

*Canada Lands Surveys Act*

[Translation]

## CANADA LANDS SURVEYS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources)** moved that Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Lands Surveys Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

**Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-4 which I have the honour to introduce provides amendments to the Canada Lands Surveys Act which will make it possible to control and manage more effectively the survey of public lands in Canada. Those lands, according to the definition given in the Canada Lands Surveys Act, in its present form, mean "any lands, belonging to Her Majesty in right of Canada or of which the government of Canada has power to dispose, that are situated in the Yukon Territory, the Northwest Territories or in National Park of Canada and any lands that are surrendered lands or reserves as defined in the Indian Act".

The present legislation on the survey of Canadian land also provides for the appointment of a Board of Examiners which will look into all matters concerning the examination, admittance and qualifications of the candidates to a commission of Dominion land surveyor or to a certificate of Dominion topographical surveyors.

[English]

The Canada Lands Surveys Act, which came into effect in January, 1952, replaced the former Dominion Lands Surveys Act. It has been amended twice since then, once in 1956 and again in 1966. As a result of increasing exploration in Canada's offshore areas and rapid technological advances in surveying techniques, particularly in the last few years, it is felt that changes in the act are needed.

The application of the act should be extended in order to bring the legal surveys required for the management and control of offshore resources under legislative authority and to facilitate better the administration, direction and control of surveys of all Canada lands. Accordingly, the term "public lands" has been deleted from the act and has been replaced by the term "Canada lands", which is broader in scope and more appropriate with respect to the new legislation. In addition, there is a need to re-define the professional standards of Dominion land surveyors, appropriate to the new era that has been opened up by rapid technological advances.

The revised standards should be comprehensive enough to embrace all persons engaged in surveying, whether on land, over or under water—mainly the offshore environment—or from the air, including the use of satellites, as well as in the interpretation, processing and display of resulting data. There is also a need for revision of educational and apprenticeship requirements in relation to the methods of qualifying surveyors of Canada lands and for an expanded board of examiners,

[The Acting Speaker.]

designed to administer effectively what is, in essence, a public trust.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, one of the main objectives of these amendments is precisely to bring under the administration of this legislation the official surveys made in off-shore areas, as is the case for lands situated in the Yukon Territory, the Northwest Territories, Indian reserves, surrendered lands and national parks. Current regulations on oil and gas lands in Canada provide that only a federal surveyor may carry out an official survey of Canada lands in the sense intended by the regulation. The department intends to apply the provisions of the Canada Lands Surveys Act to all official off-shore surveys and to the specification of standards related to these surveys.

Another objective is to give to Yukon and Northwest Territories commissioners the power to undertake surveys of Canada lands they are administering in their respective territory. At the present time, the legislation empowers the ministers responsible for the administration of land in Canada to request the surveying of that land, but since the administration of the pieces of land that encompass territorial communities has been transferred to the commissioners in council, that power should also be extended to the commissioners.

A third objective is to repeal the sections requiring that Canada lands be laid out in quadrilateral townships, except where otherwise directed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. That system, which was initially devised for the subdivision of lands in the Prairie provinces, is not applicable for it provides for the establishment of a rectangular system of reserves so that roads, whether they be north-south or east-west oriented, may be equidistant. It is obvious that such a system is not practical in mountainous or uneven regions, as exist in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, and in practically all national parks and in several Indian reserves. Moreover, the repeal of those sections would make it unnecessary to amend the act following metric conversion.

As to the need to redefine the professional standards of federal lands surveyor, we could improve the quality of land surveys in Canada by making sure that surveyors are better qualified and fully conversant with the surveying methods which apply to off-shore areas. It would also be desirable to convey a new title to surveyors, that of Canada Lands Surveyor, to replace and supersede the previous title of federal surveyor or Federal topographer. It would also be desirable to gather under this designation all professionals who meet the requirements of land surveying in Canada, because in this era, conditions keep on changing, no matter whether these professionals operate on land, on sea, on the ocean floor or in the air. This new title stems from the new definition of "Canada Lands" which appears in the act.

The bill proposes to increase the number of members on the Board of Examiners from three to five, four of them being persons having training and practical experience in the major fields of surveying.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that the proposed amendments are likely to improve the quality of land surveying in Canada.

Moreover, a number of very minor amendments which are desirable are included in this bill.

