

Grain—Proposed Cash Advances

that under standing order 38 the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, on any day when it takes place, is placed ahead of all other matters, including starred questions. Therefore I feel that if my leader had attempted earlier today to move the adjournment of the house he could have been told quite properly that he would have to wait until all starred questions—this being Wednesday—had been disposed of, and that he would not get a chance at starred questions until after the house had finished what debate it wished to have on the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

I can say that my leader certainly gave consideration to attempting to move this motion earlier, but he felt that he would be out of order and therefore he preferred to wait until the time provided for in the rules.

As to the point as to whether or not a motion of this kind should be allowed when the debate on the address or the budget is going on, I suggest that both of those debates are general debates. There are occasions when hon. members who have taken part in those debates are interested also in the urgency of matters such as this, and there really is no reason why the fact that these other debates are taking place should preclude their taking part in a discussion which they feel is on a matter of urgent public importance.

I can recall that frequently Your Honour and your predecessors have suggested when an attempt like this has been made that consideration had to be given to the urgency of the debate. In other words you had to consider whether the question was of sufficient urgency to set aside what had been planned already for the house at that particular time. At this particular time the plan seems to be for the house to adjourn and the members to go home. By presenting this motion we are not proposing the setting aside of any other important matter. We propose this instead of going home. I feel that on all counts, the way in which the rules are set up, on the score of importance and on the score that it does not interfere with the discussion of anything else, this motion should be allowed for discussion for such time as the house wishes to give to it between now and six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: I must tell the hon. gentleman that when he says that in the past my predecessors, at least two of them, or I,

decided that there was no urgency of debate on the basis that we should not put aside the matters which had been specified to be debated on a particular day, he has, I agree, a point. It was in that light that very often decisions were made, namely that the motion would not be allowed, and that the business which had been appointed for that day should not be put aside, it being more urgent to debate other matters than the one proposed in the motion to adjourn the house.

I am not going to try to split hairs. It has been indicated by the hon. member and his leader that they have specific reasons for bringing forward this motion at this moment. Were I to agree that the motion has been moved at the right moment, and that it cannot be refused on the ground that matters appointed for today are more urgent, and this obviously because the said matters have already been disposed of and we are now, as he says, preparing to go home; if I were to state it as my opinion that this was a matter of urgent public importance we would have the situation that between four and six o'clock we would be debating this matter, namely the need for immediate action to provide cash advances on farm-stored grain, to alleviate the serious financial crisis now confronting western farmers and the entire economy of the prairie provinces.

For two hours we would be debating this specific subject which, in my view, as it has just been mentioned in the speech from the throne, will certainly be commented upon, discussed and debated at great length by many speakers during the debate on the speech from the throne. What will be my position when I try to administer other rules which tell me that there should not be any repetition of arguments, notwithstanding how much latitude is given in a debate like the speech from the throne debate?

I think the hon. member, for the sake of orderly discussion from now on, should not press the motion at this time, as I feel it is very important that we have an orderly and sufficiently wide discussion in the speech from the throne debate, and as I feel difficulty would be caused to other hon. members generally in discussing the speech from the throne without knowing exactly what to do about the specified matter being brought up today, one which cannot be debated to the satisfaction of all within the two hours that we have at our disposal.