

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway but the hon. member for Trinity is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Hellyer: My question of privilege is this. Today we have had an assurance from the minister that Mr. McCracken's file was given the usual routine examination and that it was satisfactory in all respects. Yet some of us have been advised privately by a member of the minister's department that in fact information concerning Mr. McCracken's background was not shown on his application and that no attempt was made to have the RCMP do any kind of security screening whatsoever. In view of this, I feel the minister has misled us and I would appreciate it if he would make available Mr. McCracken's file to the appropriate parliamentary committee so that we can examine it and determine the facts.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. member that my information was that Mr. McCracken's application had passed the test of immigration requirements. I have no reason to believe that this is not accurate information. Certainly, I will personally review the file. After reviewing it, if there is any discrepancy whatsoever I will be glad to respond to the hon. member.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Since he is not in the House today I would like to defer the question until tomorrow, but perhaps you would like to give my spot to the hon. member for Selkirk.

Mr. Speaker: I would be delighted to recognize him but we have gone beyond the time allocated for oral questions. I will note those hon. members who did not have an opportunity to put their questions and supplementaries—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: —and see that they are given an opportunity for priority tomorrow, if that can be arranged. Orders of the day.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROVISION FOR HOLIDAY ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1973

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 2 (3) indicates certain days on which the House shall not meet. However, there seems to be some uncertainty as to whether the reference in that standing order to Remembrance Day applies this year in view of the fact that Remembrance Day falls on Sunday. There have been some discussions about this and I wonder whether, so that everyone will know where we stand, the government House leader could clear it up by seeking an appropriate House order.

[Mr. Andras.]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, if the Standing Order were to be observed, the House would normally sit on Monday, November 12. But because, in certain cases, hon. members may have made arrangements to be in their ridings and will be travelling to observe Remembrance Day, it would be agreeable to the government if the House order were adopted providing that the House will not sit on Monday, November 12.

Mr. Bell: We agree to this suggestion, especially since it was one of our former members, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, Mr. Gordon Churchill, who fought long and hard to ensure that Remembrance Day be included as one of our holidays.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the President of the Privy Council. Is this agreed and so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW BILL

PROVISIONS RESPECTING ACQUISITIONS OF CONTROL OF CANADIAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISES AND ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW BUSINESSES

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-132, to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons and of the establishment of new businesses in Canada by certain persons, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As hon. members know, there are a great number of motions to be considered at this point, and in the hours and days ahead. Motion No. 1 is in the name of the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom). I will read that motion in a moment and express a few thoughts.

I might mention that procedurally speaking, from the point of view of the Chair in any event, there does not appear to be anything seriously wrong with motions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13, but the Chair has some reservations in relation to motions Nos. 1 and 14.

Perhaps the Chair might read motion No. 1, and then seek the advice of hon. members as to whether it is procedurally acceptable. If the Chair can be convinced that there is no serious or insurmountable procedural difficulty the motion would then be formally put and debated by hon. members. The motion proposed by the Hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) reads as follows: