

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

## ALLOCATION OF TIME DURING ALLOTTED DAY

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I have a brief point of order. I believe that earlier this morning we made a tentative arrangement whereby we would divide up the time in a way similar to what we did on Monday night. Perhaps it escaped all of us that at that particular time on Monday night, because it was an adjournment debate, there was no such thing as a question and answer period after the speeches.

I would like to suggest to my colleagues in the other Parties that we should proceed in the following way; that in each round the Party in question decides whether they will have a 20-minute speech, followed by a 10-minute question and answer period. Alternatively, there could be a 10-minute speech, followed immediately by a five-minute question and answer period, followed again by a subsequent 10-minute speech and another five-minute question and answer period. In this way, we will not lose the opportunity to have questions and answers, but we will pro-rate them depending on the length of the speech. In other words, a 20-minute speech will have a 10-minute question and answer period and alternatively, a 10-minute speech will have a five-minute question and answer period.

I have had some discussions with my colleague from the New Democratic Party on this subject. I would like to offer that as a suggestion to the Whip of the Government to see if it has their agreement as well.

I think that we have perhaps inadvertently forgotten that part of the equation in the earlier discussions this morning.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Calgary West, and then I will hear from the Hon. Member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, the Government is quite prepared to see the ratio discussed. I think if we had a 13-minute speech and a seven-minute question and answer period then it should as closely as possible approximate the length of the speech in terms of its relative proportion, if that is not too onerous for the Chair. It may turn out to be too fine a line at some point, however, we could basically try that.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I agree there have been

*Routine Proceedings*

discussions. I would like to support the suggestion for two reasons.

One is that we are dealing today on an opposition motion put forward by the New Democratic Party on a number of environmental concerns. I think it is in the House's interest to have as many Members as possible participate in the debate if they wish.

Second, I think that it is a way to experiment with a change to the Standing Orders without actually changing them, to see if in fact it is an effective way to involve Members of the House on critical issues.

For those two reasons, we are anxious to proceed with the suggestion.

\* \* \*

• (1120)

**STARRED QUESTIONS**

**Mr. Speaker:** In the normal course starred questions Nos. 33 and 61 would be the subject of oral answers. If that is not the case, then perhaps the Hon. Minister of State could let the Chair know and the answers will be tabled.

**Hon. Jean J. Charest (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to starred questions Nos. 33 and 61 I am informed that the reason why the Government suggests that they be tabled is because the responses are very long. We felt that it would take up the time of the House to read them. Thus we suggested that they be tabled.