

next week's discussions between the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the President of the United States, a motion for which, I understand, I have unanimous agreement. One of the high priority matters on the agenda of those discussions is the Garrison diversion. It is reported that Garrison has just received approval from the administration in Washington for new funding of some \$4 million. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael), and the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie):

That this House express to the government of the United States, through the Secretary of State for External Affairs, its strong concern that important funding decisions on Garrison are being made in Washington before the start of discussions between the Prime Minister and the President that are to deal with this fundamental and serious issue.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

PRICING PRACTICES OF OIL COMPANIES—MEASURES TO COMPENSATE CONSUMERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I too rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that each man, woman and child in Canada over the last 15 years, while successive Liberal and Conservative consumer and energy ministers stood by, has been bilked out of \$2,500, and in view of the fact that these practices have escalated since 1973, and indeed continued last weekend when the oil companies piggybacked increased costs when oil prices went up, and in view of the fact that the people of Canada are demanding their money back, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans):

That this House direct the Government of Canada to present immediate measures to Parliament to ensure that the people of Canada will get their money back.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

THE CONSTITUTION

CONDEMNATION OF ADVERTISEMENT ATTACKING BILINGUALISM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 43 on a matter to which there may be favourable disposition on all sides of the House. In view of the fact that today an advertisement has appeared in the *Globe and Mail* which equates unity with a unilingual speaking Canada, and in view of the fact that the same ad says that official bilingualism as proposed in the constitutional package will become the central cause of permanent division, and in view of the fact that federal bilingualism is a policy endorsed and practised by the leaders and members of all three parties in this House, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke):

That this House unanimously condemn the spirit and the letter of this backward advertisement which ignores the rights of millions of Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Who said no?

● (1415)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

PRICING PRACTICES OF OIL COMPANIES—GOVERNMENT'S POSITION RESPECTING COURT PROSECUTIONS

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Postmaster General arising out of those matters under combines investigations, the restrictive trade practices of the oil companies.

Yesterday the minister made it pretty clear to the House that he had no intention at all of taking any action arising out of the report of the director, save and except to move on toward another inquiry about an inquiry which has already taken place. He indicated in the House of Commons that he had no intention of taking the advice of the Attorney General of Canada with respect to the prosecution of offenders as had been found in a report, which was about the most strongly worded report I have seen since coming here.

As the minister has had overnight to reconsider his position, is it still his position, notwithstanding the strong evidence and strong wording of the report presented yesterday, that the