

I want to emphasize once again that there is no difficulty with the United States Administration. It remains as committed to this project as it was when the Prime Minister and the President announced it some time ago.

As a matter of fact, a similar statement was made just recently. However, the United States Administration has found that the plan for procurement is obnoxious. I ask the pipeline czar, how could the Secretary of State for External Affairs be so wrong; and has he on his desk, for signature, that procurement plan?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, there was nothing wrong with the statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I would repeat the statement today, on behalf of the government, by saying that the government of the United States is still committed to carrying forward this major international project.

What the hon. member is referring to is a procurement plan that must be submitted by Foothills Pipe Lines and approved by the minister. That plan has been circulated confidentially to the United States and provincial governments. The object, of course, is to maximize economic benefits to Canada.

It is not surprising that there might be some concerns expressed by the United States about our procurement plan. These concerns will be discussed by the pipeline commissioner who is presently in Washington. I assure the hon. member that the procurement plan that will be approved by the minister will be in accordance with the agreement with the United States and with the law that was passed by parliament.

**Mr. Alexander:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the minister's enthusiasm and optimism has certainly been exaggerated. As a matter of fact, his credibility is showing.

The Canadian people would like to know all the facts. Can the minister give me the assurance that he will stand in his place on Friday of this week—and no later—in order to make a statement on motions outlining the entire scenario, the facts and the pros and cons with respect to this pipeline, so the Canadian people will know the whole truth and not just that part of it which comes to our attention by way of press comments every now and again. Will he give us an opportunity of hearing the whole story?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should be asking for the whole story and complaining about a lack of facts. Last night I appeared before the standing committee dealing with northern pipelines. I made an opening statement and I answered all the questions that were put to me by members of the committee. If the hon. gentleman had been on his toes and off the mark—

**Mr. Alexander:** Will you answer the question?

**Mr. MacEachen:** —he would have been there and taken advantage of that occasion.

*Point of Order—Mr. W. Baker*

**POINT OF ORDER**

MR. BAKER (GRENVILLE-CARLETON)—REQUEST FOR MEETING OF HOUSE LEADERS TO DISCUSS BILL C-32

**Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, my point of order is with respect to business of the House. It deals with a specific piece of legislation and is a matter which arose out of the question period today. During the course of the question period today I indicated the position which our party would be taking with respect to this bill. I want to say to the minister that it would be appropriate perhaps if we met with respect to the carriage of this bill. Given the amendments which we feel should be put to the bill, not to destroy it but to strengthen it, it is worthy of that kind of meeting. Since the matter—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, the matter arose in the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Yesterday I recognized the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) on a point of order during which he developed some inquiries about House business related to a reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Today the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) at the end of the question period is raising by way of a point of order a further question about House business.

If the House wishes to proceed this way and ask questions by way of a point of order about House business at the end of the question period, I am prepared to be directed by the House. However, I think that we must be careful because what has been reserved as a point of order on Thursdays after the question period occurred yesterday and is occurring again today. I just do not want to encourage the House to drift to a point where at the end of the question period every day we ask questions about House business under the guise of a point of order. Therefore, I would want to be very strict with what we are doing here.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I share the Chair's concern with respect to this situation. However, I think that it is important that the government House leader and the House know that it is our intention to strengthen that bill—because this interest engages the attention of members on all sides of the House—and that we intend to bring amendments forward within the period of time to strengthen that bill. We want to strengthen the prohibitions in the bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** Surely the hon. member is indicating the intention of his party in respect to a piece of legislation. We have even drifted away from the usual Thursday point of order. I think that we are getting into what may be a debate on the bill with regard to anticipating a measure. I do not know if there is a question in the hon. member's point of order, but if there is he should put it forthwith.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of debating. The government is trying to leave the