

REDISTRIBUTION

REPRESENTATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA—ALLEGED BREACH
OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council, involving the redistribution of seats. In view of the fact that the terms of union under which British Columbia entered confederation guarantee that the province's representation in the House of Commons will be increased in accordance with the British North America Act, 1867, and not as subsequently amended, and a further guarantee that the BNA Act, 1867, is applicable to British Columbia in the same way and to the like extent that it applies to other provinces, will the President of the Privy Council tell the House whether the government has obtained the consent of the government of British Columbia to the breach of these guarantees by the reduction of the representation of British Columbia in comparison to the representation of Ontario and Quebec?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I was not aware that any action of this kind had been taken.

Mr. Reynolds: Can the hon. gentleman tell us, then, whether he intends to reintroduce the redistribution bill in the near future?

Mr. Sharp: Yes. I hope we shall deal with this matter before the end of the year. Otherwise, we would have to extend the existing legislation unless we want to return to the distribution which has been criticized so strongly in all parts of the House.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

BRUCELLOSIS—REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN COMPENSATION
PAYMENTS AND REVIEW OF CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the growing incidence of brucellosis is driving milk producers out of business, is the minister prepared to review his program for control? In particular, is he prepared to consider increasing the amount of compensation which is now paid? Knowing the minister's opinion that it is already generous, is he prepared to increase it further?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): First, I should make it clear that we are reviewing the control program—stepping up the number of inspections and so on. I am sure the hon. member is aware of this. I am sure he is aware, too, that we have raised levels of compensation twice already this year. At the present time we are reviewing these levels to determine whether they provide enough compensation to enable farmers who suffer losses to restock their herds when the time comes.

Oil and Petroleum

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): May I inquire of the government House leader the business for today, tomorrow, and next week?

Mr. Sharp: Today the House will begin consideration of the motion for second reading of Bill C-32, the Petroleum Administration Act. This evening, of course, there will be discussion of the emergency motion which was agreed to earlier. The debate on second reading will continue, except for possible interruption to call the report stage of Bill C-22, the Canada Pension Plan amendments. After these bills have been disposed of, if this should happen before Tuesday when we will debate the VLA motion, we will take up Bill C-10, subject to revision should urgent items be returned from committee.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING THE ADMINISTRATION OF
INTERPROVINCIAL, EXPORT AND IMPORT TRADE IN
PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-32, to impose a charge on the export of crude oil and certain petroleum products, to provide compensation for certain petroleum costs and to regulate the price of Canadian crude oil and natural gas in interprovincial and export trade, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I refer to the substance of the measure, I wonder whether, on a point of order, I might raise a question on the motion itself. As hon. members have just heard, the reference is to a committee of the whole House rather than to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works. The predecessor of the bill before us, Bill C-18, was referred, in the last parliament, to the standing committee where there was, of course, an opportunity to hear witnesses and to carry out an extensive examination. I wonder whether the House would agree, either now or at some later time, to the motion being amended so that the bill would go to the standing committee, rather than being dealt with on the floor of this chamber.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): In response to the minister's suggestion, may I say we should like to hold the matter in abeyance and make a decision later.

Mr. Speaker: This being one of the budget bills, unanimous consent would be required before the motion could be changed so that the bill might be sent to the standing committee. Perhaps that matter could also be considered.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, this bill, the successor to Bill C-18 in the last parliament, has been