

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 5, 1971

The House met at 2 p.m.

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TRADE

TABLING OF RESTRAINT AGREEMENT FOR 1971 BETWEEN CANADA AND JAPAN

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table a press release announcing the signature of the agreement on voluntary restrictions between Canada and Japan for 1971, as the well as appendix and copies of the correspondence exchanged between the Japanese ambassador and myself.

* * *

[English]

GRAIN

ALLEGED MISLEADING ADVERTISEMENT CONCERNING STABILIZATION BILL AND WHEAT RESERVES ACT—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask for unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion in a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

This matter concerns a full-page presentation which appeared in the Saturday, October 2, issue of the *Regina Leader-Post*. This sheet is headed by the familiar exhortation, "It's your choice", which is followed by the equally familiar nostrum that is composed in equal parts of a suppression of the truth and a suggestion of the false. The subject matter is the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act and the prairie grain stabilization bill—a subject matter that is now before this House as well as before the courts. The blurb purports to be authorized by the "Keep the Stabilization Plan Committee". The seriously disturbing fact in this fiction is the assertion that the stabilization plan is endorsed by a farm organization which has since denied such endorsement. That assertion, in a matter before the House and the courts, is serious.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta):

That the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs inquire into the advertisement which appeared in the *Leader-Post* of the 2nd October, 1971, concerning the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act and the prairie grain stabilization bill with respect to the misleading allegations therein contained and report back to this House.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Mackenzie. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity and the motion cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT—PROSPECTS FOR EARLIER FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE—FEDERAL PROPOSALS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Prime Minister could indicate the prospects for an earlier meeting between the government of Canada and the provinces with respect to winter unemployment? For example, I understand the government of Ontario has indicated its willingness to meet earlier. Could the Prime Minister indicate the prospects for an earlier meeting?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is a fairly general willingness on the part of the provinces and the federal government to have an early meeting. The difficulty is in finding dates on which all governments can agree to meet in Ottawa. As did Premier Schreyer, Premier Davis has changed his mind on this. His first answer was that he could not see a meeting until late in November. On that basis some alternative dates were looked at. I believe he wrote me a few days ago saying that he hoped for a meeting on October 28 or soon thereafter.

Mr. Broadbent: He will be in the opposition then.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Trudeau: That is not the view the hon. member's leader had a few days ago. After he wrote to me I telegraphed to all the provinces, asking them if they could agree on some further dates. I indicated that as far as I was concerned there were only two days in November on which I would be unable to meet but that any other time would be agreeable to me. I have not had final answers to that; I think half the provinces have given some answer. The only general agreement coming out of those answers is that they all think a one-day meeting would be too short. Indeed, I agree with that myself. They all seem to say that whatever meeting it was it would be good if we had some preparatory meetings such as finance ministers. Therefore we are not much further advanced. It is made all the more difficult because I have not yet received an answer from Premier Bennett of British Columbia. The