● (1210)

[English]

**Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, on the surface this appears to be a housekeeping measure to set up machinery for a modern system of surveys suitable for our northern and offshore lands. However, on reading through the legislation it becomes obvious that this is more than a housekeeping bill. There is a political operation going on here reflecting the government's determination to do away with the nomenclature we traditionally use to describe our country.

This country is still, legally, the Dominion of Canada, and traditionally we call the survey the Dominion Land Survey. The main object of this bill, and everywhere where that phrase is used, is to get rid of the word Dominion and replace it by Canada. And the phrase "Dominion lands" is replaced by "Canada lands". Looking around this country today, we find alienation from the government, alienation between the regions, alienation between groups. Surely we are in enough trouble. But here we find just one more exacerbation of the alienation to which I have referred. I cannot understand what possible good the government is doing by yielding to a few extremists who want to get rid of the word "Dominion". The word "Dominion" was decided upon at the time of the formation of our nation by people of many ethnic origins. They were to have dominion over this land from sea to sea. Yet here we find this squirreling going on.

The proposal to set up a survey system suitable for the north will arouse no great excitement among our people. But carrying into a housekeeping act this additional needle, adding to the tension which already exists in the country, is not sound, especially at a time when we should be working toward national unity, not disunity. I have to point this out loud and clear—and if my right hon. friend from Prince Albert were here he would make the point more forcefully than that.

The next point I wish to make concerns the handling of affairs in the territorial areas. If we look at the legislation which gives statutory powers to the minister in charge of the north we find he has all the powers of a czar. Any conscientious minister aware of this great power in his hands must worry a great deal about its exercise. I had it for three years and I must say it worried me. Every week scores of forms passed across my desk for me to sign, affecting the livelihood and security of people in the north about whose affairs I had no knowledge. Nor was it possible to gain personal knowledge of what was involved, since no minister can regularly fly 4,000 miles here and 4,000 there. He has to accept the words of his officials.

In 1963, when the government changed, the late Arthur Laing became minister. He decided to delegate this part of the work load to a number of senior officials across the north—a huge region. Knowing his sincerity, I asked him in the House whether he would make certain that the officials to whom he

### *Canada Lands Surveys Act*

had delegated this power understood the significance of this completely dictatorial authority. Let me give the House an example of what I have in mind.

When you look at a map of the Yukon it becomes apparent that there is a vast unsurveyed area. In accordance with our concept of law, no one owns it. When land was granted to people in that area, every single acre had to be approved by the minister. Under Mr. Laing, that authority was transferred to five or six senior officials. Let hon. members read the legislation before them. That power still resides with the minister here. Any Privy Councillor, not only the minister directly responsible, can order the officials to conduct a survey. In addition, the commissioner can so order.

To get back to what I was saying: you see this vast area which does not belong to anyone—it is public land—and you approve a survey and give ownership of title. But suppose that in this vast area there are groups of native people, Indians here and Eskimos there, who use this land as a place to settle down during the seasons of the year when they are not travelling. When you find out months or years later that you have allowed a document to go through your hands, and you have allowed surveyors to go in and survey a piece of land and give ownership to a person, and you did not even realize the ownership you were turning over on a blank sheet of paper happened to be the traditional wintering grounds of 200 or 300 families of loyal Canadian citizens, that is what I mean by the danger which is not mentioned in this legislation.

● (1220)

In this legislation we have applied all the dictatorial rules which we applied to the citizens of the south, that if the government has directed that a piece of land be surveyed, any person is punished if he stops that survey. You can cross a person's land in southern Canada, and if any effort is made to hinder the surveyor, that person is the one who is guilty. They have applied this type of southern culture to the north.

Officials think the north is such a huge place that rarely will there be cases of infringement on native habits and customs. The fact is that it has been happening for all the years I can remember. Under this legislation you give statutory power, as if these native people are the same as those of us who are domesticated down here in the southern part of the country where we are used to taking orders from governments. These people have no legal claim to the land, under our law. They have just a moral right to it. They keep moving around and are not happy with a fixed boundary. Therefore I should point out to the minister and to the government that this housekeeping legislation has inherent in it great power to harm innocent people and a great ability to break a moral custom or a moral right that these people have to access and use of this land. We are used to the fact that you put a wall or a fence around your property and say, "That is mine", but they are not.

I am aware of various groups which have been formed to put forward the rights of the native people. These rights have not been accepted under our law yet, although an agreement has been made. This problem of human relations between the mass

*Canada Lands Surveys Act*

of the Canadian people and these few thousand Indians up there is ignored in this legislation. This is looked on as purely a question of improving the survey system, and purely a question of getting the machinery to act efficiently.

