

Possible Sale of Publishing Firm

hearing in Washington by the United States Department of the Interior. If the House would consent, I would therefore move:

That this House urges the government forthwith to express Canada's opposition to the TAPS proposal; and further urges the government to inform the government of the United States that both nations must participate in a joint task force to reach a solution to the problem that will best protect the environment of any route used.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peace River which requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity so the motion cannot be put.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

POSSIBLE SALE OF McCLELLAND AND STEWART PUBLISHING FIRM TO FOREIGN INTERESTS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the leave of the House to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I can explain my reasons for so doing in one sentence. This morning McClelland and Stewart, the publishing firm, announced its intention to sell, and while it indicated that it would be reluctant to sell to foreign concerns it did not exclude that possibility. This is the third major Canadian publishing house to be placed in this position in the last six months. I would therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert):

That this House urges the government to consider specific measures to prevent the third major Canadian book publisher in six months, McClelland and Stewart, from being purchased by foreign interests, and immediate action, such as the provision of long-term, low-interest loans to Canadian book publishers and the creation of a Canadian book development corporation in order to prevent the imminent collapse of the Canadian publishing industry.

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member under the provisions of Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity so the motion cannot be put.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26**THE CANADIAN ECONOMY**

PROJECTED TAKEOVER OF HOME OIL BY UNITED STATES COMPANY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the statement made in the House of Commons yesterday by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) that Home Oil Company Limited of Calgary had not yet been sold and this morning's press reports that a sale is imminent, and hence the need for Parliament to debate this vitally important matter and to consider methods of preventing the last major Canadian-owned and controlled oil company from being sold to non-residents.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has given the notice required under this Standing Order 26. As hon. members know, this same matter was brought to the attention of the House about a week ago. At that time the Chair indicated that this was the kind of matter or type of situation contemplated by the provisions of Standing Order 26.

At that time I indicated that in view of the fact there were to be two days of debate on the budget that would be an ideal occasion for the House to consider this very important and urgent matter. Unfortunately that debate did not relate to this particular matter. There was a debate on unemployment and the subject matter raised by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands was not touched upon. I am of the same opinion today in that I believe this is the type of situation contemplated by the Standing Order and that under such circumstances the Chair should be prepared to put the motion to the House.

I might say in passing that I have some objection to the form of the motion put by the hon. member, specifically the reference to the statement by the minister. This would perhaps give the impression that what the hon. member wishes the House to discuss is the statement of the minister. At that point we might perhaps get into the type of debate which I am sure the hon. member does not envisage at this time.

Having said all this and having given the matter very serious consideration, and taking into account the probability that the very important debate in the House this afternoon on veterans affairs legislation is likely to be completed before this evening, I would think that hon. members would want to have the opportunity to express their views on this subject. Therefore I propose to ask whether the hon. member has the leave of the House to put his motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.