

Business of the House

ries to determine whether they can be available before the weekend. If there are any other amendments, although I do not think there are, I will advise my hon. friend.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in view of the reference made a moment ago. I wonder if it would not be more sensible if the House had the question period between 5 p.m. and 5.40 p.m., rather than going into private members' business and having the question period tonight. We could either postpone private members' hour to eight o'clock or suspend it altogether.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be no agreement in this respect. My understanding of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is that we dispense with private members' hour and have the question period and routine proceedings immediately. This would require the unanimous consent of the House. I will ask again whether there is unanimity in this respect.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity, so we will have to proceed with the order of business as provided by the Standing Orders.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Earlier today, without reflecting on the move, the House adopted a motion that would cut off debate on the taxation bill by some time late Wednesday afternoon. It now appears that in so doing we were assenting to this without realizing that amendments would not necessarily be before the House today or even tomorrow. I wonder how it will be possible for us to limit debate, the subject matter of which has not yet been placed before the House or may not even be placed before us shortly before the termination of the debate next Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would have to rule, if that would answer the point of the hon. member, that it seems to me this was the purpose of the two-hour debate which was terminated by a vote. I do not think I could suggest that the result of the vote be changed on the basis of the information which has been given since then.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I rise on a further point of order. I thought it was clear at the time the House leader was speaking that amendments to which he referred would automatically be tabled this afternoon. It is a difference of some magnitude that amendments which were only referred to may not even be presented when perhaps more than half the allotted time has expired, placing not just this House but thousands—indeed, millions—of people who will be directly affected by changes in this legislation in an impossible situation.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I gave you notice that I wanted to propose a motion. Are we still on motions or are we going to come back to them later on?

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Speaker: We will call the motions in a moment; that is the next order of the day.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26**AGRICULTURE****LOSSES INCURRED BY CERTAIN QUEBEC PRODUCERS**

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): I would have hoped that my notice of motion would have originated from the government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter which gives rise to an urgent economic situation and affects a great number of people.

The loss of millions of dollars suffered by hog, egg and turkey producers represents a real disaster which will drive many of them to bankruptcy shortly if the government does not take the necessary action to remedy this situation immediately.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Bellechasse has given notice to the Chair of his intention to move this motion under Standing Order 26.

The hon. member has moreover given the Chair additional information in order to underline the importance and urgency of this matter. I recognize that this is an important and urgent matter of interest, as the hon. member has said, to a great number of Canadians and obviously to all members of this House. The Chair must decide if the business of the House should be interrupted to permit consideration of the question that the hon. member has raised. He will admit that this problem is not new. In fact, during the last weeks, he has had the opportunity of bringing this matter to the attention of the House through the many questions he has directed to the responsible minister day after day. If I remember correctly, he has even proposed that this matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture pursuant to Standing Order 43.

• (5:00 p.m.)

All this indicates that this is a serious, and even urgent, situation which has existed for some time already. The hon. member suggests that action should be taken immediately to solve this problem. I do not think—and I suggest this to the hon. member with great consideration—that this is the type of question that we can, today at least, ask the House to consider under the provisions of Standing Order 26.

It may be that the situation is changing and that circumstances will become such that the Chair could be convinced by the hon. member or some of his colleagues that a debate should be held under the provisions of Standing Order 26 but, for the time being, I am not prepared to recognize that the business of the House should be adjourned for the purposes suggested by the hon. member for Bellechasse.