

*Motion to Adjourn*

Food Prices. I believe we could have a motion to concur without debate, and I am wondering when that may be put.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps we should try to proceed with some kind of order. We have heard a proposal by the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada (Mr. MacEachen)—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:**—and while considering the motion hon. members have introduced many matters which are perhaps somewhat foreign to the motion which should be put. My understanding is that a certain agreement has been entered into between representatives of different parties, and subject to this agreement and this being made an order of the House, the minister's motion can be put.

There is one matter about which there is some uncertainty. The minister said that there would be a maximum of one speech for each party, for a total of ten minutes. The hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) spoke of "about ten minutes". My experience with the word "about" in this House is that it is very uncertain, and that "about ten minutes" might turn out to be a long ten minutes. So that we do not get involved in difficulty, I hope we will clarify whether it is ten minutes or "about" ten minutes, with regard to the duration of speeches on this subject.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, speaking only to the request of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) for a time limit on this debate, may I suggest that the modification proposed by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) is acceptable. In other words, we would be prepared to agree to a House order that the debate on this motion be limited in the sense that each party would be limited to a total of ten minutes. Therefore, if I speak for one minute, one of my colleagues might speak for the other nine.

**Mr. Speaker:** Am I to assume that there are only eight minutes left for the hon. member's party?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Before putting the minister's motion, I am wondering what will be the situation in relation to the point raised by the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen), because if we have a 30-minute debate and the motion is put and carried, it might be late at that point for the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton to do what he wishes to do, unless he wishes to do it all alone in the House. Perhaps there might be a clarification of this point before the motion is put by the Chair.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I think the point you have raised is a considerable one, because I had intended to ask the House to pass government order No. 82, which is to send a certain subject matter to committee. If my motion is carried, we will adjourn. Perhaps the House at this point could be irregular and agree to consider, before we proceed to the adjournment motion, whether the chairman of the Committee on Trends in Food Prices could put his motion, and then consider whether I could put my

[Mr. Cullen.]

motion on government order No. 82. Then we could put the motion to adjourn. Perhaps we could agree to that.

**Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I would agree to doing that if there were agreement to allow me to put a request similar to that proposed by the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen).

**Mr. Speaker:** Apparently there is not agreement; therefore the motion to adjourn will be put.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** My understanding is that the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark) indicated that he wanted these motions to be put if his were put. This would require unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Mr. Nielsen:** With great respect, Mr. Speaker, the way I understood the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark), all he wanted to do was seek consent to put a motion, to have one at a time. We are prepared to deal with the motion of the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) now, give consent to it and then go on to the motion of the hon. member for Rocky Mountain.

**Mr. Speaker:** There should also be some guidance as to whether there is to be a debate on these motions if they are put.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may at least try to be helpful. I believe it is fair to say that the motion of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) was drafted with the thought that it might be presented before we had finished the debate on Bill C-245. Now that we have finished that debate and passed the bill, Your Honour is perfectly right that if we pass this motion it would order an immediate adjournment.

● (1620)

Therefore I wonder, if before we have this debate of ten minutes per party, we could deal with two or three things that we have agreed upon, such as the request of the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen), and so on. Your Honour is also aware of a point of privilege that I said I would like to raise. Perhaps we could do those two or three things now and then have this short debate, at the end of which we could adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**TRENDS IN FOOD PRICES****CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE**

**Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton)** moved that the third report of the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices, presented to the House on Friday, December 14, 1973, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.