

ENERGY

CALL FOR RESIGNATION OF MINISTER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a motion of urgent and pressing importance under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that the hon. Liberal member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance), who is also the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Trade (Mr. Lumley), has condemned the government's proposal to impose a federal excise tax on the export of natural gas and hydroelectric power from Canada, and has also, in a recent statement, given his full support to many aspects of the sensible energy policy which was put forward by the Progressive Conservative government in the ill-fated budget of December, 1979, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle):

That the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources be directed to resign immediately so that he might be replaced by the hon. member for Rosemont who has proposed wise, Conservative ideas which would put Canada on the road to energy self-sufficiency.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

• (1415)

PENSIONS

CALL FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE PENSIONS TO
HOMEMAKER SPOUSES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, and seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell), I move:

That this House urges the government, in view of its stated recognition of the rôle of spouses working in the home, to bring before the House legislation to provide pensions for all homemaker spouses, in their own right, equivalent to those earned by contributors to the Canada Pension Plan, thus recognizing in full, for pension purposes, the contribution to our society made by those who work in the home.

Madam Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

SMALL BUSINESS

CALL FOR LEGISLATION RESPECTING DEVELOPMENT BONDS—
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to point out to the House that a great number of small businessmen have been applying to banks and lending institutions to take advantage of small business development bonds. The bonds were confirmed in the "Crosbie" budget and in the mini budget of April, but the legislation has never been introduced and the lending institutions will not make loans without the legislation being introduced and passed. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean):

That this House directs the Minister of Finance to introduce forthwith the legislation allowing small business development bonds; that the legislation be segregated from other tax legislation; that this House do pass the legislation through all readings without debate; in view of the delay in producing the legislation, that the legislation provide that the program be extended until December 31, 1981.

Madam Speaker: Presentation of such a 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

REQUEST DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO PROPOSED RESOLUTION BE
TABLED

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. It concerns the indication last night that the government is prepared to entertain certain amendments to the draft constitutional resolution presently before the House. So that Parliament will know exactly what we are dealing with, will the minister undertake to have tabled in the House today or tomorrow any draft amendments to the draft resolution on the constitution?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development): Madam Speaker, I would be willing to table the exchange of letters between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the New Democratic Party. Of course, we have not yet reached committee stage; I hope we will get there very quickly. I know the Leader of the NDP will present an amendment, and we said that if it is in conformity with the exchange of letters we will accept it. In fact, it is entrenching in the constitution the proposition we made to the provinces last summer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

Mr. Clark: Madam Speaker, it is precisely because we have had some experience of dealing with the differences which can occur between letters and the language of resolutions and amendments that we are asking the "Liberal democratic government" to table it now—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark:—so that the House will understand exactly what is being proposed and not be misled by letters or any draft amendments.

But let me turn to another matter. In the Prime Minister's letter to the leader of the New Democratic Party, he specifically failed to deal with a number of issues which are controversial. For example, there was no reference to section 42 respecting a federal referendum. The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville, speaking as the federal-provincial spokesman for his party, described section 42 as "dangerous", "repugnant" and "highly unacceptable", and these views were shared by the Premier of Saskatchewan who stated that this section "would threaten to undermine the federal-provincial partnership upon which Canada rests". Given those strongly-held views, can the Minister of Justice tell the House whether section 42 will be removed?

Mr. Chrétien: Madam Speaker, we said many times that the intention of the resolution was very clear. We wanted to make it very clear that section 41 will have to be used before we use section 42. We wanted the deadlock-breaking mechanism to apply only after the formula under section 41 had been followed.

If the language of the resolution is not clear, I will be willing to discuss it with members in committee. What amazes me the most is the fact that the opposition does not want to discuss it in committee where we can have exchanges, and if there is some room for improvements, we will accept them.

• (1420)

At the same time, we said very clearly that we need that deadlock-breaking mechanism. In a speech made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, he said the policy of his party is to have a constitution in Canada and that to have a deadlock-breaking mechanism is an absolute necessity.

Mr. Clark: I remind the Minister of Justice that so far in the debate on the motion more Liberals have spoken than members of the official opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: I take it that, despite any deals which may have been made, the government intends to keep the essential nature of section 42, which the member for Yorkton-Melville has described as "dangerous", "repugnant" and "highly unacceptable".

My supplementary is directed again to the Minister of Justice and concerns another matter which was not raised in

yesterday's letter from the Prime Minister to the Leader of the NDP, namely, the question of provincial concurrent jurisdiction over international trade. When speaking on behalf of the NDP, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville, their spokesman on federal-provincial relations, stated that it was absolutely necessary to achieve provincial concurrence with federal paramountcy when it comes to international resource trade. Given that in the case of Saskatchewan, for example, such trade accounts for 95 per cent of potash sales and 50 per cent of heavy oil sales—

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Clark: I understand this is embarrassing to members of the "Liberal democratic party", but I would like to ask the minister whether he or one of his seatmates—or soulmates—can tell the House whether, as part of yesterday's agreement, the government is prepared to accept concurrent provincial jurisdiction relating to international resource trade?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Madam Speaker, the letters exchanged between the Leader of the New Democratic Party and the Prime Minister of Canada are very clear, and we do not intend now any more than we did this summer to entrench into the constitution transfer of the federal jurisdiction in international trade. We believe this matter must remain under federal jurisdiction, if we really have a country. However, if problems occur in the administration, of course we could always find the administrative solutions required.

