

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, September 23, 1971

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

FAMILY INCOME SECURITY

TABLING OF LETTER FROM PRIME MINISTER TO
PREMIER OF QUEBEC

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copy of a letter dated September 17 which I sent to the Quebec premier in reply to the letter which he sent me on September 2 and which I tabled in the House on September 15.

[English]

My letter indicates the readiness of the federal government to have discussions about the proposal Mr. Bourassa has advanced concerning the adjustment of family allowance payments to effect an integration of federal and provincial programs. Mr. Bourassa also mentioned questions relating to Manpower centres and the professional training of adults. I agree that they too should be discussed as well as other problems, especially in the area of social policy.

The letter indicates that if from such discussions it appears that arrangements can be made that will be satisfactory from both the federal and provincial points of view, they will be submitted to the cabinet for consideration. Provinces other than Quebec will, of course, be interested in any arrangements that might seem feasible and there would be discussion with them before any final decision was made.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DELAY BY EMBASSY IN ROME IN NOTIFYING PARENTS
OF SON'S DEATH—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT
TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43 and in light of disturbing revelations of a serious failure on the part of a Canadian mission abroad to deal effectively with the aftermath of a tragedy affecting a Canadian citizen, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather):

That the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence forthwith investigate the circumstances surrounding the role of the Canadian Embassy in Rome in reference to the delay in communicating with the next of kin of David Bagguley. That said committee also examine the general question of the present capacity of Canadian diplomatic missions to render meaningful, useful assistance to Canadian citizens travelling abroad.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Hillsborough. It requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not. The motion cannot be put.

PROPOSED AMCHITKA NUCLEAR TEST—REQUEST FOR
UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I would like to move a motion because of urgent and pressing necessity which does not require elaboration on my part. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Mather):

The House of Commons of Canada extends its appreciation to the congress of the United States of America for the action it took in banning the nuclear device test scheduled to take place at Amchitka Island and expresses the hope that the President of the United States of America will also join us in banning the proposed test and that this decision of the House of Commons of Canada be communicated to the President of the United States forthwith.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Skeena. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not. The motion cannot be put.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I wonder if I might raise a point of order which I would ask Your Honour to consider seriously. I know Your Honour has said on other occasions with respect to motions under Standing Order 43 that it is sufficient for Your Honour simply to hear a negative response, but I would ask that you consider seriously certain other factors. First, it might well be that an hon. member might say "No" but from behind the curtains rather than from his proper place. Or the dissenting voice might even come from the gallery.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Knowing Your Honour's powers of perception, I am not suggesting you would not be able to recognize the difference, but there might be other Speakers in the future who would not. To conclude the point of order, I want to suggest that Your Honour consid-