

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 20, 1977

The House met at 11 a.m.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1107)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TRADE

[English]

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON QUESTIONABLE TRADING PRACTICES OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF CASE OF SANT P. SINGH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the tremendous economic problems in the country which are undoubtedly being exacerbated by the dumping of certain types of stainless steel from Japan, West Germany and South Africa, as has been pointed out by the Department of National Revenue, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and his predecessor were asked some time ago for a status report on the importation of cheap railway axles which could undermine the position of the only Canadian manufacturer of these axles, namely, Hawker Siddeley of Trenton, Nova Scotia, and no reply has yet been received, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie):

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I move, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander):

That the government cease its persecution of the public servant, Sant P. Singh, an economist with the Department of Health and Welfare, for his political beliefs and abide by the decision of the adjudicator, J. D. O'Shea of the P.S.S.R.B. who ruled that Singh was improperly disciplined for his political activities, suffered financial loss because of the department's incompetence and that he be entitled to the pay raise which the adjudicator found ought to be paid to him and that this whole regrettable incident be referred to a parliamentary committee for an investigation.

That the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce make a statement on motions outlining to the House the position and activities of countries which are using questionable trading practices vis-à-vis Canada, so that the House and the country may be apprised of the government's stand on this issue.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House for presentation of such a motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion for debate pursuant to Standing Order 43 can be done only with unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

* * *

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON EXISTENCE OF ALLEGED ADVISORY GROUP—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF PROGRAM "THE TAR SANDS" TO STANDING COMMITTEE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under Standing Order 43. My motion concerns the revelation that there exists within the government a conflict of interest advisory group. In light of the mystery which surrounds this group, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski):

That the President of the Privy Council make a statement on motions about this group and further deal decisively with certain apparently spurious reports that the conflict of interest advisory board consists of Senators Austin, Davey and Giguère and Messrs. Goldfarb and Coutts.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity dealing with the serious implications of the manner of presentation of the subject matter of the CBC program "The Tar Sands", seconded by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert). I move:

That the subject matter of the CBC film "The Tar Sands" be referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for such a motion?