

That this government take immediate steps to make necessary payment to western farmers.

**Madam Speaker:** For presentation, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

### WILDLIFE

#### FUR RANCHERS—DANGER POSED BY JAPANESE FOXES— MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough):** Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. Nature conservationists have strongly criticized the federal government for permitting fur ranchers in Canada to import from Europe so-called "raccoon dogs" or Japanese foxes, as they are sometimes called, which could devastate domestic farm crops and wildlife in this country if they escaped or were released. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro):

That this House urge the government to require fur ranchers to send all Japanese foxes or raccoon dogs back to Europe; to compensate the ranchers for their losses; and to pass strict laws to prevent the importation of all exotic animals except those proven to be harmless and over which complete control can be exercised.

**Madam Speaker:** For presentation this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

● (1415)

### FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

#### REPORTED EXCISION OF ALBERTA FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAP—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer):** Madam Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 43 to seek redress from a news item and map which appeared in this morning's *Ottawa Citizen* and dealt with a Canadian government map which excised the province of Alberta out of confederation in favour of Saskatchewan. It is quite one thing for my province to be excised at the wellhead, but it is quite another thing to be excised out of existence.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes):

That the Prime Minister:  
Woo the socialists if you must,  
Bed them down in common-law lust,  
Rash after them their favour to curry,  
Because, after all, they're Liberals in a hurry;

### Oral Questions

But don't get caught in the Brou-Blake snare,  
And leave Albertans tearing their hair.

**Madam Speaker:** For presentation, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### THE CONSTITUTION

#### PATRIATION—REPORTED POSITION OF UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs that flows out of the possibility that new difficulties have arisen in the government's attempt to have Britain decide constitutional questions which Canada should decide here in Canada. The Secretary of State will know from British news reports that the British government does not want to become the arbitrator between the Canadian federal government and the provincial governments on amendments to the British North America Act. The reports relate both to alleged communications between the British government and Canadian representatives and to more recent statements by British government spokesmen.

My first question is: Has there been any suggestion, in correspondence or conversation involving ministers or representatives of the two governments, to the effect that the British government wants basic Canadian disagreements to be resolved in Canada before Ottawa asks Britain to resolve them?

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, there has been no such request made by the government of the United Kingdom. There was a news story published this morning with which I am acquainted—it was also denied at 10 Downing Street this morning—to the effect that no message had been sent to the Canadian government as that earlier communiqué suggested.

There was also a news report stating that my colleague the Minister of the Environment and I, while in England, were told that the British government would not accommodate a request to patriate the constitution in the face of violent provincial disagreement during this year's parliamentary session. That report is entirely false.

**Mr. Clark:** Madam Speaker, I understand, as does this House, that the minister's department earlier denied the report in *The Times* as it was written. That was not my question. My question was: Has there been any suggestion communicated, in conversation or in any other communication, between British

### Oral Questions

government ministers or representatives and Canadian government ministers or representatives suggesting that the British would want basic Canadian disagreements to be resolved in Canada before Ottawa asks Britain to resolve them? I am not asking for paragraph by paragraph verification of *The Times* story; I am asking the question whether or not there has been any suggestion to that effect conveyed in any way by any representatives of the British government to the Canadian government.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** Madam Speaker, there has certainly been no proposal or request of that kind in our discussions with the British government. We had a free-flowing discussion, and while many possibilities were canvassed, as happens in a discussion of this nature, certainly that was not the way in which the conversation ended. There was no request, suggestion or proposal of that kind.

**Mr. Clark:** Madam Speaker, I believe that the minister has now said that there was no suggestion of that kind at any time. If that is what he intended to say, I would like him to verify his statement. Since the government strategy document anticipated provincial and parliamentary opposition to certain parts of the Liberal proposal, will the minister tell the House of Commons whether Canadian ministers or representatives raised with the British government or representatives the possibility of disagreement here in Canada and the possibility that Britain might have to decide questions that are deeply contentious in Canada?

• (1420)

**Mr. MacGuigan:** We certainly acquainted the British government and its representatives with the fact that there would be disagreement in Canada. That was already apparent at the time we saw them but, of course, there was a common assumption on both sides that the normal constitutional convention in the United Kingdom would be followed, namely, that the advice of the Canadian government would be the advice heard by the British government and that a joint resolution of the Canadian Parliament would be what is accepted by the British Parliament.

**Mr. Clark:** Madam Speaker, the minister and the rest of the House will know that detailed memoranda of conversations of this kind are kept. In light of the extraordinary circumstances, it being important that all members of Parliament know exactly what was discussed between ministers and, indeed, between officials on this question, and in light of the extraordinary situation of the government seeking a joint address on a matter that is contentious in Parliament and a matter of disagreement among the provinces and under challenge in the courts, I wonder if the minister would agree to publish the Canadian memoranda of the conversations in which he and his colleague, the minister responsible for the environment and other things, participated. In these extraordinary circumstances I wonder if there would be a willingness to publish those memoranda.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** Madam Speaker, I do not think that would be in accord with the precedents nor with the practice, because it would remove the sense of confidentiality all sides have in discussions of this kind.

As I mentioned to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition, there was free-flowing discussion with various representatives of the British government. We have stated here the conclusions of that discussion. I do not think it would be appropriate to go through the discussion here in Parliament.

### PATRIATION—POSSIBILITY OF DISAGREEMENT—POSITION OF UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT

**Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the same minister. I want to reiterate that it is our belief that this is a Canadian matter, that we should patriate the constitution with an amending formula which has widespread support here in Canada and that all future amendments should be made in Canada.

