

Supply—Agriculture

to do the kind of thing the United States did on that occasion. On May 5, 1955, it was announced that the United States would sell Great Britain \$73.9 million worth of surplus grain for sterling, the United States paying the \$3 million freight. Members of this group have repeatedly asked the Minister of Trade and Commerce to accept sterling but oh, no; he will not listen to us. He just cannot understand the meaning of sterling. Meanwhile the United States is taking sterling and also taking the markets. The United States will use part of that sterling—

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think this discussion would be more appropriate on the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I might suggest to my hon. friend that I intend to leave here tonight to go to meet Mr. Benson in Regina, and if I do not get somewhere with my estimates I do not know whether I will be able to talk to him when I get there. I wish we could get along and get down to the items.

Mr. Blackmore: Mr. Chairman, I am in your hands and in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, but this matter affects his department, too, and affects other products just as much as grain. I could leave out this portion but, so far as I can see, for the people of Canada there is nothing that could impress upon them the seriousness of the situation we face any more than these figures I am drawing to the attention of the committee. I have just a few more to give, then I shall pass on to other things which will be strictly in relation to the minister's department. I wish to help the minister as much as I can, but I have something to say and I am saying it. I am sure the minister will be quite happy to have it on the record.

The Chairman: I did not rise immediately after the Minister of Agriculture raised the point of order, though I thought perhaps there was a good deal of merit in what he said when he pointed out that certain portions of the hon. member's speech might very well be more properly made when the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce are under consideration.

However, without deciding that question, which is a difficult one, I rise now to remind the hon. member that his time has now expired.

Mr. Blackmore: Mr. Chairman, you certainly know that, now that you have spoken, I have 40 minutes more. You know that, surely. Every time a member is interrupted he has 40 minutes in addition to what he has already had.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

The Chairman: Order. I do not think I can subscribe to that principle. If carried to its logical conclusion, it would mean that a member would need only to ask one of his friends to interrupt him when he had spoken 39 minutes, and as a result he could speak indefinitely. I should think a more reasonable interpretation of the rule would be that a member may speak twice or three times, provided another member or members have had the opportunity to speak in the interval.

I understand any of the interruptions of the hon. member who had the floor were made with his consent, and I do not think my interruption would give him the right to proceed indefinitely.

Mr. Blackmore: Mr. Chairman, your ruling changes the procedure which has been followed ever since I have been a member in the House of Commons, and I have been here for nearly 20 years. I say that just one word of interruption gives me a chance to go on for another 40 minutes, according to the rules.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Blackmore: There is no doubt about it, according to the rule.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: I cannot subscribe to that interpretation by the hon. member. I feel I am on sound ground when I say that there must be an interruption in the nature of a speech of some sort by another member before the hon. member who has the floor would have the privilege of speaking again.

Mr. Blackmore: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, then all these interruptions have been using up my time. That is an outrageous thing. If a member consents to questions, and that is deducted from his time, it is obviously unfair in the very highest degree, and it is contrary to the rules. The minister himself interrupted, and it gave me the chance to speak another 40 minutes. The rule says that; there is no question about it. However, I do not propose to take all that time, but I do wish to give the message I intended to give. I think it is fitting that I do so; and, while I do not propose to impose upon the house or to abuse the privileges of debate, I do claim the protection of the rules.

Now, the United States uses part of this sterling—

The Chairman: Perhaps the hon. member did not understand me, but I have indicated that his time has expired, and that I cannot accept the interruptions as enabling him to enter into another timing period, if we may so describe it. Therefore the hon. member