We forget the lessons of our history when we move in and attack the culture of people. For example, when we moved in and attacked the culture of the Metis who lived along the Red River and the Assiniboine in Manitoba, the result was a rebellion in 1870. Every time you monkey around with a person's land or his culture, you get into trouble. I do not see any awareness in this legislation that there is any question of asking permission before you walk across a man's land to survey. It just provides that you have the right and the man will be punished if he interferes in any way. The only answer to this problem is for us in this parliament to trust the humanitarianism and the fair play of the minister and the commissioners of these various territories. That is all we have to protect us.

Under this legislation we are giving a tremendous dictatorial power, to public servants in most cases, but let us call them surveyors, and taking it away from the minister. It has to be done with some sort of a survey system. Referring to the question of commissioners, I would think that has to be supported. It has always struck me as very wrong that a minister in Ottawa has this power over 60 per cent of the land mass of this country. The power includes the bottom of the sea, the Arctic, the Pacific and the Atlantic half way across the ocean, which is probably three or four times more area than we have in the land mass. All this tremendous power under our legislation is now concentrated in the cabinet ministers here in Ottawa.

The phrase "and the commissioner" has been added over and over again in this legislation. The commissioner is the person who is responsible to Ottawa. He heads up the Yukon government and the commission which heads up the Northwest Territories. Some day I expect we will have two territories to make up the present Northwest Territories. At least we have turned over the power a little closer to the people, because the commissioners in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories have to share some of their decision-making powers with the elected council. Sharing the power which is now held by the minister or other Privy Councillors over the north, and widening that out to include the commissioners of the two territories, is an improvement. That improvement has to be supported.

The final point I should like to make is on the survey. The parliamentary secretary is quite correct when he said you cannot use the American style survey that we used in opening up the Canadian west. Because our west is reasonably rolling and level, it was very easy for us to adopt the survey of Ohio or Pennsylvania and bring it into western Canada.

If you look at the history of surveys in western Canada, there were five different stages of surveys. Essentially they were very unique and useful to us because every mile north and south there is a road, and every two miles east and west there is a road.

As I have said in this House on many occasions, the province of Saskatchewan, where only 4 per cent of the people of Canada live, has 36 per cent to 40 per cent of the roads, and that is why we get so sensitive when somebody comes along and wants to apply a new survey system. We spent the last 100 years, or at least the last 70 years, paying for these roads on one system of survey, and then the government comes along, carrying out the orders of a few junior grade public servants, and applies a new system of survey measurements called the metric system, for no good reason. We are not selling land around the world, and yet we are asked under the laws of the province of Saskatchewan to survey in a foreign system, which means millions of dollars of cost to governments at the municipal and provincial levels. It also means hundreds of millions of dollars of cost to individuals living in towns, cities, as well as in the country. This is rammed through even on the docile, domesticated Canadians who live in the south, and they do not like it. We can take it because at least we can read and know we are being gored.

When we go into a survey system in the north, it is not just a question of adaptation to some other survey system from a country like the United States or what we have in Ontario, the maritimes or Quebec. This is a survey system which has to be developed. It is designed for the rivers of the north and is designed for the mountains of the north. Imagine how silly it would be putting in a square system where you have a valley with the tablelands on each side of that river running a few miles out, and then into mountains which go up 8,000, 10,000 or 12,000 feet. In the early days of the French colony everybody lived along the rivers and the long lines served them very well. This is not the system which will work in the north.

• (1230)

In the north it is essentially a question of getting a survey system that is simple to operate on a resource based economy. Whether we like it or not, with some of our current, temporary, non-growth philosophies, the north is a tremendous resource area. To picture it clearly, just think of the resources at the bottom of the sea. Fish and other things live down there. A survey system designed for a settled area, along a river or in a mountainous river area such as there is in the northwest or the tundra of the central Arctic, would not apply to the bottom of the sea. It should be done on a grid system based on the natural curvature of the earth, such as is already in place in the Territorial Lands Act. That is how oil and gas permits are assessed and granted.

