

to that sector and when we look at the statistics which I mentioned earlier about the number of people, the input into the Gross National Product and the numbers of hours that go into it, we are dealing with these areas.

We are dealing with the Government's relationship with voluntary groups that give assistance to the disadvantaged, the advancement of religion, advancement of education, advancement of health, conservation of natural environment, as well as other purposes beneficial to the community. That is the frame of reference under which the voluntary agencies put themselves. If the Hon. Member wishes to dissociate himself from those, so be it.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier today our respective House leaders entered into an agreement or understanding regarding how the proceedings today would continue. I do not recall part of that gentlemen's agreement being a prolonged question and answer period. I believe it has served us well and we have agreed to continue with this, but I suspect, having listened to the arguments for the past half hour, that the arguments over the last 15 or 20 minutes have simply been arguments repeated time and again. I do not believe that we are exposing any new information or material. I ask that the House give some consideration to returning to our normal procedure.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member made that proposal earlier in a somewhat similar expression. As I understand it, the House gave its unanimous consent to an unlimited continuation of the question, answer and comment period which is normally of ten-minute's duration. Perhaps the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean) deserves considerable commendation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): As far as I know, while I have been in the chair no Member has been able to take a 20-minute speech and add a 10-minute question period for a total of something in the order of an hour and fifteen minutes.

However, the difficulty for the Chair is simply that the House gave unanimous consent to an extended question and answer period without putting a time limit on it. I would advise members, if I may, that I am receiving conflicting signals. Some of these signals indicate that there are Members who would like to enter debate and some of the signals, which are clearly given by Members to my right rising to continue the question and answer period, are that we ought to continue.

There are formal methods, the most usual of which would be to put a motion to see a particular method, for the purposes of debate, by which this could be done. I think that perhaps we might take a couple of minutes to see whether or not there is a mood in the House to move on to debate. If not, I invite those Hon. Members who wish to move to debate to consider a motion for that purpose.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Income Tax Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In the meantime, it is my view that since unanimous consent did not include any time limit, I will continue to recognize Hon. Members on questions and answers. I must. There is no choice.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. To begin with, I find it strange that a member of the NDP, a Party which has used every tactic in the book over and over to delay debate, is now saying that we should not delay debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): A point of order is an appeal to the rules and standing orders of the House. I must ask Hon. Members who rise on a point of order to do that. Before I can recognize the Hon. Member on a question, I must recognize any other points of order.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I agree with the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap and I agree with you as well that we should commend the Member for Waterloo for his endurance contest. He has indeed contributed greatly to the debate.

I would like to note his contribution at the end of the question session when he said that his Party was not advocating a return of the \$100 standard deduction. However, may I propose a second point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Before we get to a second point of order, would the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary address himself to the first point of order? I would be pleased to hear any point of order, but let us make it a point of order.

Mr. Fisher: Thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker. Your gentle teaching is moving me in the right direction. Since the unanimous consent of the House for extending the question period has meant that we have probably robbed one speaker of a full 20-minute cycle, I suggest, with the good will of the House, that we could give the next speaker a 20-minute cycle and a 10-minute question period, which would restore us to the normal balance in debate. We could then resume shorter speeches. I propose that you seek unanimous consent to go back to debate and to give the next speaker his or her regular turn with a 20-minute speech with questions.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, I will not give unanimous consent to that. I want to put a question to the last speaker.

Mr. Bosley: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): There is nothing in the rules which says we have to alternate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair will recognize Hon. Members, whether to the left or to the right, in the usual fashion. I think it is consistent, but the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) is pursuing a form of supplementary questions, and since the time is unlimited by the decision of the House of Commons, I will recognize the