

Canada Development Corporation Act

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity. The hon. member's proposed motion cannot be put.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder whether we could have some explanation of why the Liberal party denies this motion but agreed to the motion proposed yesterday?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Is it a matter of having a two-faced policy on this question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT

AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE ESTABLISHMENT OF
MINERAL PROCESSING PLANT IN NORTHWESTERN
BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the order: Introduction of Bills.

Mr. Howard (Skeena)—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Canada Development Corporation Act (mineral processing)".

Mr. Speaker: Before proposing the motion of which notice has been given by the hon. member for Skeena, it might be appropriate for the Chair to offer one or two brief observations.

At first glance it does appear that the title of the proposed bill may be defective in that, while it purports to amend the Canada Development Corporation Act, it does, in effect, give that body, or some other corporation, the power or authority to establish a smelter or refinery in northwestern British Columbia under the provisions of the Canada Development Corporation Act. Ordinarily, it seems that authority of that kind is granted under the provisions of private legislation.

Additionally, there is the question of the propriety or legality of endeavouring to direct the use of the funds of the corporation which, in part, consist of private as well as public moneys.

The procedural difficulties to which I have alluded should be considered in due course by the House and by the Chair. The motion will be put at this time without ruling on the question immediately, subject to further scrutiny of the question in due course.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-210, to amend the Canada Development Corporation Act (mineral processing).

An hon. Member: Explain.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, someone has asked me to explain but I think you have done that adequately by indicating the purpose of the bill. It seeks to stop the export of job opportunities for Canadians in regard to processing of minerals in this nation by seeking to give the Canada Development Corporation, a body set up by this parliament, the authority, either by itself or in conjunction with other corporations or with the province of

[Mr. Speaker.]

British Columbia, to build a smelter and/or refinery in British Columbia.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

ELECTION EXPENSES BILL

AMENDMENTS TO CANADA ELECTIONS ACT AND INCOME
TAX ACT

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-211, to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

• (1450)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**THE CANADIAN ECONOMY**

REASON FOR LABOUR FORCE FLUCTUATIONS—
ADEQUACY OF BUDGET MEASURES TO PRODUCE
SUFFICIENT STIMULATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance who a few days ago referred to his expectation that there would be fluctuations in the labour force for some months ahead. This has been borne out by the report from Statistics Canada for the month of April compared with the month of March. I will not ask the minister to engage in any lengthy explanation, but can he say in a few words why this phenomenon is taking place at this time?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the fluctuation in the month to month figures in the budget speech a week ago Monday and have nothing further to add except that, while I take some encouragement from the trend represented by today's figures, it is still small encouragement for the 600,000 men and women who are out of work.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the minister takes encouragement from this because I was going to ask him whether, in view of the fact that employment in three very employee-intensive industries, manufacturing, services and recreation, and sales declined in the month of April compared with the month of March, he would review his position that the economy has sufficient stimulation under the measures he proposed last week.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I stand by the position I presented to the House in the budget, and obviously the hon. member, if he disagrees with it, will continue the debate.