

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am prepared to present my point of order tomorrow when this motion is made, if that is the preference of the Chair, or I would be willing to state now the reasons I raise the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has simply given notice of a motion today. It would probably be more appropriate if the hon. member has a point of order respecting these discussions to raise it tomorrow. It is very difficult for me to decide, however, without knowing the point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to give more detail tomorrow, but because this is the first time in history—granted, the history of Section 75C is not yet a full ten years—that a motion under this standing order has been made to cover two stages in the proceedings of a bill, I suggest Your Honour look at the precedents respecting this matter.

● (1512)

My contention is that despite the wording of Standing Order 75C, it is hardly fair or proper to be discussing or moving curtailment of time on a stage, namely, third reading, that we have not yet reached. Who knows, Mr. Speaker, there might be some amendments to the bill at the report stage that would change the whole picture. At any rate, I am prepared to argue tomorrow, if you accept this as a caveat, that I question the right of the government to present a motion on Bill C-14 covering two stages.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I shall certainly hear that point of order at the appropriate time, which I believe is tomorrow. My impression is that, as the hon. member has said, he would have to argue his point despite the language of the standing order. Without looking at it, my recollection is that the language of the standing order is "stage or stages" of any bill. It is open for the hon. member to raise that point and argue it, however. I think the appropriate time would be upon the introduction of that debate tomorrow.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 385, 470, 472, 474, 538 and 662.

[Text]

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Question No. 385—**Mr. Herbert:**

During each of the past five years, what amount of money available for use under federal programmes, was unused in the Province of Quebec?

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Judd Buchanan (President of the Treasury Board): The information requested is not readily available. To provide an accurate reply would entail a lengthy and costly examination of the accounts of every program of each department which cost in manpower and time would be exorbitant or prohibitive.

AGRICULTURE—POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

Question No. 470—**Mr. Wise:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,793 of the Third Session of the 30th Parliament, for what reason was \$2,500 given to L.-J. Personnel of Ottawa in the fiscal year 1976-77 to write up position descriptions for the small farm development programme, bearing in mind that the programme was set up four years earlier in 1972, and was only funded to run until 1979?
2. Was the Department of Agriculture's Personnel section asked to write up the position descriptions and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Program managers did not have staff resources to allocate toward writing position descriptions and arrangements were made to contract for these services with a firm with the necessary expertise for the following reasons:

- (a) The program was being developed over a period of time and positions were described and classified as required.
- (b) The organizational structure of the program administration was evolving at this time and, even though the program was scheduled to expire in 1979, it was necessary to prepare position descriptions that were consistent with the new organization.

2. No. It is the responsibility of program managers to write position descriptions for their organization.

ALAN WARD OF WAKEFIELD

Question No. 472—**Mr. Wise:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,793 of the Third Session of the 30th Parliament, what is the layman's explanation of the purpose of the \$21,792.77 contract given to Alan Ward of Wakefield "to restructure agriculture follows directly from technological progress and improved living standards to help farmers who are restructuring"?
2. What were the conclusions or recommendations of the study?
3. For what reason was this contract not given to the Agricultural Economics section of the Department of Agriculture?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Initiatives under the Small Farm Development Program (SFDP) were designed to assist small-scale low-income farmers to adjust to changing circumstances, including changing technology and demands for farm products. The primary purpose of this contract was to assess the need for changes in the program in the context of the extent and nature of the small-scale low-income farmer problem.

2. The principal conclusions and recommendations were:

- (a) SFDP resources should be directed primarily towards an estimated 51,000 full-time and 14,000 part-time low-income farmers;