

stabilization plan, any final report has been prepared on the consolidation of small farm units into units of more efficient size? If so, can the minister say whether this report will be made available to the House?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the paragraph in the statement to which the hon. member refers had reference to some plans being developed by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. Further details about these plans were subsequently issued by the minister, and I know that a full copy was distributed to all hon. members of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

\* \* \*

• (3:00 p.m.)

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

#### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Baldwin:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the government House leader about the business for the rest of this week and the beginning of next week, if he can direct his mind to that at this time.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, among the items that will be called will be the Judges Act. I hope to get consent later today to deal with it in a special way tomorrow. We will call the tax bill, the employment support bill and the agricultural stabilization bill. We will certainly call the employment support bill as the first item on Monday. I will probably call the agricultural stabilization bill as the first item tomorrow and, following that, the tax bill. For the moment, I reserve the opportunity to change the first item tomorrow if it seems desirable.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Can the minister indicate, for the benefit of members who want to participate in these important debates, whether that order will be preserved or is the minister reserving the right to change it from day to day?

**Mr. MacEachen:** No, Mr. Speaker. I do not propose to change the item suggested for Monday. The only one that might change is the first item to be called tomorrow, and probably that will not be changed.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It relates to a directive which Your Honour gave a week ago Monday at the conclusion of my speech and the point of order that I raised with regard to the regularity of Bill C-259. Your Honour indicated in very pointed terms that the House leaders should meet to discuss the nature of some procedure to cure apparent defects in Bill C-259. To date, no such House leaders' meeting has been called. The House is proceeding contrary to Your Honour's directive, with the consideration of a possibly imperfect bill which is contrary to the rules of the House. I hope the minister will be able to tell us when and if he plans to call such a meeting to produce some sort of solution to this situation.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that I have exactly the same interpretation of Your Honour's ruling as the hon. member. However, I propose to meet

with my opposite numbers at an early date. I will be happy to discuss this suggestion along the lines put forward by the hon. member.

While I am on my feet, would it be possible to raise another item with respect to the business of the House? I understand that discussions have taken place between the Minister of Justice and members opposite, as a result of which some expectation exists that we might be able to deal with the Judges Act in an hour and a half tomorrow afternoon. I know this is a firm expectation, not a commitment. There might be agreement to have an order of the House to commence with the Judges Act at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, so that regardless of what other business is before the House at that time we will deal with the Judges Act.

**Mr. Baldwin:** We are agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker. Within that period of one and a half hours, with the usual expedition that this party shows in dealing with bills, it should be through.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, we are quite willing for the government to exercise its authority over the business of the House and to call this item at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon or even earlier. It is always possible that it might be through by four o'clock, but I hope it is not being assumed that there will be an order of the House that the bill is to be through all stages by four o'clock. This might happen, but I remind the President of the Privy Council that there are several report stage amendments and third reading. We do not mind when the bill is called, but we do not want to be tied at this moment to a cutoff point.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, our party has agreed to this proposal, although we were anxious to express our objections, namely, that it is not the usual procedure and it is difficult, as the previous speaker has said, to foresee the length of the debate. We are wondering why this was not discussed during the meeting of the House leaders of all parties.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** It is the understanding of the Chair that the order agreed to now is that the item will be called at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. These are the terms of the order now agreed to by the House.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For two days in a row I have tried to get a very important question before the Prime Minister. Unfortunately, as the government has been using every opportunity to turn Parliament into a time machine, I find it almost impossible to get matters of great urgency before the ministry which, after all, should be responsible to the elected representatives of the people.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I hear a lot of static coming from members opposite, Mr. Speaker, including the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene).

**An hon. Member:** He does not have any energy.

**Mr. Hees:** And he has very few resources left.