

*Prairie Grain Stabilization Bill*

ters asked for were outside the confines of Bill C-244, but some of them were within the confines of that bill.

The answer that sent those ministers home, namely, the assurance that there would be consideration, is completely without value if the government comes back after the weekend, in which, surely, there was not enough time to give consideration to this question, and introduces this debate today. We were asked to cool off and to call off our attack. But over the weekend we heard from the minister in charge of the Wheat Board on one television network and we heard from the Prime Minister on the other, both of them attacking us for our stand. Today they are bringing back the bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I object most strongly to this change in the order of business. It was the minister's suggestion on Friday, not ours, that we proceed with Bill C-259 instead of Bill C-244. I object most strongly to this change in the order of business.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order—I presume that is what it is—I should like simply to indicate to the House that in the discussions which I had in the absence of the House leader on one point last Friday, it was quite clear that the question of the order of business would require some further confirmation between the House leaders this morning and therefore there was always in that sense the possibility that we might proceed with one item of business or with the other.

The request for postponing debate on the stabilization bill and also on any question of illegality came from the prairie Ministers of Agriculture. It was addressed in effect to all of us in the House and required all of us to consider different aspects of that question. It was that request which was put, I understand, by them to hon. members opposite and was discussed by me with my colleagues. It therefore required confirmation of discussion about what exactly would be understood with regard to the order of business.

I understand that in the course of discussions this morning agreement was not capable of being arrived at because of some view that any postponement in some way implied accepting changes to the bill, whereas in fact the proposal from the prairie ministers and our willingness to consider any delay depended upon their feeling that if we had some additional time it might be useful in our formulating a commentary to them on their proposals. It certainly was not ever meant to be a detailed or complex policy statement on those proposals but merely some kind of interim reply to them, because they raised complex matters going far beyond the bill. Briefly, with regard to the discussions we had, these depended on their being an understanding of exactly what we were agreeing upon and depended upon full consent and agreement on all sides which this morning did not appear to materialize.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

## BANNING OF NUCLEAR TESTS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. This urgent matter is the necessity for this House to enunciate Canada's position in actively working for an international agreement to end all nuclear tests by all nuclear powers, including China, France, the U.S.S.R. and the United States—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIntosh:**—and whether such tests be in the air, the seas or underground. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that a motion to adjourn the House is normally made under Standing Order 26; however, my motion contains procedural qualifications that cannot be appended to a Standing Order 26 motion. If I have the unanimous consent of the House, I will move, seconded by the member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell):

That this House instructs the House leaders of all parties to confer together to draft a motion concerning the banning of all nuclear tests; and to provide this week a period for a debate and vote by this House on the motion under terms and conditions agreed upon by the House leaders but to ensure opportunity for free expression of opinion by members; and this House orders that a message containing the text of such motion be carried to the Senate.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members have heard the terms of the motion proposed for consideration by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. This motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimity. The motion cannot be put.

**An hon. Member:** Sudbury said no.

**Mr. Bell:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When there were objections on this side to a motion under Standing Order 43 it was reported in the newspapers. I think it should be recorded that the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) said no.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An hon. Member:** Warmonger!

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

\* \* \*

## ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

## AMENDMENT TO CHANGE CONSTITUENCY NAME FROM HIGH PARK TO HIGH PARK-HUMBER VALLEY

**Mr. Walter Deakon (High Park)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-268, respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.