HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, February 14, 1978

The House met at 2 p.m.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

• (1407)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ODDS IN FAVOUR OF WINNING LOTTERY PRIZE COMPARED TO OBTAINING JOB UNDER GOVERNMENT POLICIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion is concerned with the fact that under this government which has created the just society, among other things, the chances of winning a prize in the state lottery are 1 in 9, while the chances of getting a job are 1 in 26. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie):

That this House directs the Prime Minister to explain to the premiers the inner workings of the "casino" economy which his government has created, and in particular to elucidate the philosophy of government which has led him to create a society where it is three times as easy to win a prize in the government's lottery as it is to get a job out of the government's economic policies.

* * *

[Translation]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

RECOMMENDED CREATION OF MERCHANT MARINE TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I seek the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion dealing with a very important matter, especially for the unemployed.

Considering that the Lauzon shipyard could easily provide work for over 3,000 employees but that it has slowed down operations with very few workers, which is worsening the unemployment problem on the south shore area, and to cope with those conditions, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That this House suggest the establishment of a special committee to consider the possibility for Canada of creating a merchant marine as soon as possible to provide work for the large number of unemployed.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

80031-371/2

[English]

ALLEGED MISLEADING BY GOVERNMENT RESPECTING NUMBER OF JOBS CREATED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Yesterday the Prime Minister of Canada, at the federal-provincial conference of first ministers stated, "our economy generated 250,000 jobs in 1977". At the same conference, the Minister of Finance stated, "the number of Canadians with jobs rose last year by more than 250,000". In view of the fact that Statistics Canada, the official, objective record for such information, reported that only 182,000 jobs were created last year in Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House of Commons condemns the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance for uttering such blatant, dishonest, misleading information to the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion can be presented for discussion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

NORTHERN PIPELINE ACT

CONCURRENCE OF PROVINCES TO CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LEGISLATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. The urgency of my intervention arises out of the debate currently before the House in respect of Bill C-25, the Northern Pipeline Act. Having regard to the requirement contained in the bilateral agreement between the government of Canada and the United States to achieve concurrence from the provinces in respect to certain limiting provisions in the bill, in light of the fact that the government of British Columbia has attached certain conditions to its statement of acquiescence, and in light of the fact that these conditions are not embodied in the text of the bill but are pertinent to the debate, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon):