

## DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

## REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES

**Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake):** Madam Speaker, I would have liked to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture, as it is about the federal herd maintenance program. However, in his absence I would like to address my question to the minister's parliamentary secretary or to the minister in charge of regional economic expansion.

As I said, my question concerns the federal herd maintenance program and I have received in excess of 20 complaints from the constituents I represent in the area called Pierceland. The farmers and ranchers there who have applied have been told they would not be considered because they are outside of the designated drought areas, in spite of the fact the drought conditions are actually worse than those inside the drought area, according to local records.

I was wondering if the minister could give us some assurance that the boundaries of the drought areas would be extended to include these areas, specifically the Pierceland area, and generally other areas which have experienced severe drought and are not covered by the boundaries drawn around the major weather stations.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Ostiguy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, it is well known that a federal-provincial committee is studying this question. So I am making a note of the hon. member's question and we will reply in the House in due course.

[English]

**Mr. Anguish:** My supplementary question is this. If the committee decide not to extend the boundaries, will they give some assurance to farmers and ranchers who are so severely affected by drought in those areas that if they must be considered after the applicants from the designated drought areas, can they assure us there will be enough money in the program to cover them under the herd maintenance program?

[Translation]

**Mr. Ostiguy:** Madam Speaker, I maintain the answer I gave a moment ago. We will advise the House in due time.

\* \* \*

## PUBLIC WORKS

## REPLANNING OF OLD PORT OF MONTREAL—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works and has to do with the intentions of the government concerning the replanning of the old port of Montreal. Since this morning's issue of *La Presse* mentioned that the old port project has now been shelved, could the minister say whether it is true, first, that this

## Oral Questions

project no longer has the agreement of other levels of government and second, that the government is on the verge of implementing a new global approach aimed at reviewing all such undertakings throughout the country, something which obviously would seriously delay the old port project of Montreal?

[English]

**Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (Minister of Public Works):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. It gives me the opportunity to say that the development of the old port is a ministerial priority with the Department of Public Works, and it is a personal priority with me. I have visited the site and talked to the mayor and officials. My officials and I will be coming forward to cabinet with a document to proceed with development of the port.

I might say that in the past I have visited the old port and it is a favourite of mine as, I am sure, it is of many Canadians. I am certain that many people across this country would like to see that development.

\* \* \*

## THE CONSTITUTION

## BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF JOINT COMMITTEE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. It relates to his answer as reported on page 3965 of *Hansard* which I will quote in total:

The answer to the second question about television is that the committee, I believe, is master of its own procedure in this area.

The Prime Minister was stating his belief and he will now know that his colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in another capacity as co-chairman of the committee on the constitution in 1978, ruled that it is not within the powers of the committee to decide itself on that question. The Prime Minister will know he was wrong in his answer of October 23.

That being the case, and hoping that the Prime Minister wants the people of Canada to know what is going on in discussion of this constitutional resolution, will he now agree to present an order to the House of Commons which would allow live and full television and radio broadcasting of the committee sessions on the constitutional resolution?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, since giving my answer I have had the opportunity to check with our House leader, who has asked for opinions on this. It turns out that, exceptionally, I was not wrong and that, indeed, the committee is master of its procedure. We hope that the committee will address itself to this question. I do not know how they will decide but I hope they will address themselves to the question.

### Oral Questions

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Are you in favour of it?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, it seems that members opposite, including their leader, thought that the committee could not address itself to this question. I suggest it can.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Are you in favour of it?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I am also asked by some of the backbenchers if I am in favour of it. I have no preference one way or the other, Madam Speaker. If the committee members make a good case to televise the proceedings, I think it would be a good thing. It will cost a little bit of money, but I am sure everyone will be prepared to chip in.

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

**Mr. Clark:** Madam Speaker, we could undoubtedly cover the cost from the advertising program which the Government of Canada is mounting. I am sure the Prime Minister would admit that this question of having the public of Canada know what is being done about its constitution is sufficiently important that there should be a party position on it. While I do not wish to intrude upon his ground and speak for the NDP, I know that the NDP leader has already indicated his view as a party leader, as I have indicated my view as a party leader, that it would be well to have the proceedings televised and covered by radio. We would recommend that our members on the committee vote for that.

Will the Prime Minister tell us, in his capacity as the leader of the government party, if he will urge his colleagues on that committee to have the proceedings fully covered by radio and television so that Canadians will know what is going on about their constitution?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, that is a repeat of the same question. I just answered that I have no preference. I am not all that keen on television but I have no objection to it. If the members of this party in the committee decide that it is a good thing, and they have the support of our friends in the NDP—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:**—and our great friends from the Tory party, then it can be done.

\* \* \*

### PUBLIC SERVICE

#### INQUIRY WHETHER SENIOR TRANSLATORS ACCEPTING FREELANCE WORK

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Yesterday we were informed by the translators' union that there had been some cases during the strike of senior management types in the Treasury Board doing some freelance translating on their own, drawing their own salary plus a freelance commission or freelance salary for doing the translation work.

I wonder if he could confirm that to the House, and if he can confirm it can he tell us what disciplinary action he has taken?

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board):** Madam Speaker, I am not aware of any such circumstances, hence I cannot confirm it to the House.

