

Economic Relations with United States

Mr. Speaker: Again, there is not unanimous consent. I apologize to the hon. member and I undertake to give him priority tomorrow. Orders of the day.

Mr. Nesbitt: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I decided not to raise this point of order until the end of the question period because I did not wish to take up the time of the House during that period.

On October 7 I placed the following question on the order paper:

1. Was an application for summer employment by Mr. Ian Hayes of Vancouver made to the Public Service of Canada on or about March 15, 1971?
2. In response to this application was any reply ever sent to Mr. Hayes by the Public Service Commission of Canada?
3. If so, on what date was the reply sent?
4. What was the purpose of the reply?

Last Monday, the day before yesterday, I received the following reply. I will read the reply. The question appeared somewhat changed and altered compared with the question I placed on the order paper.

1. Was an application for summer employment by Mr. Ian Hayes of Vancouver made to the Public Service Commission on or about March 15, 1971?

Here is one of the changes:

2. In response to this application, was any reply ever sent to Mr. Hayes by the Public Service Commission and, if so, on what date was the reply sent?
3. What was the purport of the reply?

My first point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the whole tenor, the whole meaning, of the question I placed on the order paper was changed when it appeared on the return. Now I come to the reply, which is as follows:

Answered by the Hon. Gerard Pelletier, Secretary of State of Canada.

I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Yes. June 1971.
3. He was advised that it appeared unlikely that he would be offered employment.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter sent to Mr. Ian Hayes and dated August 31, 1971. The letter reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Hayes,

Your application submitted to the Public Service Commission of Canada for summer employment has been reviewed.

Your interest in our program has been appreciated, but it now appears unlikely that you will be offered employment.

My second point of order is this: I very properly object to receiving completely wrong information in reply to written questions, and I hope the Secretary of State will carefully check into this matter with the Public Service Commission in an attempt to prevent unfortunate incidents such as this taking place in the future whereby the House is misled and misinformed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is a slight procedural difficulty. Orders of the day have been called. However,

perhaps with the consent of the House the hon. member for Peace River might speak. I appreciate that he is rising on a point of order concerning the business for this afternoon.

Mr. Baldwin: The point of order is that there has been a discussion with regard to the length of the speeches and, while no firm agreement has been reached, the general understanding is that the first speaker from each party might speak for 30 minutes and that thereafter speeches should be limited to 15 minutes. On our side these limits will be strictly adhered to. This is the suggestion I make to the House with the hope that hon. members will accept it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we agree to the times suggested, and we wholeheartedly support the proposition that no one ask for overtime.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed and so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (3:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO DEVELOP POLICIES TO ENSURE ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE AND FULL EMPLOYMENT—DETERIORATION OF RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough) moved:

That this House, noting the continuing deterioration of communication on the basis of common interest and mutual respect between the government of Canada and the government of the United States, condemns the government for failing to employ and improve firm and constructive economic and political relations with the United States, and, at the same time, for failing to develop a new economic policy which would strengthen our economic independence and fully employ our growing and highly-skilled human resources.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the last time I led off an opposition day to debate matters dealing with the external relations of Canada was May 28, less than half a year ago. That debate was brought on by feelings of discomfort and anxiety on account of the government's actions, and more particularly and painfully by the injudicious utterances of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the Soviet Union. Some of the same elements of concern are among the motivations for this motion and debate.

During the five months since, there have been some vast and at times perilous changes. Today the conduct of our foreign policy, especially our relationships with the United States, is far from being an intellectual exercise or a philosophic exchange. There are problems in the economic field that are of enormous gravity and very serious portent. Canada is not a great power, nor a super power. We are not, however, among the least nations in the world; not large enough to be feared, we are not so small as to be despised. We are not neophytes in diplomacy. We are a charter member of the United Nations, as we were a