

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, July 29, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

DIVORCE ACT

PROPOSED PREPARATION AND STUDY BY COMMITTEE OF AMENDMENTS TO ACT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under Standing Order 43, the circumstances of which appear in the motion itself and are prompted by the disappointing response given to me yesterday by the Minister of Justice. I move that:

This House, aware of and alarmed by the glacial progress of reform in the field of domestic relations and divorce and the urgent need to rectify certain obvious and pressing problems, urges the government immediately to prepare and introduce for debate and discussion in an appropriate committee of parliament a green paper on divorce reform, including changes covering maintenance and support.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

SPORTS

SUGGESTED PROGRAMS TO EXPEDITE CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to Standing Order 43. In view of increasing evidence that Canadian amateur sport requires additional emphasis and encouragement in order that Canadian athletes can take part successfully in world level competition and more importantly to foster greater participation by Canadians in various forms of physical recreation, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That the Minister of National Health and Welfare initiate more specific programs for this purpose in conjunction with provinces to expedite the construction of additional sporting facilities, and that funds for this purpose be provided to communities which have demonstrated by their own initiative that they are willing to utilize and manage such projects.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ENERGY

MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—POSSIBILITY OF UNITED STATES RELEASING STUDY OF PIPELINE PROPOSAL

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development may I address my question to the Acting Prime Minister. Has the government been in contact with United States government officials concerning the release by the U.S. department of the interior of its study of the Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited's Mackenzie valley pipeline proposal?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will either take that as notice, or I believe the Minister of Indian Affairs will be in the House shortly and perhaps it can be redirected to him when he arrives.

MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—SUGGESTED FOLLOW UP OF DEFECTS IN PROPOSAL ALLEGED BY UNITED STATES STUDY

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the U.S. study determines safety factors, leak detection, operating plans and seismic monitoring to be inadequate for the scope of the project as well as criticizes proposals by the consortium for seasonal maintenance and an unrealistic operating schedule, what was the degree of awareness on the part of the government of these concerns expressed by the U.S. department of the interior, and will the government be doing a follow up study on the particular items of contention expressed in the U.S. study to ensure correction of the inadequacies in the proposal as they apply to Canada?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Perhaps I can deal with some of those points, Mr. Speaker, because they relate to the hearing which will be conducted before the National Energy Board. It is precisely for dealing with that kind of question that the law provides for a National Energy Board hearing. Indeed, the board would require the applicants to submit evidence in response to those kinds of criteria. I presume that my colleague will have drawn this to the attention of Mr. Justice Berger, if his Lordship has not already taken it into account. In addition, of course, these