecting citizenship.—Chapter No. 108.

Bill C-88, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2).—Chapter No. 109.

Therefore, pursuant to the order made Friday, July 9, 1976, this House, subject to the conditions contained in that order, stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 12, 1976, at 11 o'clock a.m. Needless to say, this provides a very much needed break from the work of the Chamber. While hon. members no doubt will find other work to do, it will at least provide hon. members with an opportunity to take a much needed rest.

The House adjourned at 12.10 p.m., until Tuesday, October 2, 1976, at 11 a.m., according to order made July 9, 1976.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 12, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before reading the communication I have received, and since it is predicted that the present session is soon to terminate, I wish to draw to the attention of the House the fact that there is some disposition on the part of the government to answer certain questions and some agreement on the part of the House to receive answers at this time. At this point this procedure can only be embarked upon with unanimous consent. Before we receive the messenger may I ask, is there unanimous agreement at this point for depositing certain answers to the House. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Apparently there is not unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I speak to that matter for a moment? I hope the government is not merely asking for the right to table answers to questions. There are orders for returns to be tabled and I understood that the government would be answering questions in the normal way. We would be giving consent to do that. They would be printed as part of today's *Hansard,* in the normal way. That was the understanding arrived at. I say this as I think the House should be made aware of the discussions which have taken place.

● (1110)

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the volume of questions to be answered today, in one way or another, is obvious to the House by the stack of material I have on my desk. This includes answers in three categories; answers to be made in the normal fashion, a number of orders for returns to be tabled immediately, if that is the wish of the House, and a number of orders for returns to be tabled at a later date. I could read through all of the numbers, all 566 of them. I would prefer to have unanimous consent to simply deal with them in the normal way. Depending on the nature of the answers, they would be printed in *Hansard* and/or *Votes and Proceedings* as usual.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore ask, does the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Goodale) have the unanimous consent of the House to make these answers at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimous consent.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received which is as follows:

Ottawa, September 29, 1976

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Bora Laskin, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber at 11.00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 12th, for the purpose of proroguing the First Session of the Thirtieth Parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be,
sir,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière
Administrative Secretary
to the Governor General

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

Then, the Deputy Governor General was pleased to close the first session of the thirtieth Parliament of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The First Session of the Thirtieth Parliament was opened on September 30, 1974. In the 744 days since the opening, the Senate has met 216 times and the House, 343 times. Both in terms of the amount of elapsed time and the number of sittings of each House, this has been, by far, the longest session in the history of the Parliament of Canada. In terms of public legislation, this has been our most productive session, although, if examined on a yearly basis, the pace of legislation has been at the rate that has come to be normally expected in the last two decades.

The principal direction of the legislation enacted during this session has been toward the reasonable development and the just and equitable sharing of the great riches of our land. In addition to several important fiscal measures that have been passed, Parliament has put into place a program to combat inflation so that Canadians may indeed reap the benefits of their own productivity. As part of this program the Government has imposed upon itself a policy of restraint in the growth of its own expenditures and Parliament, as part of this program, has enacted alterations to such statutes as the Medical Care Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act.

At the same time, Parliament has not been unmindful of the need for continuing growth of the economy and has amended the Export Development Act and created the Federal Business Development Bank. The orderly development of business will be assisted by the enactment of the Canada Business Corporations Act and healthy competition in the free market will be stimulated by the amendments to the Combines Investigation Act.

[*Translation*]

In both economic and social terms, housing has been of great concern during this session and you have twice amended the National Housing Act and related statutes.

Energy resources are central to the development of the nation. This has led to the enactment of the Petroleum Administration Act and to the creation of Petro Canada.

Agriculture has been of major concern to you during this session. You have enacted a measure to provide for two price wheat and you have passed the Agricultural Stabilization Act and the Western Grain Stabilization Act. You have made important amendments to the Farm Credit Act and to the Canadian Wheat Board Act as well as to several other statutes of great importance to the farmers of this country.

Several measures have been enacted to strengthen our social security system. You have improved the benefits of the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act. Amendments to the statute law with regard to superannuation have been enacted. The services of those who fought for our country have been remembered in amendments to the laws relating to veterans' and civilians' war allowances, veterans' and returned soldiers' insurance, and to the compensation for former prisoners of war.

[*English*]

The institutional framework of Government has been a significant concern in this session. Parliament has enacted statutes to create the office of Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal-Provincial Relations and to amend Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements. Measures have been passed to protect the representation of all provinces in the House of Commons and to improve the representation of the northern territories in Parliament. You accepted your responsibilities by dealing with the financial arrangements for representatives of the Crown, for judges and for legislators. A number of measures relating to the structure of the courts were enacted, including important amendments to the Supreme Court Act. Committees of both Houses considered and made recommendations on the subject of members of parliament and conflicts of interest. A special joint committee of both Houses considered and made recommendations on employer-employee relations in the public service. The Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments has not only effectively taken up its responsibilities under the Statutory Instruments Act, but also has embarked on an important study of government policy on the release of information, the conclusions of which are eagerly anticipated. Both Houses have considered procedural reform and, while progress has been made, both are to be encouraged to continue the work in future sessions.

[*Translation*]

You have made several amendments to the criminal law, including the enactment of a permanent law with regard to the punishment for murder and certain other offences.

Several of the statutes enacted have been designed to protect the equality of men and women in the letter and administration of the law.

During this session, a new Citizenship Act was passed and a measure to regulate the import and export of articles of cultural value was enacted. The Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission was created and a measure was enacted to assist the development of Canadian publications and broadcasting.

Almost all of the legislation that was forecast in the Speech from the Throne opening this session on September 30, 1974 has been enacted. This, however, constitutes merely half of the legislation that Parliament has adopted in the session. Parliament has indeed produced a remarkably great amount of legislation. Nonetheless, the demand for even more continues and Parliament has little time to spare in its effort to meet the needs of the nation.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provisions you have made for the service of Canada during the present and the two previous fiscal years.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our country.

This concluded the first session of the thirtieth Parliament.

END OF VOLUME XIV