

Time Allocation

[Translation]

I thank the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for raising this most interesting issue.

[English]

I hope that this judgment has helped to clarify the matter for all hon. members.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, during Question Period and in response to a question the Minister of Agriculture stated that I had misled the House.

This is very serious. I would like to point out that some of the figures I used came from the minister's own department. I would suspect that likely he was referring to the fact that I said as result of his government's policy farm income would drop by \$2.6 billion in the coming year. The minister's own figures show that there will be a drop of \$1.7 billion in expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for the coming year.

Therefore I would suggest to you, Sir, that the drop in his own expenditures is in effect as a result of government policy.

I would ask to have that remark withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: I am prepared to hear further argument.

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture who has another engagement at the present time. He is unable to be here to make any comment. We would ask him to respond at the earliest opportunity when he returns to the House.

Mr. Speaker: We certainly will accommodate the minister and hear his response.

I want to point out to the hon. member for Lambton—Middlesex that the word "mislead" is sometimes used on both sides of the House. It always gives me a certain concern because the question has to be whether the word is used in the sense that the minister or the

member is intentionally misleading the House. That is what I would have to determine.

The hon. member for Lambton—Middlesex would know that that would be the question I would have to decide. I have some difficulty in sorting out the merits of an argument over various allegations of numbers and figures on both sides of the House. However I will hear the minister at an appropriate time.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-28

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis:

That, in relation to Bill C-28, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and, one sitting day to the consideration of the third reading stage of the bill; and

That, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the day allotted to the report stage consideration and on the day allotted to the third reading stage consideration of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, I am not very happy to be speaking this afternoon on a motion to impose closure on a bill that deserves to be heard.

I sat in the House throughout this morning's debate just as you did, Madam Speaker, and I listened to argument after argument by opposition members. These opposition members were stating the obvious, that is this government has imposed closure and time allocation more times than any other government in the history of this country.

It is a sad state of affairs when the government has to impose its will on the people of Canada, rather than do the will of the people of Canada and carry out their wishes and needs. I sat here and listened to the various arguments that were being made. I was quite surprised that I did not hear a single word in response from members on the opposite side of the House.