Wheat Export Prices

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, before we pass whether the President of the Privy Council would inquire about question 2247, asked on May 8, and 2349, asked on May 23. It should not require much research to obtain the information to answer question 2247. It would also be most helpful if we could have the answer to question 2349 before the house rises for the summer.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will endeavour to do so, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION TO ADJOURN **UNDER S.O. 26**

TRADE

WHEAT-REDUCTION IN U.S. EXPORT PRICES THREAT TO CANADIAN ECONOMY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the new threat to the Canadian wheat economy arising from the announcement by the United States government that it has lowered its export price of wheat by 12 cents a bushel, which will further erode the financial position of the Canadian wheat farmer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has given the Chair notice of his motion, as required by Standing Order 26. As hon. members know, a number of similar motions have been proposed during the last week or ten days. On each occasion it has meant that the Chair has had to make a difficult decision. I ruled before that there had been a debate which in some ways was related closely to the subject matter of the motions then presented by other hon. members. I have had the same doubts about the motion the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has just proposed. At the same time, the motion refers to a very important new factor and I feel that perhaps it would be the desire of the house that we set aside a few hours of debating time for the purpose of considering the very important matter referred to in the motion of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

[Mr. Corbin.]

Having taken all factors into consideration, on to the next item of business I wonder I feel it is my duty to allow the hon. member's motion so that a debate can take place after eight o'clock this evening provided, of course, that the hon. member has leave of the house to propose his motion. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: If 20 hon. members rise, the motion is opposed and will not be put. If 20 or more hon. members rise in opposition to the proposed motion, that is the right of hon. members.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): What do you boys over there say to that?

Mr. Speaker: If hon. members will look at Standing Order 26(8) they will see, I believe, that 20 or more members may rise to indicate that a debate shall not take place. I have to leave it to hon. members to decide whether 20 or more wish to rise in opposition.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, is it not the other way round?

Mr. Speaker: I was going to read the Standing Order. It is 20 members supporting the motion who have to rise. This would be the condition determining if there is opposition. Are 20 members rising on this point?

And more than 20 members having risen:

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could make a suggestion? It would be quite agreeable on this side, if hon. members would like to start earlier, to start perhaps at four o'clock rather than at eight, o'clock this evening.

Mr. Speaker: If there is agreement. Hon. members know what the terms of the Standing Order are. Under Standing Order 26(9) leave would be deemed to be granted and the motion would be proposed for consideration at eight o'clock this evening. If there is unanimous agreement the hon, member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands could allowed to proceed immediately.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of hon. members?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.