

raised in the proposal by the hon. member for Oxford lies in his suggestion of the inadequacy of the present situation. I am not too sure that this is a sufficient basis for the Chair to grant the motion.

I indicated to the hon. member and to the House when the motion was made on March 3 that the circumstances might be such later that the Chair would be inclined to grant the motion of the hon. member if it dealt specifically with student employment during the summer months. It seems to me that the proposition of the hon. member is somewhat larger in its terms in that it is concerned with the employment of all students coming into the labour market in the months of April, May and June. I am not suggesting that if the motion had been in more limited terms it would automatically or necessarily have been granted, but I do recognize that this is a matter of considerable urgency and the day may come when this kind of a motion should be granted.

I think hon. members would want me to take into account the undertaking by a minister on behalf of the government that a statement would be made at an early date. The hon. member may feel that the statement is not forthcoming soon enough, and perhaps the Chair might reach a point where it will agree with the hon. member for Oxford.

I suggest that at least for the time being the motion is perhaps somewhat premature. I apologize for making this suggestion to the hon. member, but again I am dealing strictly with student employment during the summer months, but I would think that in the circumstances I should not put the motion at this time.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

#### ALLEGED INCONSISTENCY OF GOVERNMENT ACTIONS RESPECTING DENISON MINES AND HOME OIL

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Prime Minister. Will he tell the House why it is that, after advising the president of Denison Mines that he would be prohibited from selling the control of his company to United States interests in order to keep that company from falling into United States hands, the government is now willing to discuss with Home Oil Company the possible purchase by the government of a controlling interest in that company to keep it from falling into United States hands? Can he explain the reason for the apparent inconsistency in these two approaches toward solving essentially the same problem?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair has some reservation about the question of the hon. member. Obviously the hon. member is asking a question which essentially is the basis of a possible debate. At the same time, the

### *Inquiries of the Ministry*

question is important and perhaps the Prime Minister or the minister responsible should be allowed to reply briefly, overlooking the argumentative aspect of the question.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, they were two ad hoc decisions. I do not see anything inconsistent in those two decisions. In the case of uranium the federal government had jurisdiction under the constitution to intervene directly. In the other case it did not have that authority, and the government adopted two different approaches to two different problems.

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister not agree that it would be highly advisable for the government to work out a uniform approach to this problem instead of adopting ad hoc solutions which are often contradictory? If it is the opinion of the government that this is desirable, when may we expect such a policy to be announced and put into operation?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Of course it would be desirable to have a general policy announced, and we have told the House we will bring it forward as soon as possible. But even under a general policy there will have to be specific decisions made in respect of different cases. I think the House will have to accept that we will not deal with all cases in the same way.

**Mr. Hees:** As it is of vital importance to all Canadians that they know where the dividing line is as between companies which it is essential to keep in Canadian hands and companies which it is perfectly satisfactory to allow to fall into foreign hands, will the government announce its policy in the very near future so that Canadian industry will know where it stands in this important regard?

**Mr. Trudeau:** It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the member is repeating the same question in another form. He is suggesting we have a general policy, and I have answered that. There are elements of a general policy which exist now. The country knows that in some areas such as banking and financial institutions and mass communications institutions there is a policy which applies there. It is our intention to announce in what other areas the policy will eventually apply.

\* \* \*

### PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

#### SASKATCHEWAN—PETITIONS REQUESTING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO DISALLOW LAW RESPECTING REDISTRIBUTION

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that on January 11 a group of Saskatchewan citizens petitioned His Excellency the Governor in Council asking that a Saskatchewan law with respect to redistribution in that province be disallowed and in view of the fact that this petition was acknowl-