

objective in terms of what it would like to deal with between now and the end of June.

Mr. Pinard: Part of it.

Mr. Deans: Partly? The Government House Leader interjects "Part of it". He is dreaming in technicolor if he thinks he will get that and something else, I will have you know. However, with that out of way, I will say that the Opposition House Leader is not presenting anything new, is not presenting a demand that the Government introduce something it has not already introduced, is not suggesting that the Government deal with something it has not already indicated a willingness to deal with. He is simply saying that for the purpose of gaining acceptance of the extension of the hours, this business be called in that way, and then acceptance of the extension of the hours will be gained.

I suggest that it would therefore, in both instances, be ruled admissible as an amendment. It may well be disposed of by the House of Commons. Maybe the Government majority will overrule the wish of the Opposition that the amendment become part of the motion. However, I would urge that the Chair not overrule it. The Chair overrules too damn many things around here for my liking.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cousineau: Come on, now!

Mr. Deans: I just call them as I see them.

Therefore, I would urge upon the Chair that it see the matter as being two quite separate matters: first, whether it is indeed admissible to direct what should be done during the period of extended hours—and I do not think there is any question in anyone's mind that surely a motion containing reference to the subject matter would be acceptable; second, that it is the prerogative of the House to dispose of the amendment, since the amendment is not technically out of order. It is up to the Government either to accept it with its majority or reject it, as it sees fit.

Mr. Harquail: Point of order!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Simcoe North on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention, after listening to the remarks of my friend, that the Chair might also wish to consider Standing Order 8 when considering the acceptability of the amendment, since it makes specific reference to an extension of hours, either through the dinner hour or through the evening, for certain purposes. Standing Order 8(4)(a) states:

When the Speaker is in the chair, a Member may propose a motion, without notice, to continue a sitting through a lunch or dinner hour or beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of considering a specified item of business or a stage or stages thereof—

Extension of Hours

I submit to the Chair that this Standing Order might be helpful to the Chair in its consideration as to whether or not the amendment which we have submitted, since it refers to the extension of hours and specific items of business, might therefore be acceptable.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, by quoting Standing Order 8(4)(a), the Hon. Member is making my point. It specifies the business to be dealt with, while Standing Order 9 merely deals with sitting hours and not with the kind of business to be conducted during those sitting hours. Standing Order 9 is a new Standing Order dealing with nothing else but the extension of the hours, not with the content of what is to be debated during those hours, while Standing Order 8(4)(a), as quoted by my colleague, specifies an extension of hours during lunch time or at the end of the day provided that the business to be dealt with is a specified item, and that is a different case. It is specified in the Standing Order. But in the present case there is no reference at all in Standing Order 9 to any specified business, and that is exactly my point.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, the reason I wanted Your Honour to rule on my point of order at the close of the remarks of the House Leader of the New Democratic Party, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, was because of his remark that the Chair overrules too many damn things around here.

Mr. Deans: That's my opinion.

Mr. Harquail: I am sure the Chair heard what he had to say. In my opinion, he is reflecting on the Chair. When he said that the Chair overrules too many damn things around here, I did not think that that was quite acceptable or conducive to good conduct in the House, to say the very least.

Mr. Deans: It may be accurate, however.

Mr. Harquail: However, I would think that we could at least have your views, Mr. Speaker, as to what your interpretation of his remark was when he said that—

Mr. Deans: Listen, don't give him your real opinion.

Mr. Harquail: —and whether in fact you interpret it as being a reflection on the Chair and, indeed, unacceptable conduct and terminology for the House, especially since he was addressing the Chair.

Mr. Deans: Not at all. Even the Speaker believes that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): If the House is ready, we will deal with the point of order on the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail). There are times when it seems to me that observations made by Hon. Members are best left unremarked upon—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): —and that might include the Chair as well.