

*Inquiries of the Ministry***GRAIN****PRESENCE OF RUSTY BEETLE IN WHEAT SHIPMENTS**

**Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie):** Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. On November 17 he indicated to the House he would order a study of the whole question of contamination of wheat by the rusty beetle. Is he now in possession of this report and could he indicate to the House briefly what the situation is?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I did not say I would order a study. I said I would try to ascertain the facts. One of the facts that is important is that we have not had any claims in respect of contamination by the rusty beetle in grain shipments to our overseas customers.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION****PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—PROVISION OF OFFICIALS TO ASSIST RELATIVES TO COME TO CANADA**

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, now that we have exchanged diplomats with the People's Republic of China, if he would make a statement on motions on what plans his department has for additional immigration officials on the mainland to provide opportunities for relatives of Canadian citizens to come to Canada from the mainland area?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I will certainly look into the question of whether a statement on motions would be helpful some time in the near future.

[Translation]

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the hon. member for Joliette raising a point of order?

**Mr. La Salle:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since I have received this morning a telegram of which the Minister of Transport should also have a copy in hand, would the House allow me to ask him a question concerning a most urgent problem?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have reminded hon. members that the question period has been over for six or seven minutes already. Should the House agree—

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member might perhaps ask his question tomorrow. I shall see to it that he is recognized at the very beginning of the question period.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****SUPPLY**

**ALLOTTED DAY UNDER STANDING ORDER 53—NON CONFIDENCE MOTION—CONDEMNATION OF FALSE HOPES RAISED BY GOVERNMENT—INABILITY TO USE TALENTS OF YOUNG PEOPLE BETWEEN 16 AND 24 YEARS OF AGE**

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière)** moved:

That this House condemns the government for having inspired false hopes among young people between the ages of 16 and 24 by assuring them that education pays, at a time when young people coming out of schools and universities find no outlet for their energies and no means of placing the knowledge they have acquired at the service of the people, because the government has been unable to introduce such financial devices as the compensated discount and the national dividend so as to enable the masses to benefit from the communal resource constituted by young people who are educated and better equipped than any previous generation to produce more efficiently, more abundantly and more economically, so as to assure the greater welfare of all Canadians.

[English]

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly on a point of order to renew the caveat which was filed by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) some time ago when a non-confidence motion was moved on behalf of a representative of the New Democratic Party. I do not intend to make a formal argument, and I shall not object to this motion proceeding now, because we feel that with some substantial improvement we might be able to support it. I simply wish to make plain that in allowing the motion to proceed, it is without prejudice to the view of our party that when we are in the process of dealing with the granting of supply to Her Majesty's government, it is the traditional right of Her Majesty's Official Opposition to move motions of non-confidence. I know that objection will be taken to this position by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who is about to spring to his feet. I recognize that there is a very difficult problem here, and some day the hon. member, I, and other hon. members may have to place it before Your Honour.

● (3:00 p.m.)

May I conclude by saying that I hope this might be one of the matters at which the Procedure Committee might look. Quite properly, we should try to limit the number of non-confidence motions, but surely with 25 motions on opposition days it should be quite plain that in the past there have been too many desiccated and anaemic discussions, not because the subject matter was not a good one or because the calibre of the debate was not high, but because there was no vote to be taken at the end of the discussion. It would seem to me that some arrangement might be found by which motions which are dealt with on opposition days might be the subject of a vote, so that members on the government side who could not vote against the government because it was a non-confidence motion, might be free to take a position when suggestions are made urging the government to do something or take a less critical position than is involved in a non-confidence motion. I hope that this is one of the issues which the House and the committee might well discuss later.