

careful not to upset United States markets. The government must take into account Canadian interests but also United States interests. And it is in our interests to take into account their interests.

Mr. Woolliams: Perhaps I can put it very simply. Can the minister explain now to the house why we had a different answer from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources last week with reference to this very matter, and why he is contradicting the other minister.

Mr. Pepin: I read the answer given by my colleague and it was in accord with what I am saying now.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is becoming argumentative.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Did the government agree to limit exports of Canadian crude oil to the United States?

Mr. Pepin: I said this was possible within the framework of the agreement. It would not be right for me to say yes or no, without qualification. I have never denied the possibility. I just repeated today that there were figures in the framework of the agreement, but I also said that these figures were qualified by a number of ifs and whens. That is quite clear.

Mr. Harkness: Instead of using so many ifs and ands, I wonder whether the minister could simply answer the question as to whether an agreement was made by the Canadian government to limit exports of Canadian crude oil.

Mr. Pepin: This matter is now in the hands of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, but when these arrangements were made I was trying to implement intelligently a policy devised by the Conservatives back in 1960.

Mr. Hees: Does the minister realize that by his answer he is making Hon. Paul Martin look like a plain, blunt spoken man, and the essence of clarity?

HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL MONEY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport.

29180—69

Inquiries of the Ministry

In his absence I had intended placing it before the Minister without Portfolio, but since he is absent also I shall direct it to the right hon. Prime Minister who perhaps will take it as notice and pass it on.

Yesterday I asked the minister whether the amount of \$170 million which is to be made available by C.M.H.C. for new housing starts this year represented any additional funds for housing construction in 1968. The minister said there has been no increase in the capital budget this year, but that this does represent an increase in the expenditures for this year. Will the minister therefore inform the house whether, prior to this announcement, there was a planned underspending by the government for 1968 in this critical field?

HARBOURS

ROBERTS BANK, B.C.—INQUIRY AS TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he can bring us up to date on a most important matter. Will he advise the house when it is anticipated that the question of jurisdiction, financing and the rail route to the new Roberts Bank development will be concluded with the government of British Columbia and the railway companies in order that construction can proceed as soon as possible to meet the contractual obligations made with Japanese companies?

Right Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could prevail on the hon. member and ask him to be here on the next sitting day, at which time the Minister of Transport will answer the question.

[Later:]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the one the hon. member for Vancouver East directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the truancy record of the Minister of Transport, can the Prime Minister assure us—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot ask a question which includes epithets. The question cannot be permitted on that ground. If the hon. member wants to ask a direct question he will be recognized.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Vancouver East, the Prime