

Privilege—Mr. Jelinek

might have been effective but, in any event, knowing the usual courtesy of the President of the Privy Council I am convinced in advance that he would have answered my question.

Since the question I asked related to this Parliament as a whole and was supplementary to a question I have previously asked in this session which seemed to meet the approval of all colleagues in this House about setting up a calendar for session periods which would correspond as much as possible to the school calendar in order to allow parliamentarians to be able to live a family life during two or three periods in the year, especially as there is now a private bill before this House which was tabled by an hon. member and which is also in agreement with the proposal I had made on that occasion, and since the President of the Privy Council at the time stated in this House that he would recommend to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization that it examine that question, which is very serious not only for parliamentarians themselves but for the efficiency of Parliament as such because I consider that when we have in advance a well determined calendar I think that every parliamentarian will do all he can to give his full effort to meet the obligations he has to meet in the given period.

So my question was this: Can the President of the Privy Council say today where things stand in respect of that matter, and will the government be introducing soon a session calendar so that we can work with more efficiency, more assurance and waste less time on useless discussions: Are we going to adjourn or are we not going to adjourn?

That is my point of order, Mr. Speaker. And if you allow the President of the Privy Council to be kind enough to answer my question I would be very happy about that, and I thank you in advance.

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member, but either I was inattentive or the translation facilities were not perhaps working properly and I did not catch the introduction to his question. I am very sympathetic to the hon. member's desire to be able to know when we can leave this House for our constituencies and for home. For example, by Friday of this week—I have given notice of this over and over again—it was the desire of the government to rise. However, it is not really for me to say whether we will or not, since there is some government business still uncompleted. I am still hopeful that that will be the case.

I should also like to say to the hon. member that in the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, on which his party has a representative, we have established a subcommittee on the management of time, and I am hopeful that that subcommittee will be able to arrange affairs in such a way that we can have a more definite idea when we can go to our constituencies.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Olivier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) on a point of order.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

Mr. Olivier: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege concerning the decisions you make so that members on this side are not recognized during the question period. I would respectfully submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we consider the jurisprudence used in England, members have the floor in turns no matter which party they belong to. No matter which party we belong to, Mr. Speaker, we are all equal. Mr. Speaker, some months ago you ruled that a parliamentary secretary could not ask questions. Today you followed the practice whereby only two government members are entitled to ask questions. I think that this is illogical and that you violate the member's privileges.

Mr. Speaker: I only wish to tell the hon. member that perhaps he felt better yesterday when I think three or four government members asked questions. It changes with each sitting.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member may have a good point, but probably members on the government side could take 15 minutes before their Wednesday caucus in order to get the answers in caucus.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege having to do with a question I asked during the question period today, a short while ago. It seems to me a very serious matter when a minister of the Crown, in this case the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan), has announced a freeze on the purchase of private land in the St. Lawrence Islands area and advises the public accordingly, by public statement, while at the very same time another minister of the Crown, purportedly the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer), apparently permits two persons, claiming to be his representatives, namely, William Fraser and Robert Fraser, to go contrary to this freeze and as recently as the last few days attempt to negotiate the purchase of some of this very same land.

My question of privilege is that the Minister of Supply and Services should either disassociate himself completely from this event or, if it has happened, I think I am in order to suggest that he should explain to this House why he, by his very behaviour, would be going contrary to an arrangement made by another member of the cabinet and an understanding given to the public and members of this House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Olivier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) on a point of order.

Mr. Olivier: Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to ask you to look into the statistics and you will realize that 10 per cent more members from the opposition side are recognized than from the government side, and that by your own decision.

So, when you say that government members are allowed to put three or four questions, I think you have not taken a