

*Destruction of Calves*

consider the validity of the proposed motion pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 26.

The motion alludes to a somewhat general problem of rising food costs faced by consumers in Canada. In that respect it would appear to be dealing with a continuing or general type of problem as opposed to one which is envisaged by the terms of Standing Order 26 as constituting an emergency situation so that the business of the House ought to be set aside for its consideration.

However, the reference to the rather dramatic occurrence in the province of Quebec which was reported last evening brings the motion, in my view, into a different context in that that specific occurrence is of a sufficiently dramatic impact on the food situation, particularly the meat producing industry, in its relationship to consumer prices in Canada, to take the matter out of the realm of generality and to give it urgency which, at least on a prima facie basis, in the opinion of the Chair brings it within the provisions of the Standing Order.

I was, of course, further concerned that the demonstration referred to in the motion appeared to have been directed in whole or in part at the provincial minister or the provincial government involved. However, there can be no doubt from the numerous discussions which have taken place during the first weeks of this parliament and the questions that have been answered by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) that there is a very considerable federal involvement in the subject.

Furthermore, while there is some possibility of negotiating a solution to the problem, the fact remains that the very dramatic and tragic occurrence of yesterday in the province of Quebec referred to in the motion still remains of sufficient importance in the view of the Chair to qualify it as an emergency situation within the terms of the rules.

In addition, the Chair must direct its attention to whether there is likely to be a reasonable opportunity for this very important subject to be discussed or considered by this Chamber within the time which would be appropriate for effective consideration vis-à-vis the emergency nature of the occurrence itself. I am satisfied that no such opportunity appears to present itself.

Accordingly, for those reasons, I have come to the conclusion that within the terms of sub-section(4) of Standing Order 26 the subject matter of the proposed motion is indeed a proper subject for discussion within the terms of this rule. If I may favour the House with a brief explanation of the procedure, in the circumstances the House may either give its consent that the matter be considered, in which case it will be considered this evening at eight o'clock, or, alternatively, if the House does not give its consent I will ask if those in favour of having it considered will rise, and if 20 or more members rise again it will be in order to consider it at eight o'clock this evening. Therefore, may I ask if the hon. member has leave to move the motion for the discussion of the subject stated in the proposed motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Accordingly the matter will be discussed this evening beginning at eight o'clock.

[Mr. Speaker.]

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

## FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

## MEETING WITH PREMIERS OF PROVINCES—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF RESULTS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance relating to the often mentioned discussions heading hopefully to a consensus of the principal elements in our economy in respect of sharing the gross national product. Can the minister tell us anything further following those discussions yesterday with the provincial premiers? Will he tell the House what procedures the government will be following, or the form the discussions will take with the principal elements of the economy with a view to reaching such a consensus?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, there will be an opportunity for the House to go into that in more detail. I was invited to participate at the meeting yesterday between the Prime Minister and the premiers at two o'clock, and I understand that the particular subject to which the Leader of the Opposition referred was discussed at lunch.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance, who has a particular responsibility in this area of fighting inflation, and presumably a particular responsibility with regard to these discussions that have taken place, whether the Prime Minister has not seen fit to take him into his confidence on what he is up to regarding these discussions?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and I had a thorough conversation preceding the meeting yesterday. My only limitation in reporting to the House is that I was not present during this particular conversation at lunchtime. I am sure that in due course the Prime Minister will be glad to respond in more detail to the hon. member.

## MEETING WITH PREMIERS OF PROVINCES—PROPOSAL OF MINISTER OF FINANCE ON WAGES, PRICES AND PROFITS

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the one put by my leader. I understand that the Minister of Finance has indicated he gave the Prime Minister a proposal or recommendation which would convey to the premiers a plan under which we could have a fair and reasonable balance between wages, prices and profits. I further understand that the minister has said the procedure was discussed with the premiers. Was this placed before the premiers and, if so, what was their reaction to the recommendation by the Minister of Finance?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I just arrived at coffee time and I did not hear that conversation.