

Order Paper Questions

COST OF LITERATURE PRODUCTION

Question No. 2,549—**Mr. Johnston:**

What was the total cost of producing the literature on the metric system?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: The total cost to Metric Commission Canada of producing literature on the metric system in the fiscal years 1971-1972 to 1975-1976 inclusive was \$671,063.

RCMP TUNICS WHILE ON DUTY IN FRONT OF PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

Question No. 2,552—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is June 30 the customary date for members of the RCMP to commence wearing their red tunics while on duty in front of the Parliament Buildings and, if not, what is the date?

2. Is the government aware of complaints by visitors, including tourists to Parliament Hill, prior to the date such tunics are worn and, if so, will the government give consideration to setting an earlier date for what has become a symbol of Canada to many foreign visitors and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Francis Fox (Solicitor General): 1. No; this year, 1977, RCMP members in red tunics will be positioned on Parliament Hill from June 15th to September 15th.

2. No; see answer to Part one; not applicable.

PRODUCTION OF FEED GRAINS

Question No. 2,644—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. During the fiscal year 1976-77, did the government sign an agreement with the Government of Quebec to promote a larger production of feed grains in Quebec and, if so, will the government make a financial contribution towards the implementation of the programme?

2. What votes were affected by the programme in the 1977-78 estimates?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. No.

2. None.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

● (1550)

MOTION TO ADJOURN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED COVER-UP OF BREAK-IN AT L'AGENCE DE PRESSE LIBRE

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, the appropriateness and the desirability of the motion I am about to move has been made abundantly clear this afternoon. I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), 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 clear possibility of a conspiracy concerning the concealment of evidence or the failure to take appropriate action pertaining to the illegal break-in by three police officers at L'Agence de Presse Libre on the night of October 6-7, 1972.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In accordance with Standing Order 26, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) gave the Chair notice this morning of his intention to seek at this time leave of the House to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 26 for the purpose of considering the matter described by him. I have just indicated that in making rulings during the question period it is not for the Chair to decide on the desirability of a line of questioning or the desirability of the practices that the House follows and that the Chair endeavours to enforce. It is for the Chair to decide whether or not the procedures of the House are being applied and obeyed in certain circumstances. That is the judgment that the Chair always has to make without attempting to evaluate the probity or desirability of certain procedures.

What I have to decide in this instance, which is related to the same subject but in a different way, is, having regard to the subject matter and the circumstances, whether this is a subject which is appropriate to be discussed pursuant to Standing Order 26. Standing Order 26 is a very important part of our Standing Orders and if the Chair were to take the attitude, as has happened frequently in the past, particularly on matters of unemployment when I have had occasion to rule that the questions raised on unemployment are a matter of continuing concern and not a proper subject for debate under Standing Order 26, it would be regrettable.

I must confess to some misgivings and some unhappiness in most of the rulings I have to make under Standing Order 26 because there is an impression that the Chair can be found to be so technical and so difficult in the application of the language of Standing Order 26 that no one can succeed in persuading the House that the Standing Order should be used for debate. That is a regrettable posture because, as we have all heard, many people express concern about the relevancy of discussions in the House, and if there is one thing that can be said about motions pursuant to this Standing Order, it is