

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, February 24, 1971

The House met at 2 p.m.

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

POST OFFICE

TABLING OF GOVERNMENT OFFER IN DECEMBER 1970,
TO FORMER EMPLOYEES OF G. LAPALME INCORPORATED

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a request made by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski), I wish to table, in French and in English, the complete text of the offer made by the government last December to the former employees of G. Lapalme Inc.

* * *

[English]

GRAIN

TABLING OF REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL WHEAT
CONFERENCE

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I should like to lay on the table copies in both official languages of a report on the outcome of the international wheat conference.

[Later:]

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Today the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, who speaks in this House for the Wheat Board, tabled a statement on events that have transpired, or a statement of policy, and did the same thing on Monday last. It has customarily been the practice in the House when such statements are short that ministers of the Crown deliver them orally, thus providing an opportunity for one spokesman for each of the opposition parties to comment on the particular proposals.

I do not know whether this new practice is going to be followed by the rest of the cabinet ministers, but I want to emphasize that, although the rules provide for the tabling of such statements, common usage has been that this is done only in the case of lengthy documents that cannot be incorporated in *Hansard*.

On both Monday and today the statements were short, and the minister's action did not provide an opportunity for other hon. members to comment. Furthermore, on

Monday last following the question period the minister raced for the television cameras to set out one side of the particular question involved.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Korchinski: It is not always the case that objections are taken to such statements by members of the opposition. In fact, the statement tabled on Monday was one that would have elicited some support. I have just now been handed the statement that the minister tabled today. I have not had an opportunity to study it. I would think that out of common courtesy members of the cabinet in future should have the decency to present statements in the normal fashion.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFFS BY MASSEY-FERGUSON AND CHEMCELL LIMITED
—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In light of the announcement within recent days by Massey-Ferguson of projected closedowns of production facilities in Canada with a lay-off of 2,700 workers, and yesterday by Chemcell Limited of the closedown and sale of chemical production facilities in Cornwall, Ontario, and Two Hills, Alberta, and the shutdown of such facilities in Edmonton with a lay-off of 350 highly skilled workers, I move the following motion, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale):

That there be referred for examination and report to this House by the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs the question of the impact on Canadian industry and the level of employment therein of:

1. The continued unpegged state of the Canadian dollar;
2. The acceleration of the negotiated Kennedy Round tariff adjustments as a tool to fight inflation;
3. The restrictions on economic activity in Canada resulting from action taken under the monetary and fiscal policy adopted by the government to counter the wave of inflation that has bedevilled the Canadian economy in recent years;
4. The uncertainty in industry caused by the original proposals contained in the white paper on taxation.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West. Under the terms of Standing Order 43 this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.