

*Farm Machinery Prices*

support of the motion moved by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale suggesting that the house should adjourn its ordinary business with a view to discussing and considering the matter raised in his motion. There is no question whatsoever that, as the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale and others in support of his motion have said, this is a matter of great importance, a matter of urgency, a definite matter of urgent public importance. But as other hon. members taking part in this discussion have pointed out, we have to consider the question of urgency of debate.

In this connection I would again refer hon. members to citation 100, paragraph 3, of Beauchesne, fourth edition, which says:

"Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself—

There is agreement that the matter is urgent.

—but it means "urgency of debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

I would also refer hon. members to paragraph 2 of citation 100 which refers to a ruling made by a previous Speaker and says:

The Speaker ruled that the motion should not be allowed, because he did not think the matter mentioned in the member's statement was of recent occurrence—

I would also refer to paragraph 8 of the same citation which contains a statement made by the Speaker in the British house and refers to the same rule:

I do not think that, under the Standing Order of 1882, a motion on a subject of this kind, having such a very wide scope, was ever contemplated. What I think was contemplated, was an occurrence of some sudden emergency, either in home or in foreign affairs.

● (4:10 p.m.)

The hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale did say in his statement in support of his motion that this unhappy situation which has occurred dates back to November. It is a continuing unhappy and unfortunate situation. I do not think it is a sudden occurrence such as that contemplated by the standing order and the precedents of the house, and in view of this, with sincere regret I do not think I can accept the motion of the hon. member.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION**

REPORTED STATEMENT AT BOARD MEETING RESPECTING PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been directed to the remarks made during the course of the meeting of the board of directors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation held in Halifax which, as reported, had all the appearances of being contemptuous of parliament, to which the C.B.C. must report, in that it was alleged to have been suggested that the fact that a committee of the house had been set up might interfere with the possibility of there being a settlement in connection with the controversy over the weekly feature "This Hour Has Seven Days".

Has the Prime Minister any information in this connection and has he communicated with the C.B.C. and pointed out to that body that this kind of expression of view is contemptuous of the House of Commons?

**Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have seen press references along the lines of my right hon. friend's question and I have asked whether it is possible to obtain the text of what was actually said. The Secretary of State is unfortunately away today on official business, but I expect to see her as soon as she gets back to see whether she has any information.

**HOUSING**

REPORTED CURTAILMENT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister said the Minister of Labour would be making a statement shortly in respect of loans under the national housing legislation. However, while the house is waiting for that statement I want to ask the Prime Minister if he can tell the house whether the cabinet has made a decision to the effect that funds available for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will be curtailed? Telegrams are pouring in to the effect that not only are applications for loans being rejected but applications which were submitted early in March are now being returned to prospective home owners. I am wondering whether this is a decision of the cabinet.