

—it says 3 p.m., not 3:05 p.m.—

—as the case may be, the House shall proceed to the ordinary daily routine of business, which shall be as follows:

—and it goes on.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, Standing Order 39(5) is much more specific and coercitive. I quote the last few lines of Standing Order 39(5):

... provided also that the time allowed for a question period prior to the calling of the Orders of the Day shall not exceed forty minutes.

So in both cases, Madam Speaker, the Standing Orders are very clear, namely, that the oral question period may not go beyond 3 p.m. and may not exceed forty minutes. That is the first point of my argument.

The second is that the way the business of the House is directed and organized is based on and guided by the standing orders, by doctrine or by practice. It is the first time, at least in the seven years I have been sitting as a member, which is not all that long, that the same member was recognized more than once during the oral question period, I say to my knowledge, it is the first time that a member who has asked his main question and his supplementary questions is given the floor a second time a few minutes later after other members.

Madam Speaker, in my opinion, the current and very well known custom forbids us to allow this type of practice, and I respectfully submit that in keeping with the established practice, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) should not have been legally recognized when he asked his last series of questions. So, Madam Speaker, for all those reasons and considering that the Leader of the Opposition asked his questions after 3 p.m., that is after the expiry of the oral question period, pursuant to the two Standing Orders I quoted and to the established practice whereby a member may not be given the floor more than once during the oral question period, for all those reasons, Madam Speaker, we on this side of the House strongly object and we ask that the Standing Orders be respected in future and that the Leader of the Official Opposition not be given a preferential treatment which he does not deserve.

Madam Speaker: The hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) is quite right. Our Standing Orders state quite clearly at what time the question period is supposed to end. However, he probably quoted it from memory because the oral question period is supposed to last 45 minutes and not 40 minutes as he indicated. Nevertheless, Standing Orders stipulate that at 3 p.m. the Chair must interrupt the oral question period. However, the President of the Privy Council has been sitting in the House long enough to know that from time to time, at his discretion, and for various reasons, for example the fact that some questions or answers are lengthy or because there is a great deal of commotion in the House, the Speaker chooses not to see the time and to go over the 3 p.m. or 12 noon limit, as is the case on Fridays. The rule is clear but the

Order Paper Questions

custom varies somewhat, yet I agree with the hon. President of the Privy Council that, whenever possible, we must try to end the question period at 3 p.m. and I try to do that as much as I can.

As for the fact that a member cannot rise a second time, it so happened, last week I believe, that the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) had the floor twice during question period, because he asked to be recognized and other members of his party who would have wanted to speak at the time remained seated to give him an opportunity to do so. So that can happen. Standing Orders do not prohibit a member from rising twice during question period. But I do take the remarks made by the hon. President of the Privy Council in consideration; he knows that I always try to apply the rules, but I think that this time I sided more with parliamentary custom.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the tabling of documents. A document was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark). In direct response, the minister indicated that the Leader of the Opposition was misinterpreting the document, thereby referring to it. Will the minister take a look at that document and perhaps see to its tabling tomorrow?

* * *

● (1510)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. D. M. Collenette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1,852, 2,527, 2,565 and 2,641.

[Text]

CANADIAN FILM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—CHAIRMAN

Question No. 1,852—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Is the chairman of the Canadian Film Development Corporation included in the corporation's conflict of interest guidelines?
2. Does the chairman maintain an interest in a private law practice and, if so (a) with which firms and in what capacity (b) does the firm conduct any business on behalf of clients in the film industry?

Hon. Francis Fox (Secretary of State and Minister of Communications): In so far as the Department of Communi-