

Motion for Adjournment

the past five years and, if so, how much and to which institutions was it paid?

2. Does the federal government have any commitment to provide grants for hospitals in the Metropolitan area and, if so, how much and to which institutions are they to be paid?

Return tabled.

GRANTS FOR ADVANCEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

Question No. 1,126—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What are the terms and conditions for grants provided under the Department of Industry's Program for the Advancement of Industrial Technology?

2. For each fiscal year since the program's inception, what have been the annual number of projects and expenditures of this program, shared by the federal government and Canadian industry?

3. What is the total federal government expenditure commitment to this program in the current fiscal year?

4. Are changes presently contemplated in this program regarding either cost-sharing and repayment provisions or rate of interest provisions?

Return tabled.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

• (2:10 p.m.)

GRAIN

ALLEGED PARALYSIS OF WHEAT MOVEMENT THROUGH VANCOUVER—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin, in accordance with the terms of revised Standing Order 26, to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the virtual bottleneck and paralysis of wheat movement in Vancouver Harbour, due to the failure of the government to work with the railways in scheduling box cars, leading to a situation which has already resulted in the loss of a 17,000 ton contract and which may result in the loss of others; which has caused damage and economic loss, since some ships have been tied up for as long as a month, paying demurrage charges as high as \$2,500 a day; which has brought about stagnation in the movement of wheat at a critical time for western farmers; and in connection with which the government, yesterday, in the person of the minister, refused to take action.

[Mr. Robinson.]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Mackenzie has given notice as required by Standing Order 26 of his intention to move the adjournment of the house to discuss the matter raised in his proposed motion.

An hon. members know, the provisions of Standing Order 26 have been radically altered in the new rules of procedure of the House of Commons. Under the terms of paragraph (5) of Standing Order 26, in determining whether a matter should be given urgent consideration, the Chair takes into account the extent to which the proposition concerns the administrative responsibilities of the government or would come within the scope of ministerial action, and also the probability of the matter being brought before the house within a reasonable time by other means. Additionally, the Chair must have regard to other considerations, many of which have been established as the practice of the house in previous years, before the enactment of the present Standing Orders.

The question raised by the hon. member, it seems to me, does concern the administrative responsibilities of the government.

As far as the opportunity for the question being raised before the house within a reasonable time by other means is concerned, the Chair must have in mind the fact that in the present state of its business the house is not likely to have available certain opportunities which on previous occasions would have provided a vehicle for a debate on this question. As an example, there is no current debate in respect to the Speech from the Throne. We learned from the Minister of Finance yesterday that there is some uncertainty whether or not there will be a budget debate within the near future, and the estimates are not likely to be tabled until some time in February.

There is another matter which I think may be of some importance, and that has to do with the alteration in circumstances surrounding emergency debates before the enactment of the current Standing Order 26. Before the present order was brought into force, in considering motions to adjourn under Standing Order 26 the Chair always had to weigh the importance of the proposed motion against the necessity of setting aside government business for the day and it was much more difficult to justify the granting of a motion under Standing Order 26 when that would have the result of delaying current important public business. To a considerable extent the revised Standing Order 26 reduces the relative significance of this factor.