

*Point of Order—Mr. Lewis*

subject so important, they will make it possible for Parliament to be seized of the question. We certainly will not object. We will be glad to participate in the debate.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

MR. WISE—ALLEGED INACCURATE STATEMENT OF MR. WHELAN

**Hon. John Wise (Elgin):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I tried to raise this matter during Question Period today, but time did not permit. My point of order will provide the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) with an opportunity to clarify or perhaps change his response to reflect more accurately the actual case. In his answer to my question of yesterday, as reported at page 22657 of *Hansard* for February 9, the Minister concluded answering my first question by saying:

For instance, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture unanimous endorsed Canagrex yesterday.

As we all know—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I do not see any point of order in what the Hon. Member has said up until now. He seems to want to continue the debate on an answer which he received from the Minister. I remind him that that does not contribute a point of order.

**Mr. Wise:** Madam Speaker, the fact is that it is an inaccurate statement. The CFA meeting yesterday did not—

**Madam Speaker:** Order. That does not constitute a valid point of order. The Hon. Member may seek clarification or correction of a statement on another occasion, but not under the guise of a point of order.

MR. LEWIS—PROCEDURE RESPECTING STATEMENTS ON MOTIONS

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North):** Madam Speaker, I rise on the point of order with respect to the question whether statements on motions have been used or misused by the Government. I want to correct something for the record which was alluded to today by the Government House Leader, namely the question whether statements on motions were abused or misused.

I did not bring this to Your Honour's attention through a question of privilege, but on a previous occasion the House Leader alluded to the fact that questioning on statements on motions had gone on far too long. As I understand it, the length of time for questioning on a statement on motions is in Your Honour's jurisdiction. I want you to know from this side that the last time there was a statement on motions, we felt it was the appropriate thing for the Minister to do. That was 14 months ago.

It is our position that statements on motions should be used as the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) said, and

that you have sole control over the time of questioning. I want it to be very clear that we feel that is your jurisdiction and it should not be referred to by the Government House Leader as an abuse of the process.

● (1520)

**Madam Speaker:** I will refer the Hon. Member to the discussion which took place a few weeks ago on that specific point. If he looks in *Hansard*, I believe he will find a statement made by myself exactly on the point which the Hon. Member has raised now. The time allocated to the different sides for statements and for questioning on motions is entirely in the hands of the Speaker. I then explained, I believe, the rule of thumb which was followed. I believe that question was dealt with completely at that time.

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, as you just indicated this was dealt with completely the last time, and you were right in so doing. You added that the Opposition could make it much easier for you to use the rule of thumb. Therefore, the Opposition has a role to play in all of this and it was not well played in the past.

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Madam Speaker, on the point raised by the Government House Leader, to begin with we cannot determine whether there will be any statements on motions. We have asked for them, we have begged for them. We have attempted to get from the Government the opportunity to debate this very important matter of the Cruise missile and the deployment of it in Canada for test purposes.

I want to ask the Hon. Member now, if we were to agree to have such a statement with a time limit today, expiring, let us say, in no more than one hour from now, would the Government House Leader be prepared to have the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) make a statement on motions dealing with the agreement just signed in Washington?

**Mr. Lewis:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, after a brief consultation with my colleague, the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon), I will indicate that we would be pleased to associate ourselves with the comments of the House Leader of the New Democratic Party in the interest of having this matter discussed in Parliament.

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, this matter was not raised yesterday at the House Leaders' meeting. I understand my hon. colleague could not attend, with good reasons, and he sent a replacement. But this matter was not raised.

I have just indicated that there will be other opportunities to raise the matter in Parliament. If the NDP had not forced the Government to limit debate on three Bills which required the first three weeks of the 1983 session, then perhaps it would be much easier for the Government to agree to such a request; but we have some urgent legislation to be dealt with which requires Government time. Under the new rules, the Government is