

*Proposed Duty on Tires***MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26****INDUSTRY****MICHELIN TIRE COMPANY—PROPOSED IMPOSITION BY UNITED STATES OF COUNTERVAILING DUTY AGAINST CERTAIN TIRES**

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the stated intention of the United States government to seek countervailing duties against tires exported by Michelin Tire Company of Nova Scotia, and the serious effects that such action would have on the tire industry in Canada and, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) admitted on the weekend, on the entire regional development incentives program.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has provided the Chair with the notice required under Standing Order 26. In fact, he was good enough to do so on Friday afternoon and this has given the Chair an opportunity to consider over the weekend his desire to have the House engage in a debate on this matter under the Standing Order. If I may say so, I am grateful to the hon. member for the terms in which he proposes his motion. The statement of the case is consistent with the formal requirements of the Standing Order; it states the case precisely, without argument, as required by the Standing Order.

Evidently the matter raised by the hon. member is one of importance and of interest to all hon. members. It has in recent days been the subject of a number of questions in the House and is not lightly to be set aside. The Chair, as hon. members know, must take into account the tests provided by the Standing Order and relate them to the situation in which the House finds itself at this time. Under section 5 of Standing Order 26 there is a clear responsibility cast on the Chair in coming to a determination that the Speaker, and here I quote the Standing Order, "shall have regard to the probability of the matter being brought before the House within reasonable time by other means."

Today is May 15. The current supply period will terminate on June 30. There is a total of 33 sitting days, including both these dates, remaining in the period. When one combines the number of days available on the budget debate and also allotted days remaining in the supply period, it will be seen that some 17 days, or more than half of the remaining sitting days in the current supply period, are available to members for the consideration of grievances or urgent problems other than legislative proposals. There is thus a considerable amount of time available during which the important matter proposed for discussion by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby can be brought before the House "within reasonable time by other means", as specified in the Standing Order. Indeed, this very day is an allotted budget day during which the matter alluded to by the hon. member can be considered by hon. members who will be taking part in the debate.

[Mr. Cullen.]

I would find it extremely difficult to justify setting aside part of a budget day for the purpose of discussing an urgent matter under the terms of Standing Order 26.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****EXTERNAL AFFAIRS****VIET NAM WAR—BRITISH PROPOSAL TO RUSSIA RESPECTING SPONSORSHIP OF CONFERENCE—CANADIAN POSITION**

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Does the government of Canada support the initiative taken by the government of the United Kingdom in approaching the U.S.S.R. to join forces in sponsoring a conference on Viet Nam similar to the conference which these two governments sponsored in 1954, I believe, at Geneva?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, we certainly support an initiative of this kind, but this is really a matter between the two chairmen of the Geneva Conference. We would be very pleased if the British government were successful in persuading the Soviet Union to agree to reassemble this committee. However, I have my doubts whether the British government will be successful.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicated to the British government and the government of the U.S.S.R. the approval of the government of Canada with regard to such a conference? If he has not done so, does he propose to urge the two governments to jointly sponsor such a conference?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I think my statement today indicates the position of the Canadian government. We hope the British government is successful, but I do not think that anything more than that kind of statement would be very useful. If the Soviet government is not prepared to reassemble the conference, they certainly will not be persuaded by my support.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I did not realize the Secretary of State for External Affairs was so modest. From time to time the minister has referred to the possibility that he might be making a statement with regard to the Viet Nam problem. Is it the intention of the minister to make such a statement?

**Mr. Sharp:** No, Mr. Speaker, I have no present indication.