

## INDUSTRY

## MICRO DRUG COMPANY—REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It is in connection with the letter sent to the minister from Micro Drug Company. Was that request for assistance met by his department, and what was the conclusion of his department's investigation into the situation of Micro Drug?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to which letter the hon. member refers. If it was a request by Micro Chemicals because of certain difficulties they were having, that letter has been responded to and the matter of financing Micro under the PIDA program was referred to my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who has been answering questions on the subject in the House. He and his officials are examining whether Micro Chemicals would be eligible for a loan under the PIDA program.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

**Mr. McGrath:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport interjected on a point of order during the question I directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to say he had already responded or replied to my question, which was to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to refer to the Prices and Incomes Commission the inflationary and extravagant increases by CNR in the ferry rates. Upon examination of *Hansard* I find that the parliamentary secretary did not respond to this question, and I suggest to the hon. member that he should get his facts straight before he interjects in that way.

• (12 noon)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

## PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT, OBJECTS, POWERS, CAPITALIZATION, ETC.

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-219, to establish the Canada Development Corporation, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before the motions are called in connection with the consideration of Bill C-219, an act to establish the Canada Development Corporation, the Chair might be allowed to make some suggestions about the way in which these motions might be considered.

The first suggestion I should like to make is that motions Nos. 1 and 2 be proposed together to the House,

*Canada Development Corporation*

that they be debated as a single question and that if there is a negative vote on motion No. 1, that vote will also dispose of motion No. 2; second, that motions Nos. 3, 4 and 5 might be grouped for the purpose of debate and should there be a negative vote on motion No. 3, that vote will also dispose of motions Nos. 4 and 5; third, motions Nos. 6 and 7 could be grouped for joint consideration and here again a negative vote on motion No. 6 would dispose of motion No. 7; fourth, motion No. 8 might be considered and disposed of separately. Motions Nos. 9 and 10 could be grouped for the purposes of debate but a negative vote on motion No. 9 should dispose also of motion No. 10.

I suggest to the House that motion No. 11 might well be defective in that it would appear to go outside the scope of Bill C-219 in attempting to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act. This motion is submitted to the consideration of the House by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart). However, before making a decision in that regard the Chair is prepared to hear argument when the motion is called for consideration in due course. Lastly, it is suggested that motion No. 12 be considered and disposed of separately.

If the suggestions of the Chair are acceptable to hon. members, the Chair is prepared at this time to put motion No. 1 and motion No. 2 to the House. Before doing so I should be pleased to hear the suggestions, comments or advice of hon. members.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I was looking at the grouping proposed by Your Honour and I find some difficulty in establishing the relationship between motions Nos. 9 and 10. Motion No. 10, relating to clause 39, deals with the acquisition of shares, in whole or in part, of certain Crown corporations whereas motion No. 9 deals with an entirely different clause and an entirely different matter. I find it somewhat difficult to see—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member does not have to argue the matter too strenuously. As I indicated I am quite prepared to make changes. It is sometimes not too easy for the Chair to interpret some of the motions proposed by hon. members. When an argument as logical as the one just made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is submitted for the consideration of the Chair, I have no hesitation in accepting the suggestion and motions Nos. 9 and 10 will be considered separately.

Hon. members know that suggestions made by the Chair are just for the convenience of the House. If hon. members take exception to the situation for serious reasons, there is no difficulty in agreeing with hon. members who make such suggestions. I would, therefore, agree that motions Nos. 9 and 10 be considered separately.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, if I may comment on the ruling you have made with respect to the 11 motions that have been submitted by members of this group, I may say that the suggestions you have made, taking into account the amendment pro-