

Business of the House

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member rose on a point of order and he rose on a question of privilege. To my mind there was neither a point of order nor a question of privilege. After the expiry of the question period, the hon. member asked a question. He claims the floor again on a question of privilege. I will, of course, hear him.

● (1510)

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege on behalf of examiners in Cape Breton who are under the minister's jurisdiction. The minister made an accusation against members of his own department. He said that Mr. Perry did not want to be restricted. Is he to be restricted if he is contacting men under the minister's jurisdiction working on the question of mine safety?

Mr. Speaker: I again suggest to the hon. member and the minister that this matter might be pursued some other way. It should not be discussed or debated under the guise of a question of privilege. The Chair has called orders of the day. I apologize to the House. Apparently we are still on points of order.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**WEEKLY STATEMENT**

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask the government House leader the Thursday question about business of the House. We all know that the next four days, including today, are designed for the completion of the allotted days. Can the government House leader give us an idea of priority items after that so we can be thinking about them?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Wednesday next we will deal with the competition bill. This will be followed by CNR financing, export development and fisheries development. I ask the hon. member to now tell us his subjects for the next four days so that we can be thinking about them.

Mr. Bell: We will have lots of surprises.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The open negotiations among House leaders a few minutes ago had to do with a possible change in time limits with respect to the speeches in today's debate. I think Your Honour will find there is agreement among the four parties to modify Standing Order 58(13) for today in these terms: The mover of the motion to have 30 minutes, the principal speaker for the government to have 30 minutes, the first speaker for the Progressive Conservatives to have 20 minutes and the first speaker for the Social Credit to have 20 minutes. Everyone else is to have 15 minutes and there are to be no extensions. I think Your Honour will find that is agreed to by all parties.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

[Mr. Munro (Hamilton East).]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—SUGGESTED NEED FOR NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY, NATIONALIZATION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC AND APPOINTMENT OF CONTROLLER

Mr. David Lewis (York South) moved:

That in the opinion of this House all forms of national transportation should be integrated as a public utility to serve Canada's transportation needs instead of being governed by considerations of competition and profit so that Parliament can deal effectively with freight rate discrimination, rail line abandonment, insufficient railway equipment, inadequate rail passenger service, and urban and northern transportation;

This House is further of the opinion that to this end the Canadian Pacific Railway, including its subsidiaries, should be brought under public ownership and that both national systems should be under full public control;

And, further, in order to meet the present emergency in the movement of grain and other products, this House is of the opinion that the Government should consider the immediate appointment of a transport controller with full authority to allocate and control railway rolling stock.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) must be the envy of his colleagues in the cabinet. Who else among them could have risen in the House and outside the House to say that the national transportation policy is disastrous and, indeed, that there is no national transportation policy and be praised for it by editorial writers and commentators? That is why I say I imagine he is the envy of his colleagues. They could not get away with that. It was because of the minister's charm and transparent honesty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: I do not begrudge the minister the praise which he has received. He at least had the courage to admit to the people of Canada that the present transportation policy in this country is a failure. However, I want to emphasize that in my view the people of Canada ought not to be beguiled by this honest and frank confession by the minister. The people of Canada have to remember that it was a Liberal government in 1966 and 1967 which proposed this policy which the minister now finds to be a failure. Indeed, this minister was a member of the government at that time. I cannot imagine otherwise than that the policy presented by the Hon. Mr. Pickersgill to the House at that time was one that was carefully studied and discussed by the whole cabinet in view of the importance of transportation to Canada. This minister, like other members of the then government, and most of them are still on the treasury benches, must have subscribed to the principles of the act presented at that time.

The people of Canada must also remember and not be beguiled by the minister's frankness, desirable and admira-