In view of the at best very weak denial he issued this morning—his press release says that he denies the story as written, so the minister is obviously leaving a fair amount of doubt that there was veracity to the story in *The Times* this morning—just on this narrow point, what would be the position of the government of the United Kingdom if there was widespread disagreement in Canada, including among the provinces? Can the minister answer that specific question?

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I do not know to what communication this morning the hon. member is referring. I issued no press release this morning. In fact, my view was that the matter should await the House this afternoon where I assumed there would be questions. It may be that some answers were given by spokesmen for the department, but they were not intended to express our total reaction to the proposals or the comments which were being made by some British and Canadian media.

With respect to the precise question the hon. member asks, as I said, the common assumption on both sides during the discussion, which was never questioned by anyone and in fact has been expressly affirmed both in public and in private by the United Kingdom government, is that what the United Kingdom parliament looks to is a joint resolution of both Houses of this Parliament and nothing else.

**Mr. Epp:** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is to the same minister and it flows out of his answer. It obviously raises the question of who is responsible in his department for press releases. More importantly, in view of the difficulty in which this minister has now put this House and in view of the various reports he has given, will he assure the House that he will make a statement on motions to explain clearly what happened.

Further, in view of the requests of a number of Canadians, notwithstanding also the premiers at the first ministers' conference, would the minister recommend to his cabinet colleagues

that an early meeting be convened between the Prime Minister and the premiers to discuss one agenda item only, namely, an amending formula, so that the joint address could then go forward with regard to patriation with an amending formula that would then have the widespread support all of us seek?

**Mr. MacGuigan:** Madam Speaker, I will certainly give consideration to the hon. member's request for a statement on motions, but I will not accede to his request to change the policy of the government, which I fully support. There has been no ambiguity whatsoever in the statements made by me and the Minister of the Environment. We have stated with no ambiguity since our return—and, indeed, in the United Kingdom before our return—that the United Kingdom would follow the traditional convention that a joint resolution of this House would be followed by the British parliament and honoured by the British government, and that the only adviser to the British government on Canadian constitutional matters is the Canadian government.

\* \* \*

● (1425)

### LABOUR CONDITIONS

#### STATEMENT IN BUDGET RESPECTING "FULLY EMPLOYED SOCIETY"

**Mr. Bob Rae (Broadview-Greenwood):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The figures which have been released by the minister in his budget indicate that he himself anticipates that unemployment will rise by over 100,000 this year, and indeed it is projected that over the next five years there will be on average one million unemployed Canadians and perhaps as many as 1.5 million if one includes the real unemployed.

In light of those figures, which I am sure the minister would agree are pretty shocking, I should like to ask him what he means when he says, on page 3 of his budget statement, that the budget which he has brought down is intended to restore, over time, among other things, a fully employed society. What does he mean by "a fully employed society", and what does he mean by "over time"?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, the context of the budget anticipates for the short-term higher unemployment. The hon. member can have a dialectical argument, like we used to have ten or 15 years ago, as to what the concept of full employment would be. In this case I am talking about reduced unemployment over the time period forecast in the budget.

**Mr. Rae:** I am not a dialectician but I could describe the government's recipe as short-term pain for long-term pain. Because if the minister looks at his own projections, he will see that the unemployment figures at the end of the five-year period are just as high as they are now, and that the average over the five-year period is higher than now. That is not dialectics, those are straight facts. Can the minister please

### Oral Questions

confirm that, on the facts which are contained both in the budget and in the medium-term prospects which are described in his budget papers, if you look at the real number of unemployed in Newfoundland, for example, in the early 1980s through to 1985 one out of every four or five Canadians will be unemployed and that the average for all of Canada will be one out of every ten Canadians unemployed over the next four or five years?

**Mr. MacEachen:** So?

**Mr. Rae:** I am asking the minister to confirm those figures, and he is saying "so".

**An hon. Member:** What do you mean by "so"?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Madam Speaker, the figures in the document are accurate. The hon. member's interpretation of them is a bit suspect.

**Mr. Rae:** If my interpretation is suspect, I think the minister's complacency is nothing short of unbelievable.

My final supplementary concerns an article written in 1962 by someone describing himself as an economist by the name of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. The article is entitled "Economic Rights". At the end of this article the author writes:

—our laws... recognize as proprietors of an enterprise men who today hold a few shares... whereas workers who may have invested the better part of their lives and of their hopes in a job have no proprietary right to that job, and may be expropriated... whenever they grow old, whenever Capital decides to disinvest.

He describes that as an "erroneous concept of property". In light of all the statements that have been made by the minister in his document about the importance of labour mobility—and in fact he has turned the country into a nation of backpackers thanks to the levels of unemployment that he is expecting in many parts of our country—can he point specifically in his budget to any steps which have been taken which guarantee, not simply labour mobility, but the importance of providing some job protection, some pension guarantees and some economic security for those people who are affected by the 1,000 lay-offs per day that have been taking place over the past year and that we can be sure will be taking place over the next five years, thanks to this stand-pat-and-do-nothing budget.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacEachen:** The hon. member's rhetoric is about as outdated as the amendment which he proposed yesterday in the House which looked to me like a warmed over edition of the Regina manifesto.

**Mr. Rae:** A million unemployed is outdated?

**Mr. MacEachen:** He talked about intellectual bankruptcy. It was demonstrated clearly yesterday in his amendment and again in his questions.

● (1430)

May I indicate to the hon. member, if he is serious about the question of growth and unemployment in the economy, that I