

Motions for Papers

*The fiscal year of local governments is the calendar year. For comparative purposes, the municipal fiscal years 1962 and 1963 are equated with the federal and provincial fiscal years ended March 31, 1963 and 1964 respectively.

*REPRESENTATIONS ON McIVOR COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Question No. 437—**Mr. Stefanson:**

1. Which provincial or territorial authorities have made their views known to the federal government in regard to the recommendations of the McIvor commission, giving views expressed and dates received?

2. Which provincial or territorial authorities concerned have not made their views known to the federal government?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The answer to No. 1 is that views have been received from the governments of Manitoba and Alberta during July and August and an interim acknowledgement from the Northwest Territories government during September. It would be inappropriate to make known views conveyed until returns are complete from all governments and authorities involved and there has been opportunity for any explanatory discussion needed.

2. An expression of opinion is awaited from the governments of Saskatchewan and Ontario as well as confirmation of views from the Northwest Territories government.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call notices of motions Nos. 19 and 22. I ask that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Motion No. 19—**Mr. Knowles (for Mr. Lewis):**

That a humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence or other communications between the premier of Saskatchewan and the Prime Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and The Minister of Agriculture since July 31, 1967, concerning the international wheat agreement and wheat prices.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the mover of this motion is not present. May I say I checked with all departments concerned in this motion and I have been informed that there is no correspondence in any of the

[Mr. Cantin.]

departments relating to the matter, nor any communications on file. I would have asked the hon. member to withdraw his motion, but I will simply have to indicate that there will be a nil return.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that this motion be withdrawn.

Mr. Knowles: Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think it might as well be withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
NORTHWESTERN QUEBECMotion No. 22—**Mr. Laprise:**

That an order of the house do issue for copies of all documents or reports exchanged during the years 1965-66, between Mr. Hervé Larivière, superintendent of Indian affairs at Amos, on the one hand and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on the other, dealing with the administration or location of Indian affairs offices in northwestern Quebec.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, by this motion the hon. member is asking for the tabling of documents and reports which were distributed wholly between officials of my department. I think it is a well established rule that such documents are privileged. Therefore I regretfully ask my hon. friend to withdraw his motion.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

NOVA SCOTIA

PLANS FOR PHASING OUT OF
STEEL OPERATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. I would ask the Prime Minister what plans the government has formulated—I emphasize those words—for the phasing out of the Sydney steel operation.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are working out plans for the protection of the interests of the workers especially in the Sydney steel plant. Those are the plans with which we are preoccupied at the moment.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question. I would ask the Prime Minister to explain to the house whether this is support for the statement made by the