

Supply

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the House to Standing Order 21 which was referred to by the Hon. Government House Leader. Standing Order 21 says that the Speaker may order a Member to resume his or her seat if, in the opinion of the Speaker, improper use is made of the Standing Order. I believe the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has indicated very clearly that there was no improper use of the Standing Order and that it was in fact being adhered to. That is the point he was attempting to make.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I have one brief point to make in response to the comment by the Deputy Prime Minister. The Deputy Prime Minister has suggested that the treatment which was accorded by the Speaker to the Hon. Member for Bow River on Monday last should have been accorded to me as well. I point out that the Speaker, on Monday last, did not in fact proceed with the Hon. Member for Bow River pursuant to Standing Order 21. Standing Order 21 would have required the Speaker to ask the Hon. Member for Bow River to resume his seat, as I was ordered to do. The Speaker did not do that but allowed the Hon. Member for Bow River to continue after an admonition.

I suggest that at the very least, if the argument of the Deputy Prime Minister is to be accepted, the same treatment should have been accorded to me.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further Hon. Members rising on this question of privilege?

The Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) has raised an important matter in the Chamber, referring to statements made by another Member during the period set aside for Statements by Members several days ago.

The House will recall that when that earlier statement was made, the Chair interrupted the Hon. Member and, I believe in gentle but firm language, indicated that what the Hon. Member was saying and what he might be saying would be offensive to Hon. Members and Canadians, and furthermore that the Hon. Member, as all Hon. Members would want to do, ought to be cautious in the use of language which would possibly lead to a point of order or question of privilege in the House, or to disorder which, of course, defeats the very freedom and rights to which the Hon. Member for Burnaby has most properly referred.

The Chair did interrupt the Hon. Member for Burnaby in the last few seconds of the period set aside for Statements by Members. It was the Chair's purpose to urge all Members again, including the Hon. Member for Burnaby, to be careful in the choice of words on an issue which, while legitimately raised in this Chamber, if raised in words which are inflammatory or apparently derogatory will lead to disorder.

• (1510)

I suggested to the Hon. Member for Burnaby that, under the circumstances, in view of the intervention by the Chair several days ago, which I think had the general approval of

this House, perhaps that was all that needed to be said about it. I must indicate to the Hon. Member that I do not think that, under all the circumstances, it is a question of privilege, but I do think it is an important matter. Legitimate matters are raised frequently in this Chamber, sometimes in language which perhaps borders on the offensive, but nonetheless the issues are important. I invited the Hon. Member several days ago to continue the statement, taking into account the admonition which the Chair gave to that particular Member. The Hon. Member for Burnaby will consider that the remainder of the statement was of a different tone than the earlier part which I felt was possibly getting close to creating some difficulties in the House.

The Chair would prefer not to make a hard ruling at this time. Perhaps the Chair can carefully consider *Hansard* and bring the matter back to the House.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 82—TRADE POLICY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Langdon:

That this House condemns the government for confusion, lack of direction, and secrecy in its trade policy, and specifically, condemns:

1. the misguided efforts of the Minister of International Trade to present a unilateral proposal to the United States which undercut the Canadian position before the Commerce Department's lumber countervail decision;
2. the weak and contradictory response of the same Minister to that lumber decision, by which she has neglected firm Canadian action and possibilities and used mere rhetoric and legal appeals within the very U.S. system of countervail she criticizes;
3. the failure of the Canadian Government to eliminate the damaging trade effects of the U.S. Farm Bill which hurts so many Canadian farmers;
4. the weakness of the Canadian Government in its response to the customs surtax and the differential U.S. tax on imported as opposed to domestic oil;
5. the way in which this government's free trade talks with the U.S. have made Canada a target of U.S. countervail and congressional action rather than helping this country escape such actions;
6. the lower priority given by this government to GATT negotiations rather than to comprehensive bilateral talks with the U.S.; and
7. the failure of this government realistically to assess the massive constitutional roadblocks in the way of a truly fair bilateral agreement between Canada and the U.S.

Mr. Speaker: When the House rose at one o'clock the Hon. Minister of State for Forestry and Mines (Mr. Merrithew) had the floor.

Hon. Gerald S. Merrithew (Minister of State (Forestry and Mines)): Mr. Speaker, just prior to lunch we pointed out as graphically as we could the fault in the first part of the motion we are debating today. In every case, every strategic move made on this issue was with the full support of industry, labour