The grid system would be easy to locate because it could be numbered in such a way that to get a certain map, by a simple formula of taking the first number and second number—I am not an expert in this—you could pull out that map. I know it is not necessary to put all the details of the type of survey in the legislation. The legislation before us simply gives the power to set up such a survey system as the minister directs and as is suitable for the north. The details come in the regulations, but sometimes when those regulations are being developed it helps to know that someone has some ideas about what makes a good survey system. If you think of a non-populated area, a

*Canada Lands Surveys Act*

terrain that is not smooth like the prairies, then it is really a question of getting a grid system which will make it easy to do the bookkeeping and indexing so that the people who work in the north know where the corners of those grids are and can measure from there.

We have made a good start in the oil lands but I know the base lines are not in place, and if there is any great quarrel over a few feet of land there could be a disaster up there. The fact remains, however, that we need a survey system based on big territory, and a simple grid system that can be easily indexed so that locations can easily be found.

I now come to the last point on this matter of the survey. I have mentioned the grid system as opposed to the linear type of measurement back from a river. We have talked about the square system that works fairly well in the prairies, except in the bush and the rolling country along the rivers in the north prairies, but now we are moving into a new area of great immensity—I would say ten times larger than the land mass of Canada. We have to develop a system for this that is easy to locate. In the case of the underwater grid I think it will have to be done with references to base line points where, by triangulation and the use of modern radar equipment, location can be established by tuning into the signal given off by the beacon.

All this is known to the scientists who have developed this system in the years since World War II. We have a tremendous amount of knowledge about it which must be transmitted to the new class of surveyor who will be working in the north. That is why we have to approve this question of the schooling and discipline of those surveyors.

There is a purely political, common sense question that I should like to put to the government. Another bill is before the House on metric conversion which provides for the amendment of 90 different statutes before there can be complete conversion to the metric system at the federal level. Yet this bill before us does not seem to be aware that there is such a thing going on as metric conversion. Presumably we will have to bring this bill back in two years to be changed over to the metric system.

I simply suggest that if there is someone in the government who understands the difficulty of the government House leader in trying to get legislation through, he should tell these brilliant nitwits who draft the legislation to remember that there is another bill before us on metric conversion. In this area we are moving into the unknown—there are no cultures in the offshore areas being attacked; we are not stirring up the cultural traditions of a peasant people or anything like that, so why not agree to start out with the system that will eventually be imposed all across the country? I suppose this never crossed the minds of those who prepare legislation, but surely someone at the ministerial level on the legislative committee of cabinet should be able to see further than the political attractions of changing the name from “public lands” to “Canada lands” and from “Dominion land surveyor” to “Canada land surveyor,” which will probably make him a better Canadian! It is stirring up disunity. Surely the legislative committee of cabinet should realize that another minister is trying to put through a

metric conversion bill which only covers nine statutes and another bill will be required to cover the other 81 statutes.

Has the cabinet lost its capacity to think? Has the cabinet simply turned everything over to the genial, brilliant nitwits who came up with this? Where are the people in cabinet who think? Surely someone in cabinet must pay some attention to the ordinary, commonplace task of being a Privy Councillor?

There is nothing we can do about this situation today, but the bill will have to be amended before it is passed if the government seriously intends to bring in the metric system. I think it is time a giant firecracker was let off under the cabinet. When the government brought in a bill to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act yesterday the opposition demonstrated that it could support it because in the main it was good legislation. But it does irritate us to have to take time over a housekeeping bill when obviously the minister presenting it does not realize that another minister is trying to get the metric system accepted.

This bill discusses surveys and is a demonstration of the asinine type of thing that goes on in to the government. As people say when a government is in office too long, it is time they had a rest. I think this certainly applies now.

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

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, to my mind, Bill C-4 is of very great importance. Indeed, it amends the existing act considerably. First, it proposes the repeal of the designation “Dominion” as applied to the lands of Canada in the act as it now stands. I feel that the substitution of the word “Canada” is quite normal in view of the evolution of our country.

If we go back to 1931, when the Statute of Westminster was passed we note that the word “Canada” is mentioned more often than the word “Dominion”. Therefore, if we really want to assert ourselves as a people, who are proud of our country, we should everywhere, as much as possible, designate it under the name of Canada. For my part, I feel in no way offended by the proposed change. On the contrary: I am quite happy with it because in a few weeks we will be celebrating Canada Day. And so we evolve, we grow progressively. Our laws must absolutely be amended to reflect the change and use the word which should, more and more, find preference in the hearts of Canadians.

