

Indian Affairs

That contemplates no expenditure whatever. It may well be that as a result of those negotiations expenditures will be forthcoming, but that will be as a result of the negotiations, not as a result of the motion and report now before the House. I think Your Honour has no choice.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members again for the advice they have given to the Chair. This point has been raised twice within the last few days. In the course of giving my views about the motions that are before the House I had expressed the thought that my reservation dealt more precisely with the third report of the committee rather than with the second report. My understanding of the second report was, as the hon. member for Skeena has said, that the first part deals with principles, and if there were fault to be found with the wording of the report it would be found in the last part which reads as follows:

—and to take steps immediately to enter into negotiations with the Indian people with respect to the said title.

My hope would have been, and it is still my hope, that this could have been altered and perhaps have achieved the same result by substituting the following words; “and consider the advisability of entering into negotiations with the Indian people with respect to the said title.”

There is not, perhaps, a substantial change there, but at least if those words were included in the report before the House we would have respected a longstanding practice of the House and I think would have saved ourselves a great deal of trouble. I wonder whether the House, by unanimous consent, would not be prepared to make this change now. If it did, there would be no difficulty in proceeding. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: By unanimous consent, therefore, the report will be changed in that way. This having been done, there is no difficulty at all from a procedural standpoint with the motion and it will be put to the House.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if we could adopt the same practice as was followed yesterday and suspend the discussion on this motion until after routine proceedings and oral questions have been completed. In addition, in view of the very great interest that has been shown by many people in this subject and as we have to convenience the government in trying to expedite passage of the tax bill and have agreed to take today, a short day, for this debate, possibly there might be agreement to limit speeches to 20 minutes for the first speaker from each party and 15 minutes for each following speaker. It has been shown by experience that speeches are very much better if they are shorter.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the desirability of suspending the debate until we have concluded routine proceedings and the oral question period. However, I would very much prefer to have the regime that was followed yesterday, namely, that the chief speakers from each group have 30 minutes rather than 20. With respect to subsequent speeches, I am quite prepared to agree to any reasonable arrangement.

[Mr. Howard.]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, possibly we could have the usual interesting meetings through the usual channels to see if we can work something out before the debate begins. Otherwise, we might have to agree to something we do not want.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be a very important motion, and because today is a short day I suggest we deal with it in its proper order.

Mr. Speaker: I gather we have agreed not to agree and there will be discussions through the usual channels. Is it the wish of the House that the motion be put at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding is that this debate will be postponed until after the question period.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

APPOINTMENT OF DEFEATED LIBERAL CANDIDATES TO POSITIONS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as we are still on the order of motions I should like to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43. I do so for the purpose of clearing the air and removing certain uncertainties, particularly for friends of my friends opposite. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House request the government to table a list of all Liberal candidates defeated in the last election who have not yet been appointed to government positions, together with a list of the positions to which they will be appointed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I gather there is not unanimity. I have already heard some nays.

* * *

FLOODS

HIGH WATER LEVELS IN GREAT LAKES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion concerning a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, namely, the exceptionally high water levels in the Great Lakes and the consequential danger to property and human life constituting a national emergency. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling):