

House of Commons

Chair, to the committee on procedure which will be sitting after the Christmas holidays. Mr. Speaker, I think that matter is extremely urgent, and there is also agreement between the four parties that the oral question period should also be reviewed.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

My motion was made pursuant to Standing Order 43. I have always been under the impression that such motions required the unanimous consent of the House. Maybe I did not listen carefully enough, but was the unanimous consent of the House requested or was the decision made in another way?

● (1410)

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I did not make myself clear. I was endeavouring to indicate to the hon. member that while his motion contained a subject matter of extreme importance, it was in my opinion more a matter of continuing concern such as other rules and procedures of the House which may be considered, which may be improved and which may be clarified at each session of every Parliament. Suggestions as to such improvements in the procedures of the House and the oral question period, as well as supplementary questions, are matters of continuing concern and therefore in my opinion, while this is an important matter, it cannot be used as a matter of urgent and pressing necessity to seek the consent of the House to set aside the ordinary business of the day. Accordingly, I rule it is not a proper question according to Standing Order 43.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I say that I understand quite well what you said in respect of the motion of my colleague from Bellechasse, but I know that any rule or any ruling can be changed with the consent of the House, whether you like it or not. So at this moment I think you should have asked the House whether the House is ready or not ready for that motion. That is what I think.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will remind the hon. member and the House one more time that notwithstanding the fact that a motion is presented to the House pursuant to Standing Order 43, and notwithstanding the fact that that rule envisages the unanimous consent of the House before debate is possible, the wording of the rule is as follows:

A motion may, in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by unanimous consent . . .

Therefore, I take it as a condition of a motion presented pursuant to Standing Order 43 not only that unanimous consent of the House be sought but in addition that it not only be an important matter as this is but that it be a matter of urgent and pressing necessity which in my opinion this is not.

[Mr. Fortin.]

CRIMINAL CODE**AMENDMENT TO MAKE DESTRUCTION OF FOOD AN OFFENCE**

Mr. Max Saltzman (Waterloo-Cambridge) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-361, to amend the Criminal Code (destruction of food).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Saltzman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this bill is to amend the Criminal Code in so far as the destruction of food is concerned so as to make it an indictable offence and therefore provide a penalty in cases where food fit for human consumption is destroyed. When this is done purposely as a form of protest, it becomes an immoral act in a world where so many people are in danger of starvation.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

[Text]

LANDED IMMIGRANT STATUS OF CHILEANS

Question No. 6—**Mr. Reynolds:**

To date, how many Chileans have been approved for landed immigrant status, how many have actually arrived and how many of these people were originally born in Chile?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Between September 11, 1973 and September 16, 1974, 2,697 persons whose country of last permanent residence was Chile have been authorized to come to Canada of whom 1,098 have actually arrived. Particulars of their country of birth have not yet been tabulated.

● (0000)

DEFENCE SERVICES PENSION FUND

Question No. 14—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. Did the government fail to publish an annual report of the Defence Services Pension Fund and, if so, for what reason?

2. Is any consideration being given by the government to investing the Defence Services Pension Fund monies into mortgages benefitting the contributors of the Pension Fund?

3. Who are the contributors of the Defence Services Pension Fund?

4. Is this Fund 50 per cent owned by the contributors?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. The annual report of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Fund was tabled by the Minister of National Defence on October 3, 1974.

2. No. Since the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account is part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, there are no separate moneys available and therefore consideration cannot be given to investing moneys in mortgages.