With regard to surveying, I must say that I had occasion, when I was a bit younger, to work with surveyors. I did love their work. I thought it was wonderful to accompany those men who knew the terrain quite well, who could draw up plans so that the owners who later would live on those sites would recognize their lands and situate them very specifically. I also has occasion to participate in some research work to locate some land which belonged to an estate but had not been surveyed, as a result of which, quarrels and a trial ensued. That cost a lot of money, precisely because the land had not been surveyed: it should have been before, but had never been.

*Canada Lands Surveys Act*

Unfortunately, the heirs to the land spent huge amounts of money trying to prove they really had title to the land.

I feel that for a Canadian who owns land it is very important that he should know where it is located and what its limits are. To my mind, it is so important that he should know it by memory. The small plot of land one lives on, one really owns, is the embryo of one's country. Bill C-4 provides more than that.

Such surveys apply to the lands under the jurisdiction of the federal government, and as the parliamentary secretary said earlier, that will add to the responsibilities of Canada lands surveyors who will be drawing boundary lines even under water; as an amendment in this regard was passed this year and as Canada has extended its territorial limit to 200 miles, it will be necessary to be clear on that point if we want to be significant. We will then be able to defend our privileges and our rights if foreign fishermen were to fish within our limit.

This legislation also amends the selection procedures of new candidates. In my opinion, this new method seems at first sight excellent, for it quite clearly determines the requirements. No one shall be disqualified, for a provision of the legislation provides that the surveyors who are presently performing their duties will not be disqualified. They will be allowed to perform their duties without being disturbed.

The main feature of this bill is that it gives a commissioner in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon the kind of authority Parliament wants to have. I think this is a provision in the bill we will have to consider more particularly in committee. To be convinced about this I shall certainly have to hear extremely valid reasons because I do not agree, at this time at least, with the idea that a commissioner should enjoy powers similar to those of a minister of the Parliament of Canada. Perhaps there are reasons of which I am not aware and when I know them I may change my mind but, in any event, right now I find it is not quite correct to give a commissioner this kind of responsibilities. In brief, the bill concerns a very considerable expanse of land and the subsoil may contain unknown wealth. By giving the commissioner authority to have the land surveyed without any form of control on the part of the Parliament of Canada, we would be careless, I think.

Anyway, there is another clause in the bill which worries me a little, the one providing that the minister may appoint somebody from his office. That clause reads as follows:

"Surveyor General" means a person who is a Canada Lands Surveyor and is appointed as Surveyor General in the manner authorized by law or a person authorized by the minister to carry out the duties of the Surveyor General."

I am a little concerned by the fact that the minister is empowered to appoint somebody to carry out the role of the Surveyor General. That leaves the impression that it is not necessary for the appointee to be a surveyor. Here again, when we review the bill in committee I hope the parliamentary secretary or the minister will be able to give us explanations to justify that amendment to the act.

I would not like to go any further on this subject because as a whole this bill, save for the restrictions I mentioned, is a step

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

forward. It had become necessary to bring in amendments to the legislation, to get it clearer, so that we may really identify the borders of Canada without encroaching upon the rights of the provinces. As a matter of fact, there are also surveyors who carry out their profession in areas of provincial jurisdiction. The legislation provides that those surveyors can occasionally do surveys and act as if they were surveyors under Canadian government jurisdiction. Therefore, I do not see why they might have to complain about those changes which do not alter their rights in any way but, on the contrary, add to them since they are provided with even more responsibilities and they are being recognized as a necessary occupation. I am happy for them. I am convinced that Bill C-4 will certainly pass once amended in the way I have indicated and I assume that these people will be glad to have a clear and precise piece of legislation. It will thus encourage them to do their duties and to carry out their occupation in the best interests of the public.

● (1240)

[English]

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I am interested in two aspects of the bill, one of which has been mentioned by two of the previous speakers, namely, our relationship to the Dominion. It seems to me that we are being picayune in wanting to change the word "Dominion" to "Canada".

● (1250)

I have no objection to our country being called Canada. I have never really objected to the word "Dominion", but I think it is very picayune and it must take the kind of mentality I see in some quarters to think that it is going to be advantageous to bring forward every piece of legislation and change the word "Dominion" to "Canada". If the government really were sincere, it would bring forward enabling legislation to establish the basis for the definition of Canada. Then it would apply that substantive legislation to all the other pieces of legislation which are affected.

