

Proposed Legislation

[English]

TRANSPORT

LABRADOR—CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion under Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that it has now been 838 days since this Parliament unanimously adopted the report of the Standing Committee on Transport relating to road transport in Labrador I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House instructs the government to immediately initiate negotiations with the provinces of Newfoundland and Quebec on construction of a highway system across Labrador linking it with the national highways system; and that the Minister of Transport, who made the initial commitment on March 6, 1970, report to this House on or before the final day of this session on the progress made.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not. The motion cannot be put.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ANNUAL REPORT—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. It concerns the traffic safety annual report of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson).

In view of the fact that information on motor vehicle defects is organized—I am sure inadvertently—in such a way as to be entirely useless to the motoring public, and in view of the fact that the federal government has an indisputable responsibility to make this information known to the public in the clearest possible form, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan):

That the Minister of Transport take immediate steps to review his department's annual report with the intention of providing the public with clear and comprehensive information on motor vehicle defects.

Mr. Speaker: Under the terms of Standing Order 43, this motion also requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent and therefore the motion cannot be put.

[Mr. Speaker.]

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE ACT

AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE FILING OF MONTHLY REPORTS ON NAMES OF COMPANIES AND AMOUNTS OF GRANTS UNDER CERTAIN PROGRAMS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-219, to amend the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce Act (public disclosure).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to file monthly reports on the names of the companies and amounts of grants authorized under programs of the department such as PAIT, DIP, IDAP, PEP and GAAP.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING COMMITMENT OF MONEY IN ANY FISCAL YEAR

On the order: Introduction of Bills.

June 16, 1972—Mr. Broadbent—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act".

Mr. Speaker: The Chair referred yesterday to some procedural difficulties which were perceived in relation to the bill now proposed by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby and indicated the grounds of objections that had come to mind. If the hon. member has any opinion to express in relation to the procedural aspects of this bill I will hear him; otherwise I will express the views of the Chair.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, before doing that I would ask the Chair to clarify which of the two amendments to the Regional Development Incentives Act the Chair is referring to. I am presenting two bills to amend the same act.

Mr. Speaker: This bill has an explanatory note as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that incentive grants under the Regional Development Incentives Act result in permanent benefits to the economy and the people of designated regions rather than benefits to private enterprise.

I think the explanatory note would identify the bill.

Mr. Broadbent: On the procedural point, Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is certainly not the intention of the bill to increase public spending in this area at all; rather it is intended primarily to redistribute the spending already allocated and approved by the government and to ensure that a greater percentage of the funds goes to Crown corporations as opposed to private corporations. Because the bill involves no increase in expenditure I would think it should be allowed.