[English]

PROTEST AGAINST FLOODING OF SKAGIT RIVER VALLEY BY PROPOSED HIGHER DAM—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I rise to propose a motion of pressing and urgent necessity arising from the refusal of the city of Seattle in the state of Washington to cancel the proposed plan to raise the height of the Ross dam on the American Skagit River which will cause the flooding of the upstream Canadian Skagit River valley contrary to the protest against such flooding delivered by the government of Canada to the Seattle city council on March 31, 1972.

Recognizing the contribution of the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand) who generously offered to join with others in seconding this motion, with unanimous consent I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose):

That the House of Commons of Canada is unalterably and unanimously opposed to the flooding of the Canadian Skagit River valley which will result from the proposed city of Seattle project to raise the height of the present Ross dam situated in the state of Washington and downstream from the Canada-United States border; and

That this House further resolves that the government of Canada deliver the text of this resolution forthwith to the government of the United States of America, the government of the state of Washington, and the council of the city of Seattle.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's motion is proposed under the terms of Standing Order 43 and requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed. Motion agreed to.

* * *

FINANCE

STEPS TO PREVENT EXCESSIVE PROFITS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Terry Grier (Toronto-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move, seconded by the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Harney):

That the Minister of Finance make a statement on motions indicating what steps the government plans to introduce to prevent excessive profits being made.

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: This motion also requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity and the motion cannot be put.

ENERGY

OIL EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN EASTERN CANADA—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I also rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to Standing Order 43. It has to do with the energy crisis which is particularly acute in its effects on eastern Canada.

In view of the extreme dependence of eastern Canada on foreign suppliers for our oil requirements and the desirability of developing our own offshore production capabilities, and in view of the reported detrimental effects on exploration and development projects by major oil companies caused by the jurisdictional disputes between federal and provincial governments, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources meet immediately with the appropriate provincial ministers to resolve, once and for all, these jurisdictional disputes and procedural impediments which this nation as a whole can no longer afford.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity and the motion cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ENERGY

CONSERVATION PROGRAM WITHIN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS TO AVOID POSSIBLE INTERRUPTION OF SUPPLIES FROM MIDDLE EAST

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the statement of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources last evening and the concern he expressed about security of supply and the importance of conservation, and in view of his failure to indicate any measures that the government is taking within its own organization to conserve energy, can the Prime Minister