

resell under terms which would ensure the retention of control in Canada?

Mr. Trudeau: You will recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the question as asked is hypothetical. The Leader of the Opposition is asking me to state what the government would do if this deal were proceeded with. At this time there is nothing in the direction of a concluded deal on which I can report to the House.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I am simply trying to find out what the policy of the government is but there apparently isn't one.

[Later:]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question related to one asked earlier by the Leader of the Opposition. Is it the view of the government that the government of Canada can acquire a corporation for purposes other than those specifically assigned to it in the constitution?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member realizes that the question he has asked is defective in at least two ways. He is asking, according to my way of thinking, for a legal opinion. In the second place, he is inviting the government to express an opinion. On both grounds the question is out of order. Nevertheless, if the hon. member thinks his question can be phrased in some way which would make it acceptable from a procedural standpoint he might attempt to do it now.

Mr. Baldwin: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I was following the line taken by my hon. friend. I will put it this way: can the government acquire corporations for purposes other than those specifically assigned to it under the constitution?

Mr. Trudeau: That is obviously a request for a legal opinion. In order to give advice on that I would have to know whether the hon. member has in mind acquisition by way of expropriation or acquisition by way of voluntary purchase.

ALLEGED INCONSISTENCY OF GOVERNMENT ACTIONS RESPECTING DENISON MINES AND HOME OIL

Mr. Max Saltzman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman could explain briefly to the House why the government is proceeding to purchase share control of Home Oil Company when in the case of Denison it simply passed legislation prohibiting the sale to foreign ownership? Is there a specific reason for this change?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The distinction has been made on several occasions both in and out of this House and again by myself yesterday, Mr. Speaker. Under the British North America Act the government has jurisdiction over the uranium industry but it does not have the equivalent type of jurisdiction over

Inquiries of the Ministry

other resources such as the petroleum industry, and that is one of the reasons why we are acting in this way.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister in view of the answer he has just given and in view of the answer he gave to me yesterday on this question when, as found at page 4245 of *Hansard*, he said:

In the case of uranium, the federal government had jurisdiction under the constitution to intervene directly.

Was the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources expressing the view of the government on September 18 when he said in the second paragraph of his press release headed "Control of Foreign Ownership of Canadian Uranium Properties and Facilities":

It was proposed, the minister said, to bring into force regulations under the Atomic Energy Control Act for the carrying out of government policy with respect to the control of foreign ownership of Canadian uranium properties and facilities, but legal counsel now advise that some of the provisions which will be required by government will necessitate legislation rather than regulations. Accordingly, the government is preparing legislation to be introduced to Parliament during the forthcoming session, but it will take some additional time—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member is coming to the question. I realize he is inviting an opinion from the right hon. Prime Minister as to whether a statement made is government policy, but the statement quoted by the hon. member should not be too long. I hope he will come to the question soon.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I had finished my quotation. My question to the Prime Minister is: He said one thing yesterday, that the government had jurisdiction, and the minister on September 18 said the government thought it had but found it did not have the jurisdiction it needed and therefore must pass legislation, which legislation has not been presented to the House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has had the floor for quite some time. The question period is only 40 minutes long. We will be running short of time.

Mr. Hees: My question is, how does the Prime Minister reconcile these two completely opposite points of view?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it is very simple, and I think what the minister said confirms what I said. If the government intends to pass legislation it is quite obvious that the government considers it has jurisdiction, and that is exactly what I said. The federal government has jurisdiction over this area and that is why we will be in a position to present legislation to the House. If we did not have jurisdiction we would not be able to present legislation. It would be presented in some provincial House.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will recognize the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings for one brief supplementary, but in fairness to other members we have to go on to other questions. We have spent more than ten minutes on the first question and in my view that is unfair to other members.