

Chrysler, Ford and others will not compete unfairly against small industries.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard the motion. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no unanimity. The motion cannot be put.

\* \* \*

[English]

### FISHERIES

#### PACIFIC COAST HALIBUT FISHERY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the extreme difficulties of the halibut fishery on the west coast I seek unanimous consent, if I may, to move another motion on this matter, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Nelson):

That this House express the opinion that the indiscriminate activity engaged in by Japan, the Soviet Union and South Korea in the halibut fishery in the Pacific Ocean is not in keeping with the needs of proper conservation practices.

**Mr. Speaker:** This motion requires the unanimous consent of the House under the terms of Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent and the motion cannot be put.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### ENERGY

#### OIL PIPELINE EXTENSION TO MONTREAL—REASON FOR DELAY IN COMMENCEMENT—THROUGHPUT VOLUME

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister who, on September 4, told the House that the government intended to move ahead with an oil pipeline to Montreal. That is about four months ago. Can the Prime Minister tell the House precisely what is holding up the commencement of this project or holding up an application being made to the National Energy Board, which the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources yesterday said might be made in the spring? Why is this whole project still in the discussion stage after four months?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister also indicated yesterday

### Oral Questions

that he expects to be able to announce a decision very soon. I want to repeat that assurance to the House. The hold-up, to use the expression of the Leader of the Opposition, is due to the fact that we have tried to ascertain provincial preferences as to alternate routes, alternate ways of laying down the pipeline. In the meantime we have proceeded, as the House knows, through the Canadian Commercial Corporation with regard to the guarantee that there would be a supply of pipe. For that reason we are still confident that the deadline I announced will be met.

**Mr. Stanfield:** The Prime Minister spoke about consulting with the provinces about the route. Can he indicate what provinces the government is consulting about the route and what provinces, if any, the government is consulting about the size of the pipeline and the volume of oil to be carried through the pipeline?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, consultations have been mainly with Ontario and Quebec. There may have been other consultations but I know of those two in particular. We have ascertained, in the case of Quebec, what appears to be a slight preference for one route over another. In the case of Ontario, they have refused, I understand, to indicate a preference for one route over another.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Has the government of Canada reached any understanding or agreement with the government of Quebec about the size of the Quebec market for oil or the volume of the oil used in Quebec that would be dedicated to Canadian crude? In other words, has the government of Canada consulted the government of Quebec about the amount of Canadian crude which would be dedicated to the Quebec market, and have any discussions taken place with the Atlantic provinces in this respect?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, so far as I know the discussions have been general. The question is not only one of the amount of crude but of the time over which such various amounts would be deliverable in the eastern market. With regard to consultation with the Atlantic provinces, I would have to defer on this matter to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who has been, of course, closer to it than I have been.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but may I direct one further supplementary question either to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Is the decision to supply roughly 250,000 barrels a day to those markets in the east based upon consultations with the eastern provinces, or is it based upon some other consideration because, of course, 250,000 barrels a day would constitute only about one-quarter of the market of those five eastern provinces and therefore would offer the prospect of supplying only about one-quarter of the market?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the other relevant question of course is the productive ability of the western Canadian sedimentary basin to supply additional markets in eastern Canada without at the same time creating difficulties in regard to our export arrangements to the United States.