

Supply

I cannot recall the House having faced the unusual placing of notice, multiple notice, premature notice, and then withdrawing notice that we have seen the official opposition demonstrate over the last several days.

I ask the Chair to see the need for the return to traditional practices concerning the notice of such motions. The designation comes first, notice follows, and the notice stays. Mr. Speaker, am I wrong on that count? If the Chair looks at *Hansard* for May 28, 1987, notice and calling of debate on allotted days are inter-related in that order. If there is a slip-up anywhere along that path, it has to get set right by the consent of this House.

• (1130)

I submit we should keep our notice system as rigorous as it has been traditionally. This requires discipline for both the government and for private members. I do not believe that the Notice Paper should be empowered to somehow appear to legitimize proposals that cannot procedurally be put to the House and do not belong where we, as members, sometimes want to put them on that paper.

I do not wish to impede the debate today on the Liberal leader's motion. I am happy he is able to propose it here today. We want to get on with that debate. I do ask the Chair to consider these questions I have raised, hear other voices as there may be different views and then help the House out at a later point by giving us some answers to these technical but important questions.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary has raised some very interesting points. It is very difficult to know exactly when an Opposition day is going to be held. Normally on Thursday after Question Period, it is the responsibility of the Government House Leader to tell the Opposition parties when the next Opposition day is going to take place. It was very unclear last Thursday whether the government was going to call an Opposition day, which was our turn, on Friday or on Monday. Thus it is very difficult for people on this side of the House to plan any motion that is put down.

I suggest to the parliamentary secretary that maybe if the government would clearly set out its plan of work for the House, then Opposition parties would not have to put down two motions and then withdraw after they find

out what the government is going to do. I would say in passing that it would be very nice, when we give notice this far ahead, as the Leader of the Opposition has, to have the Minister of Agriculture here to respond.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I too do not want to extend this important discussion. We are anxious to begin the debate on the Opposition motion on agriculture, particularly in light of the Minister of Agriculture's comments late last week condemning the free trade agreement in terms of what it has done to agriculture.

Having heard the various questions that the parliamentary secretary has put to the Chair, I think they are questions that must be answered. As my good friend from Algoma has also indicated, some earlier notification of Opposition days would be appropriate. On Thursday, late in the day, we were still unsure makes it impossible for critics to be here as presumably there is some difficulty with the Minister of Agriculture being in attendance here today. As Opposition parties we really had no alternative but to take some of the steps we were forced to take. Perhaps by responding to the questions of the parliamentary secretary and hearing our concerns we can avoid this problem in the future.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have heard from all three parties on the same point of order. I think the hon. member has brought this to the attention of the Chair. I will take it under advisement and give a ruling at a later date.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 81—AGRICULTURE AND TRADE POLICIES

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That this House condemn the government for having jeopardized the future of Canadian agriculture by its ill-conceived trade policies, especially the Canada-U.S. Trade Deal,

1) which have failed to gain access to the U.S. market in spite of the promises of the Prime Minister in the 1988 General Election;