

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, February 17, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### AGRICULTURE

#### PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF MILK POLICY TO FAVOUR PRODUCER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with an important matter of pressing necessity.

Since the producers of manufacturing milk have experienced for the past months a loss of income as a result of amendments to the dairy policy, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin):

That the Standing Committee on Agriculture be asked to consider immediately the dairy policy of the government and report to the House as of March 15, to enable the Minister of Agriculture to make the necessary amendments to the dairy policy on the basis of demands from milk producers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such a consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

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

\* \* \*

### SUPPLY AND SERVICES

#### SUGGESTION INFORMATION BE OBTAINED CONCERNING LOCKHEED TO AVOID CONTRACT DIFFICULTIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to discuss a very urgent and important matter.

In view of the serious financial difficulties of the Lockheed Aircraft Company with which the government of Canada is negotiating following the decision to buy 18 Orion aircraft for nearly \$1 billion, and since this American aeronautical company has been shaken up by great scandals over bribes offered to politicians from various countries to obtain contracts, a situation which can paralyze the company fairly soon and create prejudices for the

government of Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That this House immediately discuss the schedule of payments under the Canadian contract as well as the next negotiations of the government with Lockheed Aircraft Company concerning the questions being asked on the integrity and viability of this company, to encourage the government of Canada to be very careful and reserved so that they do not bear the consequences of the still greater difficulties this American company could have soon.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The House has heard the terms of the motion of the hon. member. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There not being unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

● (1410)

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

### ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

#### REQUEST FOR APPEAL PROCEDURE WHICH WOULD NOT NECESSITATE INDICATION OF UNWILLINGNESS TO COMPLY WITH BOARD ORDER

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister arising out of information given in the House yesterday by the Minister of Finance to the effect that it is the intention of the Anti-Inflation Board to refer cases to the administrator and hence open up the appeals procedure only in those instances where a party to a settlement or an agreement has indicated an intention not to comply with the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board. Is the Prime Minister prepared to review this rather perverse situation, which means that no appeal from the Anti-Inflation Board is available except to those who are prepared to act in defiance of the Board? Is the Prime Minister prepared to review this so that appeals will be open to those seeking appeals without requiring defiance of the board?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of the question. I do not have a copy of *Hansard* here. I was not here when the minister made his statement yesterday. I will have to increase my understanding of this matter before answering the question.