

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 26, 1972

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

VETERANS AFFAIRS

First report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs—Mr. Foster.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

INDUSTRY

COAL MINING, NOVA SCOTIA—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move under Standing Order 43 a motion of urgent importance with regard to the fate of coal mining communities in the province of Nova Scotia, especially those depending upon independent coal mining operations.

In 1967 an agreement was reached between the federal government and the government of the province of Nova Scotia which resulted in the federal government assuming responsibility for the former Dosco mine operations on the understanding that the government of the province of Nova Scotia would assume full responsibility for independent coal mining operations in that province. As a result, the federal government established a Crown corporation known as Devco and the provincial government assumed obligations, including the payment of subventions or a substitute for subventions, for the coal produced by independent coal mine operations. At the present time in Nova Scotia—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that under the provisions of Standing Order 43 he should not make a speech in support of the motion. Under the terms of Standing Order 43 hon. members are entitled to make a motion without notice, but this can only be done in very exceptional circumstances. The hon. member should indicate as quickly as possible the motion he proposes for consideration of the House.

Mr. Coates: I felt it was only proper to give members an opportunity to have some understanding of the agreement I would like to see referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development. The problem is related to the fact that the coal mining operations in a number of communities in Nova Scotia that are the responsibility of the provincial government are now being threatened. I believe

that the original agreement between the federal government and the province of Nova Scotia is now being breached.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that he should indicate what his motion is. If all hon. members are allowed to make three or four minute speeches in support of proposed motions under Standing Order 43, I suggest that would lead to difficulties. I would hope we can count on the co-operation of hon. members to indicate as quickly as possible any motion they may have in mind.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That the agreement between the federal government and the province of Nova Scotia be referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

• (1410)

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North. This motion, moved under the terms 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 unanimous consent.

AUTOMOBILES—HIGHER CANADIAN PRICES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion under the terms of Standing Order 43. It arises out of the revelation today that North American auto producers are reaping an excess profit of \$150 million at the expense of the average Canadian as a result of their charging approximately \$300 more for a Canadian-made car in Canada than they do for an identical car in the United States. Such prices are not only—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to bring to the attention of the hon. member the considerations I brought to the attention of the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North. There is no provision at all in the Standing Order or in the practice of the House that allows hon. members to make speeches in support of a motion under Standing Order 43. To do so is entirely against the spirit of that rule. Hon. members should indicate as quickly as possible, without speeches, what the motion is that is proposed under the terms of the Standing Order.