

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—DETERIORATING BUDGETARY CONTRIBUTION BY SASKATCHEWAN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the fact that since the time medicare was instituted in Saskatchewan, many doctors traditionally have not participated in the medicare plan, that 30 per cent of doctors in that province now are billing patients directly, that less than 5 per cent of doctors in Manitoba are operating outside the plan, and that there is a significant decrease in the budget for hospital insurance and medicare programs in Saskatchewan, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

That the Minister of National Health and Welfare advise the recently appointed Hall commission to study immediately the reasons for the deteriorating budgetary contribution by the Saskatchewan NDP government for medicare, as well as the significant increase of extra billing by doctors in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: The presentation of such a motion for debate can be done only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ENERGY

OIL PRICES—REQUEST PRIME MINISTER AND PRESIDENT CARTER ACT TO PREVENT UNNECESSARY INCREASES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the fact that President Carter is coming to Canada next month, and that the multinational oil companies dealing in spot markets in Rotterdam, the Caribbean and Singapore are an important cause of the world oil price crisis, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That the Prime Minister try to encourage President Carter to call a meeting with Japan and Germany to bring pressure to bear on these multinational companies to strictly forbid their dealing in this spot market.

Mr. Speaker: Presentation of such a motion for debate requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

NORTHERN PIPELINES

CANADIAN PREFERENCE FOR ROUTE—AIDE MEMOIRE TO U.S. GOVERNMENT

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Cape Breton Highlands-Canso): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs based upon the aide-memoire which her government delivered to the American government on Saturday last, a copy of which we received today.

● (1415)

In view of the fact that the aide-mémoire refers to preference as stated last April 16 by the former government, preference as expressed on September 28, 1979, by the new government, and no reference to any expression of interest or concern in the intervening period, will the minister not agree that it would have reinforced the Canadian position had she referred to the alleged representations that were made throughout the summer according to the Prime Minister or, alternatively—as I believe—that her aide-mémoire is a very clear indication that the government lost the summer in making its views known to the United States government on this very important question?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member was not here the other day—or, at least, if he was here, he was not listening—when the Prime Minister very clearly outlined the number of contacts which this government had with the government of the United States over the summer concerning this matter.

It was raised on a number of occasions by Canadian officials at the embassy in Washington; it was raised on a number of occasions by direct representation from Ottawa, and the aide-mémoire which was sent to Washington last weekend confirmed the position that this government had taken throughout and had stated, namely, a strong preference for the Foothills option, and that it was very concerned—and reiterated that concern—about the possibility of increased tanker traffic on the west coast.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I would tell the hon. minister that I was present and listened to the answer by the Prime Minister, in which he failed to indicate that the contacts made had anything to do with stating preference for the Foothills pipeline.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: He said meetings were held; but the Prime Minister, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Hamilton East, said the American government understood, and there was no doubt. But never did he say these meetings had to do with Foothills.