

Business of Supply

Mr. Stanfield: I was about to rise at the time Your Honour made the suggestion to the hon. member to suggest very seriously that ministers and the Prime Minister might set an example to the rest of us in the house.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister asking whether my question was serious or not? If he does not think the appointment of the hon. member for York West is a serious matter and if he does not believe me, then he should ask the member for York West.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question period expired some moments ago.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to add to the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I do so by drawing Your Honour's attention to a portion of Standing Order 39(1). It deals with this question and I quote an important part of it:

—but in putting any such question or in replying to the same no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same;—

I submit that Your Honour is perfectly right in calling on members who ask questions to comply with that part of the Standing Order, and I think ministers should be asked to do the same.

Mr. Trudeau: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether there is any point in pursuing the matter much further? It is obvious the rules apply to members on both sides of the house, either members of the opposition or members on the government side asking questions of ministers. I am sure hon. members realize that the rules, and particularly the rule referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, apply to cabinet ministers. I thank hon. members who from day to day try to assist the Chair respecting this rule.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS**REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON FIFTH AND SIXTH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Before the orders of the day are called, Mr. Speaker, would you permit me to direct a question to the government house leader concerning the business of the house? In view of the fact that the motions for concurrence have not been passed by the house in regard

to two reports, the fifth and sixth, of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications and, more particularly, as the Transport and Communications Committee has not met since early last week, will the government house leader inform the house when he intends to bring forward these two measures for debate?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, it is of obvious importance to the house and parliament generally for the current debate on Bill C-150 to be brought to an end. The equivalent of 15 sitting days has been devoted to the second reading and report stage of the omnibus bill. Until the filibuster on this matter can be brought to an end, it is impossible to plan any of the future business of the house for the balance of this session.

Mr. McGrath: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, each time this question is directed to the government house leader he refers to a filibuster. It is a legitimate debate. I remind the house leader that many Liberal members have participated in that debate, as well as members of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we should call orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**BUSINESS OF SUPPLY****ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE CAPITAL TO AGRICULTURE**

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex) moved:

That in the opinion of this house the government has failed to deal with the seriously deteriorating net income for Canadian agriculture, as a result of which farmers in all parts of Canada are unable to obtain the necessary operating capital to finance the 1969-70 crop year.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the debate begins I wish to advise Your Honour there have been discussions among members with regard to the course of conduct of this debate. I am happy to propose now for the consideration of the house an amendment to the appropriate Standing Order so that the length of speeches would be limited in this way: The first speaker for each party to have 20 minutes and thereafter each speaker to be limited to 10 minutes. This would permit a wider participation in the debate. I am sure it would not