

floor for questions, I wonder if Your Honour could outline upon just what basis backbenchers are selected for asking questions during the latter part of the question period.

Madam Speaker: There is no written rule about the order in which members are recognized in the House. The member who has the floor is obviously the one the Speaker recognizes. When a discussion on a particular subject is taking place and a member of the opposition who has held responsibilities concerning a certain department rises to ask a question, obviously I will recognize him because I do not want to break the rhythm of the dialogue which takes place during question period. I think it is very healthy to have questions and answers from people who have a particular interest in a specific area. I think that is quite a healthy thing to encourage in the House.

As for backbenchers, they have rights in this House equal to those of any of the members who sit here. I try to recognize them, but obviously they are more numerous than the others, and their turn does not come up as often as perhaps they would like. However, I do my best.

Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, on this point I wonder if I might be permitted to say a word. It does seem to me that one of the reasons many members are not getting the floor in the question period is that those who do get the floor, and ministers who answer are too loquacious. I suggest that if questions and replies were succinct there would be an opportunity for more questions to be put in the question period.

● (1510)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: The remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) are most welcome. I feel that it will become increasingly important to cut off the preamble to questions. The questions should be sharp and, as everyone knows, the sharper ones are more effective. I suppose that members of the House are looking for effectiveness in their dialogue. This also applies to answers which, I think, should be brief and to the point. I find that I will be increasingly asking members to comply with that practice.

This is not an unwritten rule; it is a written rule that the purpose of questions should be to elicit information and that answers should give information. This would allow me then, if we save some time—I would be grateful for the co-operation of hon. members in this respect—and if members asked crisp and brief questions and answers were equally brief, to recognize more backbenchers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

80082-54

Order Paper Questions
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 324, 356 and 362.

[Text]

TELEGLOBE CANADA—NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Question No. 324—**Mr. Herbert:**

How many (a) permanent (b) other employees were on the payroll of Teleglobe Canada and its subsidiaries as at March 31, 1979?

Mr. Peter Stollery (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State and Minister of Communications): In so far as Teleglobe Canada is concerned, the answer to the above question is as follows: (a) 1,238 permanent employees; (b) 35 other employees.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE—SX CLASSIFICATION—NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Question No. 356—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. As of March 31, 1979 (a) how many persons in the SX classification were employed by the Privy Council Office (b) how many were (i) Francophones (ii) females?

2. What are the present totals?

3. Was there a structural change in the PCO since March 31, 1979 and, if so, what effect did such a change have on the number of SX's employed?

Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):

1. SX	24
Francophones	3
Females	0
2. SX	22
Francophones	3
Females	1

3. A new organizational structure came into effect on October 1, 1979. It did not change the number of SX's employed in the office.

JUSTICE—EMPLOYEES IN THE SX CLASSIFICATION

Question No. 362—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. As of March 31, 1979, (a) how many persons in the SX classification were employed by the Department of Justice (b) how many were (i) francophones (ii) females?

2. What are the present totals?

3. Was there a structural change in the Department since March 31, 1979, and, if so, what effect did such a change have on the number of SX's employed?