

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will have heard that there is not unanimity in this regard.

Mr. Muir: Yes. The right hand man of the President of the Privy Council said no.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order reflecting once again on the automatic refusal of government members in respect of motions under Standing Order 43. I would draw the attention of the Speaker to the fact that there was a "no" from the other side of the House in respect of the first motion moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I heard "no's" in all three cases.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member had a negative ear because I certainly did not hear it.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED CONFERENCE ON ALL TYPES OF
INSURANCE—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO
MOVE MOTION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provision of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the announcement by the Canadian Underwriters Association to the effect that the costs of car insurance will be increased by 5 per cent to 16 per cent in six provinces which do not enjoy the benefit of provincial automobile insurance, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the federal government take the initiative and call together a federal-provincial conference to deal with all aspects of car insurance, general and life insurance, so as to ensure that Canadians in all provinces would enjoy the benefits of insurance programs at reasonable costs comparable to those in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This motion again is proposed under the terms of Standing Order 43 and requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimity in respect of the motion of the hon. member for Broadview?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Apparently there is not unanimity. The motion cannot be put.

WESTERN ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES CONFERENCE—
TABLING OF FINAL BACKGROUND DOCUMENT

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table in both official languages the final federal background document for the Western Economic Opportunities Conference.

• (1420)

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT

AMENDMENT TO FACILITATE GRANTING CITIZENSHIP TO
NON-CANADIAN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. Joe Hueglin (Niagara Falls) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-214, to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Hueglin: The purpose of this bill is to facilitate the obtaining of Canadian citizenship by those men who have served in the Canadian armed forces and who are not in possession of Canadian citizenship. It is concerned primarily with veterans, and I am certain it will be dealt with in the manner in which veterans affairs have customarily been dealt with in the House. I commend it to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and to the gentleman in charge of citizenship—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have leave to introduce the said bill?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

ENERGY

PROPOSED MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—ALLEGED
DELAY IN TRANSMITTING CORRECTED REPLIES TO
UNITED STATES INQUIRIES ON CANADIAN POSITION

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the revelation yesterday that the government did not make the Canadian position on the Alaska route and the Mackenzie alternative clear in answering questions put by the United States state department, and in view of the amazing delay in communicating corrections in government answers from June 27 to July 16, can the Prime Minister explain to the House whether the original answer was government policy and if the correction concerning Canadian ownership was the result of a change in government policy after June 27, 1973?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be allowed to answer. May I say specifically with regard to the last question, the answer is no. It was not a recent change in government policy; it was a position that had been decided last summer.

With regard to the delay in transmitting the clarification, I should point out that the Canadian embassy in Washington communicated the exact terms of the clarification to the state department on July 6 and that the U.S.