I can see us bringing a bill forward with regard to the Dominion Observatory to have it changed to the Canada Observatory. I can see us bringing forward all the other pieces of legislation which use the word "Dominion". It seems to me that we should first establish a definition for Canada. We should do that in a piece of legislation calling Canada "Canada". However, we should not be playing with it. How long do the Liberals think they can take advantage of using our establishment as a Dominion for 110 years, and use it for other purposes on a perpetual basis by changing the word "Dominion" wherever it occurs periodically to "Canada"? Surely we ought to have enough guts to decide what we want to do, to act in a strong and forceful way and to pass substantive legislation in one measure to change all the acts which are affected. We do this with other things: why should we not do it in this case?

In a similar vein I am concerned that we really have not done anything about the territories. We are passing this piece of legislation not only for the new territories we are obtaining

in the 200-mile offshore zone, but we are also applying it to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. We are saying that the minister is no longer directly responsible for federal services in those areas in this regard, and certainly the operation of surveying is not small, although it affects a small number of surveyors. I presume they are in this category. We should really be looking at what we are going to do about some kind of self determination for the people of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon and giving them the right to make decisions about surveyors.

Surveyors are very important. In my part of the country they have been immensely important. The parliamentary secretary said that surveying is a science. If it is a science, it is a very inexact one on many occasions. There have been multimillion dollar lawsuits over the opinion of one surveyor against the opinion of another. This has happened particularly with regard to mining claims. Fortunes have been made and lost depending on lines drawn by surveyors. We have been very fortunate to have had the surveyors we have had. Surveyors have been able to establish a very accurate accounting of the lands of this country, and I would not want to see that changed.

It may not be offensive to change the number of members of the board from three to five, but I think we should be very careful with the training which is required and about the assurance which is given at the bottom of a deed, whether it be in the Northwest Territories or anywhere else. When a surveyor signs a deed, he has a responsibility, and the designation he gives to a particular property is important. We have been very fortunate over the years that our training of surveyors has been sufficient to ensure that a deed is accurate. I do not particularly want to see us dilute that by allowing the commissioners to have the responsibility for surveying. I am quite happy to see that responsibility remain in the hands of provincial authorities, and I think in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon until we make the decision—and I hope it is very soon—that they will have the control of the surveyors and other government officials in their area, that control should remain the responsibility of the federal minister.

I do not want to prolong this. If the parliamentary secretary wants this bill passed before one o'clock, that is all right, but I want to point out that many people feel abused every time we go through this stupid argument about changing the word "Dominion" to the word "Canada".

If we really want to do that, let us pass legislation which will enable all other pieces of legislation to be changed by registering them under the enabling legislation. That will cause fewer hassles and will probably do more to promote unity than the kind of division which always comes about when we talk about changing the word "Dominion" to the word "Canada" or "Canadian".

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I wish to inform the House that, if I recognize the parliamentary secretary at this time, he will close the debate.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

### *Administration of Justice*

**Mr. Maurice Dupras (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I personally have no difficulty with the word "Dominion". I regret that in some parts of the country some people feel the way the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) and the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) described. It seems that it is still difficult for some Canadians to accept that things can be Canadian. I see no difficulty with this type of evolution whereby more and more we are trying to develop a Canadian nationalism and a Canadian identification. I feel that the word "Canada" should be used more and more.

The faculty for adaptation of some of us is better than that of others, but inevitably things will be more and more Canadian. This is our country. I am proud that our major airline is called Air Canada, and we also have a company called Canadian Pacific. After all, they are Canadian.

[*Translation*]

I have much hesitation, difficulty and impatience, Mr. Speaker, when I see that some of my fellow citizens are still reluctant to identify more and more as Canadians. Having visited all parts of my country in the last couple of years, I can see that it does not correspond so much to the feelings I have detected in Canadians of all parts of the country. In the east as in the west, Canadians tend more and more to identify as such and more and more express this feeling of nationalism which takes so long to blossom out in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it being one o'clock, I would like to continue after lunch.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

---

### HIGH-FREQUENCY FOR FIDO

According to a story in *The Globe and Mail*, Canadian mailmen are now protecting themselves against dogs by beaming a high-frequency sound at them. They used to use a spray, but it is difficult to aim precisely while being devoured, and anyway, the owners were often more bloodthirsty than their pets.

However, before urban surveyors buy this boon, they may consider that ultra high frequencies are used by certain insects, and more particularly by bats. This raises disturbing possibilities of escaping the dog, only to be attacked by beavies of bats, or worse, African Killer bees, made mad by a high-frequency mating call.