

Sugar Price Increase

to be considered. One is urgency and the other is opportunity. Under the heading of urgency may I say that this matter has been talked about, considered and discussed. It may not have been done too thoroughly, but at least it has been raised over a period of several days.

An hon. Member: Just like the price.

Mr. Speaker: The question of opportunity is, of course, easier to deal with. Surely there will be an opportunity next Monday at the latest. Therefore in the circumstances I do not think that the motion of the hon. member justifies the conditions set out in standing order 26 for the adjournment of the ordinary business of the house for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. In view of the opportunities which will be available presently I do not believe the motion comes within the conditions required and the general understanding of standing order 26 in accordance with the precedents. Therefore I do not believe the motion is in order.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): On the point of order, may I point out with reference to the question of opportunity that the opportunity of dealing with this matter on Monday to which Your Honour has referred lies almost solely within the purview of the official opposition, since they have the right to move the amendment to the supply motion and that amendment will govern the debate which follows right up until the vote is taken at 8.15 on Tuesday evening. Unless the member is fortunate enough to catch Your Honour's eye subsequently in the very short period between the taking of the vote and ten o'clock, there is really no opportunity to discuss this matter. Therefore the supply motion does not give members in all parts of the house an equal opportunity to raise a matter of such urgent importance as we deem this to be.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point just raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam I would point out that one of the friends of the hon. member who has just sought to adjourn the house was recognized on a grievance as recently as last Tuesday, and did not see fit to raise this question. So this suggestion that there is no opportunity to do it does not appear to be in accord with the actual and very recent facts in this house. It does seem to me that Your Honour's ruling is completely in accord with the practice over the years.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Megantic): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that this

[Mr. Speaker.]

motion is somewhat like one I had last Thursday week, and I delayed it until last Monday or Tuesday so that we could debate it. We all know that the amendment then proposed dealt with nuclear arms and not with agriculture, and after that I did not have the opportunity of catching Your Honour's eye for grievances, when debate turned to the pension plan. The agricultural business is still not discussed, and the St. Lawrence seaway is freezing up. If it keeps up this way the same thing will happen with respect to a discussion of sugar prices, and I believe the question should be discussed today in the house.

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, to supplement what the Secretary of State has already said, the opportunity arose for the hon. gentleman in question to speak on this question on the estimates of the Department of Justice, which were before the house last Friday night. That opportunity was taken by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to discuss this subject, but neither the hon. gentleman nor I believe any member of his party or any other hon. member of the house took part in that discussion. I suggest that those estimates will be coming up again in the very near future and that they will provide an opportunity for all hon. members to discuss this question.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this has taken a strange turn. You made a ruling, and following the ruling various members of the other parties have been making statements respecting this matter.

The failure to make any statement at this time is not to be taken as the attitude of the official opposition against this motion. We have been inquiring about this matter ever since the month of March, but without success. However, I suggest that if there is going to be difficulty discussing this matter on the supply motion on Monday or Tuesday, now that the Minister of Agriculture is back in the house possibly the committee on agriculture should deal with this and discuss it at length, because it needs to be discussed and considered. The rise in the price of sugar is beyond anything that can be excused, and this government has done nothing.

LABOUR RELATIONS**REFUSAL OF U.S. WORKERS TO LOAD CANADIAN SHIPS**

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the