

*Nuclear Tests***EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****FORTHCOMING NUCLEAR TESTS BY FRANCE—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION**

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a motion under Standing Order 43. In view of the impending French nuclear tests in the Pacific some time this month and in view of the mounting world protests, including those from our Commonwealth partners, Australia and New Zealand, I seek, under Standing Order 43, unanimous consent of the House to move a resolution in similar terms to those adopted by this chamber in regard to the Amchitka test by the United States and the nuclear tests by France last year. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Mather):

That the Canadian House of Commons again calls on all nuclear powers to cease all testing of nuclear devices and specifically on the government of France to cancel all its proposed nuclear tests in the Pacific Ocean.

**Mr. Speaker:** Under the terms of Standing Order 43 the motion proposed by the hon. member for Kootenay West requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

● (1410)

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent? It is difficult to determine. Perhaps we should call for the "nays" this time.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there is unanimous consent provided the motion is not debated.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed? Is there unanimous consent to the proposal of the President of the Privy Council?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Since there is unanimous consent, the motion will be put.

Motion agreed to.

On the order: Motions.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I do so at this time because it appears we are at the conclusion of the item, motions, on our agenda and no one on the government side has risen to make an announcement to the House about a matter of very great importance that I raised a while ago. I refer to the agreement between Canada and the United States signed on April 19 of this year which, effective tomorrow, seeks to bring about a severe restriction of the opportunities for Canadian fishermen on the west coast to fish stocks of United States-bound salmon while enhancing and increasing the opportunity of United States fishermen on the same coast to fish close to shore up to our three mile limit and seriously impinge on the stocks of Canadian-bound and Canadian-owned Fraser River Salmon.

I think it is an affront to the House for the Secretary of State for External Affairs—

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member. I realize that hon. members sometimes would like to hear statements on motions from hon. members on the government side, but I doubt very much that the failure on the part of a minister or of the government to make a statement on motions can be brought to the attention of the House by way of a question of privilege. I am not sure whether this is the kind of matter that the hon. member thinks should be referred to the Committee on Privileges, and this in itself may be the best indication that there is not a real question of privilege. The hon. member has made his point, but I doubt that the matter should be pursued by way of a question of privilege.

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**LAWYERS AND LAW FIRMS EMPLOYED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN FREDERICTON, N.B.**

Question No. 231—**Mr. Howie:**

1. What are the names of all lawyers and law firms in Fredericton, New Brunswick, who performed services for the Department of Justice from January 1, 1971 to January 1, 1973?

2. What was the total amount of money paid to each one?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice):** The following lawyers and law firms in Fredericton, New Brunswick acted as agents of the Attorney General of Canada on behalf of client departments from January 1, 1971 to January 1, 1973:

1. Lawyer or Law Firm	2. Amount Paid
	\$
Appleby, Olmstead, and Quinn	465.85
Richard B. Cochrane	1,886.35
Hoyt, Mockler and Dixon	58,873.89
W. L. Hoyt	4,480.10
David Hughes	3,561.50
Hughes and Malone	10,890.80
Arthur Limerick	75.00
Eugene McGinley	1,822.30
Brian Malone	7,913.95
Charles A. Sargeant	378.15

**LEGISLATION RESPECTING NATIONAL AND ROYAL ANTHEMS**

Question No. 256—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. For what reason was there no mention in the Speech from the Throne of any intention of the government to bring in legislation with respect to our National and Royal anthems?