[*English*]

PROVINCIAL OWNERSHIP OF RESOURCES

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Justice and I speak in part as a member of Parliament from Ontario, which is the second largest mineral producer in this country. I ask the Minister of Justice to refer to item 1 in the Prime Minister's letter to the Leader of the New Democratic Party, which states that an amendment would be considered which would confirm the jurisdiction of the provinces with respect to exploration, development, conservation and management of non-renewable natural resources.

Would the Minister of Justice indicate if that section or reference, if passed, limits the present ownership that Ontario has in its own resources, as are so clearly set out in section 109 of the BNA Act, which states that all lands, mines, minerals and royalties shall belong to the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? Has the minister a legal opinion which would indicate that he has not, in fact, narrowed our rights in Ontario to our own resources, including the right to sell those resources?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development): Madam Speaker, he is asking for a legal opinion and I am not willing to give one at this time. I would like to tell the House we are very eager on this

side to go into committee, which would give us the opportunity to reply to those kinds of questions. I have listened to the debate and the opposition is running around looking for someone to make a speech and passing around the same speech to each member who gets up. It would be more convenient for all members of the House and for the level of debate if we were to go into committee and reply to that point. Of course, it is provided in the Canadian constitution that resources belong to the provinces and we intend to respect that. I hope that we can get the matter into committee so that we may define and solve the problems in the resolution and do what the Leader of the Opposition will be asking for later this afternoon, that we unilaterally patriate the constitution.

• (1425)

Mr. Stevens: Madam Speaker, again to the Minister of Justice. If in fact it is the government's desire to ensure that the ownership of natural resources remain with the provinces, why did it not simply state that in the letter which the Prime Minister wrote to the Leader of the NDP?

[Translation]

Mr. Chrétien: Madam Speaker, we shall have answers to all those questions whenever the opposition will allow us to discuss them in committee.

* * *

[English]

INDUSTRY

MASSEY-FERGUSON—REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF REFINANCING PROPOSAL

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, my question is addressed to the ever ready Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and I see that he is getting prepared. Last night in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs the minister refused to confirm any plans to refinance Massey-Ferguson. As the minister spoke in committee, a member of my party actually revealed to the minister the details of such a plan. Would the minister confirm that there is a proposal whereby the federal government will guarantee some \$200 million worth of investment shares and, if so, will he now tell the House whether the government has agreed to the refinancing package announced by Massey-Ferguson yesterday? Is the minister willing to make a statement in the House explaining in clear terms the details of this proposal?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Madam Speaker, I will not be able to confirm that the amount the hon. member mentioned is the amount which the government of Ontario and the Government of Canada are willing to guarantee as part of an equity refinancing program for Massey-Ferguson. We have not yet agreed to the proposal set out by Massey-Ferguson in its statement of late yesterday afternoon. Our participation will depend on the working out of satisfactory terms and conditions, such as the terms and conditions from lenders involving the postponement of repay-

Oral Questions

ment of principal and interest and maintenance of lines of credit, as well as the agreement by Massey-Ferguson on conditions involving the maintenance of jobs and an increase in production, investment and research and development.

What I said in my press release on Monday is that the government of Ontario and the Government of Canada are:

—prepared to guarantee the capital risk of a portion of the new equity investment in Massey-Ferguson, providing various conditions are met, including a satisfactory degree of co-operation from the existing lenders.

I think that is pretty clear.

Mr. Broadbent: Madam Speaker, indeed it is very clear. The minister has just said that he will guarantee the new investors. I would like him to clarify the point even further, because the principal investors or largest shareholders in Massey-Ferguson are in fact the employees through their pension fund. Is the minister telling the House, then, that the Government of Canada will provide guarantees to the new free enterprise investors on their money so that they will not be taking any risk, but that the workers at Massey-Ferguson who have their pension funds tied up will not get any backing at all from the Government of Canada?

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Watch out, he's going to jump out of bed, Herb!

Mr. Gray: Madam Speaker, if Massey-Ferguson does not survive, the shares of the employees held in the pension fund will not be worth anything. Our objective is to attract new equity investment to Massey-Ferguson to enable its equity refinancing, so that the company will not only survive but be strengthened. In this way the workers will not only retain their jobs but the value of their shares will be preserved. This is our objective. I am surprised that my hon. friend does not agree with this because the UAW, representing the workers, issued a statement yesterday indicating support for that approach.

• (1430)

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. When they are more fully aware of the government's intentions, they may have some qualified opinions following on what the minister says they said yesterday. Will the minister confirm two things to the House. First, with this massive new investment that is going to take place, the inevitable result will be that the shares that are already held by the workers will decline very substantially in value. That is the inevitable result of this infusion of new capital. Therefore, they are not being guaranteed their investment to start with, as the minister is prepared to guarantee to new investors, and their current investment is going to go down in value. Second, if the Government of Canada is going to put up money for this enterprise, does the minister not think it is time that the Canadian public, which will be taking the risk, got some equity in the company?

Mr. Gray: Madam Speaker, the governments of Ontario and Canada have not said that they will be putting money into the company. They have said they are willing to guarantee the