

3. What was the (a) military (b) civilian strength of National Defence Headquarters as of October 1, 1978?

**Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of National Defence):** 1. (a) 79,033; (b) 21,178.

2. (a) 74,326; (b) 4,707.

3. (a) 2,753; (b) 4,255 (includes term, casual and FLIP employees).

#### CUSTOMS OFFICE—EDMONTON

#### Question No. 376—**Mr. Malone:**

How many items that passed through the Customs Office in Edmonton in (a) 1969 (b) 1976 (c) 1977, were destined for the Alberta towns of (i) Camrose (ii) Hay Lakes (iii) Armena (iv) Kingman (v) Round Hill (vi) Viking (vii) Sedgewick (viii) Lougheed (ix) Ohaton (x) Bawlf (xi) Daysland (xii) Strome (xiii) Killam (xiv) Forestburg (xv) Heisler (xvi) Ankerton (xvii) Rosalind (xviii) Kelsey (xix) Donalds (xx) Meeting Creek (xxi) Edberg (xxii) Ferintosh (xxiii) Bashaw (xxiv) Duhamel (xxv) New Norway (xxvi) Gwynne?

**Hon. Joseph-Philippe Guay (Minister of National Revenue):** The information is not readily available for the following reasons: For shipments arriving by air, highway and mail, customs entries are prepared which show the importer's name and address. These entries are filed in Edmonton by customs entry number and are held on file for five years. All entries for goods cleared at Edmonton, numbering approximately 225,000 for 1976-77 would have to be reviewed to determine if the address of the importer was one of the 26 locations mentioned. For shipments arriving by mail which are released as being free of duty and turned over to the post office for delivery to the importer, Customs maintains no record of the number of parcels so released.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The questions enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### STANDING ORDER 26

PETRO-CANADA—PURCHASE OF SHARES IN PACIFIC  
PETROLEUMS LTD.

**Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham):** Mr. Speaker, I gave you notice that I intended to ask leave today to move the adjournment of the House under the provisions of Standing Order 26.

On Friday afternoon, after the House adjourned for the weekend, Petro-Canada, a federal Crown corporation, committed itself to buy 48 per cent of Pacific Petroleum Ltd. of Calgary, and further committed the government to a potential minimum liability of \$1.4 billion, without reference to parliament. This agreement is subject to conditions respecting the management of Pacific Petroleum Ltd. which must be made almost immediately. We heard the minister indicate today that

#### S.O. 26

there is an important meeting on Thursday respecting that very matter.

If parliament is to have any input at all into the decision which substantially alters the nature and structure of the market, and commits parliament to massive but unapproved expenditures, it must intervene, in my submission, to defeat this matter immediately before the transaction is finalized. Therefore I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member, of course, would have to have the permission of the Chair to make that motion and then, in accordance with the terms of Standing Order 26, the motion would be made, not at this time but at some time later if it was my disposition pursuant to that standing order to grant his application that this was a proper matter to be discussed within the terms of Standing Order 26.

There are a number of aspects within the standing order to which I want to refer briefly. The first relates to a matter coming under the administrative competence of the government. According to subparagraph 5 of the rule, in determining whether the matter should have urgent consideration I have to give some consideration to the opportunity to discuss it in other ways and the extent to which that might be satisfactory in the circumstances.

Finally, subparagraph (16)(a) of the rule reads:

The matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency, calling for immediate and urgent consideration;

There has been some body of law or some argument that under Standing Order 43 the urgency really need only be urgency of consideration, but under Standing Order 26 this subparagraph of the rule certainly takes it simply as urgency of consideration and introduces an element of genuine emergency. In order to accede to the hon. member's request at this time, therefore, it seems to me I would have to find that a transaction, which on the face of it appears to be within the normal orbit of the purpose for which this Crown corporation was set up in the first place, had in some way become an emergency.

While it is obviously an impressive transaction and a very important transaction and, therefore, certainly cannot be brushed aside as an unimportant matter, nevertheless I do have the view, at least on the basis of the information I have at the present time, that there was nothing irregular or extraordinary about the transaction, and that it was within the competence of the Crown corporation which was set up for this kind of transaction by this parliament. It would therefore seem to me that without some element of an extraordinary nature or irregularity, at least by an initial impression, it would not be the proper subject for consideration pursuant to Standing Order 26.

In other words, the Crown corporation, being a creature which is given an independent life and authority by parliament, I think it would be quite extraordinary for parliament to recall the activities of that very independent Crown corporation each time the Crown corporation entered into a transac-