

actual need for the government and for responsible ministers since, in effect, this House would become the discussion point before the government could make up its mind. It is the government that has the responsibility for determining the direction in which it should move to correct anything found out, or found to be improper, as a result of the investigation.

I also think that the hon. member for Hamilton West, for the benefit of those persons who may, more by accident than design, read what is being debated in this private members' hour, should have expanded a little bit on the bill itself. In that respect I think I should read paragraph 2 of Chapter I-13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada:

The Governor in Council may, whenever he deems it expedient, cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof.

Then there is a paragraph about the appointment of commissioners and the power of the commissioners, which is much as it is set out in a court of law. Perhaps I should also read paragraph 6 as follows:

The minister presiding over any department of the Public Service may appoint at any time, under the authority of the Governor in Council, a commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business, or any part of the business, of such department, either in the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service, so far as the same relates to his official duties.

I have already stated my position in respect of the principle governing the declaration of these reports being at the discretion of the government. We then come to the technical considerations. As the hon. member himself must realize, as most of us do when presenting these public bills, when they are compiled they almost inevitably contain points at conflict with the existing statute.

Let us take Bill C-206 as an example. In the first clause, which is the part the hon. member suggests be added, it states:

The commissioners shall, within 15 days after the completion of a report by them on any matter within the scope of the commission, cause the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

However, the act itself says in Section 13:

No report shall be made against any person until reasonable notice has been given to him of the charge of misconduct alleged against him and he has been allowed full opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel.

Obviously no one can guarantee the time this is going to take, and that makes quite inoperative the definition in Bill C-206 of the specific time, which might quite easily take away the rights of the individual.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in respect of the arrangements that have been considered for the debate tonight. I think you will find there is unanimous agreement to a House order which I shall suggest in a moment.

Slaughter of Calves

Standing Order 26 provides for all speeches to be limited to 20 minutes, but it makes no provision for the debate to end until everyone who wishes to do so has spoken. I think you will find, however, that there is unanimous agreement to the following points: First, that the first round of speeches be limited to 20 minutes, but that all speeches after that be limited to 15 minutes; second, that no one shall seek or be given overtime; and third, that the debate be concluded not later than twelve o'clock.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is the agreement as I understand it as well, Mr. Speaker, and we consent.

Mr. Caccia: It is acceptable to us as read, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired I now leave the chair until 8 p.m. at which time the House will proceed to consideration of the meat producing industry, under Standing Order 26.

At 6.03 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

AGRICULTURE

DESTRUCTION OF CALVES AND HIGH RETAIL PRICE OF MEAT

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Leave having been granted to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the crisis in the beef producing industry manifested by the destruction of calves in Quebec and the high prices being paid by consumers throughout Canada, it is moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I want at the outset to answer briefly the questions—why do we have this debate—why do we have the crisis that now exists in the meat producing industry, referred to in the motion I sought leave to move this afternoon?

Public awareness that something was drastically wrong, that something was profoundly disturbing, was surely maximized last night when millions of Canadians witnessed on television the tragic destruction of some 600