**Mr. Nystrom:** I wonder if the minister is aware of a memo dated August 19 from Mr. Roch Blais, who is a director of special operations in the Treasury Board, in which he talks about the need for an internal freelance team to be established by the Treasury Board. I wonder if the hon. gentleman can tell us whether or not he is aware of the memo which went out to all of the translators, a copy of which I have here, and whether or not he thinks it is a violation of the conflict of interest guidelines that have been issued by the Government of Canada governing public servants. It says, and I quote:

*No conflict should exist, or appear to exist, between the private interests of public servants and their official duties.*

Is the minister aware of this? If he is aware of it, what disciplinary action has he taken? If he is not aware of it, may we have a commitment from him that he will look into this matter and take some disciplinary action?

**Mr. Johnston:** Madam Speaker, I am not aware of it. Furthermore, I cannot tell from the information which has been put before the House exactly what the nature of the conflict is or exactly what the problem is. Many of us do our own translations. In this part of the House, as a matter of fact, people usually originate their own material in both languages.

\* \* \*

### THE CONSTITUTION

#### REPRESENTATION OF SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE

**Mr. Bill Dumm (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, we were all saddened these past few days to learn of the intent of the government to spend between \$20,000 and \$30,000 on advertising for 13 minutes during the Grey Cup. My question is to the Prime Minister. I have received a letter from an Indian reserve, signed and dated October 27 and delivered to my office, which says:

*We will do anything. We will crawl to dignity and recognition in order to be heard in constitutional matters.*

Will the Prime Minister answer this House with a simple yes or no. Is he going to make it possible for special interest groups like native people and women's organizations, to come to Ottawa and present their case to the government? Or is the Prime Minister expecting these people, as this native says, "to crawl with dignity" and ask for recognition when they do not have any funds? How are these groups going to get before this committee in order to present their case in the interests of human rights, native land claims, aboriginal rights and women's rights?

• (1500)

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, first I would point out that if we had not gone the committee route, a route to which the opposition is now objecting vigorously, there would have been no occasion for the natives to be heard. We are referring the matter to committee so that the natives as well as other special interest groups can be heard on this resolution.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** How do they get here?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I am asked how they get here. I indicated in answer to that question last week that I hoped the committee would set funds aside to provide those groups which have no other means of getting here with the funds to get here.

**Mr. Andre:** You will give them a means test before they come.

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker, the response of the Prime Minister conjures up in my mind the last election.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker, I have only said half a sentence, yet members opposite are asking for my question when they have delivered answers which say nothing for two or three minutes. My question to the Prime Minister is this. Is he satisfied that the legitimate concerns of women, who make up 51 per cent of the electorate, have had a fair opportunity for input into his unilateral action to bring in constitutional reform, and is he satisfied that women and native people in Canada have had a fair opportunity to present their cases on human rights before this government?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Madam Speaker, I have just been informed that we have already announced that some \$400,000 will be available to each of the three native groups so that they can prepare and present their constitutional views. I am sure that out of this \$400,000 they can find travelling money to come to Ottawa to present themselves before the committee.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Knowles:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, may I draw to the attention of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) the fact that there have been certain discussions about when the recorded divisions might take place during the budget debate. I believe I can say that there has been agreement that instead of taking a vote this Thursday night, the votes on both our subamendment and the Conservative amendment will be taken on Tuesday night and that the final vote will be taken on Thursday night of next week.

Since I believe I am stating what has been agreed to among the House leaders, would the government House leader confirm what I have said and make the necessary designation?

#### *Business of the House*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pinard:** On that subject, Madam Speaker, indeed we have the intention of designating Friday this week as an opposition day, which indicates that the votes will necessarily be held next week, Tuesday evening and Thursday evening.

To make everything clear I would like to confirm the days for the budget debate. The debate will begin tomorrow morning, after the budget speech this evening, and will continue on Thursday. I understand that the New Democratic Party intends to move a subamendment. The division on that subamendment will be deferred and held the same evening at the same time or immediately before the vote on the amendment of the Progressive Conservative Party, if there is one.

Friday being an allotted day, the third day of debate on the budget will be Monday, the fourth day next Tuesday and the two votes will be taken Tuesday evening if a subamendment and an amendment have been moved. The fifth day of debate will be Wednesday next week and the sixth on Thursday.

I understand that my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre has had the agreement of the House leader of the Progressive Conservative Party. That being so we on this side of the House agree as well and as soon as we are through with this point of order I would advise you, Madam Speaker, that I have another point of order to raise.

[*English*]

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I think that arrangement is agreeable. While we are discussing House business, with regard to its effect on the televising of the committee hearings and since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has indicated he does not care one way or the other—and I would assume that the government House leader would take a position stronger than that—there would appear to be some considerable doubt, or at least differences of opinion, with respect to whether a House order, or an extension of the reference is required, or whether it can be done in committee.

Apparently there have been rulings both ways. My understanding is, and the government House leader can check, that at one time before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts in 1976, the parliamentary counsel, Mr. Joe Maingot, QC, gave evidence to the effect that in his opinion it would require an order of this House to ensure that the committee proceedings would be televised. My colleague can check that out, and I stand corrected if I am wrong.

If the matter is checked out and proved to be correct, given the agreement there is now in this House, at least among the opposition parties, that this constitutional committee be televised, and if it should be the opinion of the parliamentary counsel that an order of this House is required, will the government House leader now undertake to take such steps in the House as are necessary to have that matter resolved once and for all so that it is no longer a matter of debate, but rather a matter brought to conclusion?