

*Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen*

Government orders shall be called and considered in such sequence as the government determines.

I underscore the words "government orders". The government is only entitled to call in such sequence as the government determines government orders. The government is not entitled to apply that Standing Order to any other order of business.

I refer now to Beauchesne's fifth edition as it deals with the business of supply at page 167 Under "The Business of Supply" Citation 475 states:

The business of supply consists of the consideration of main, or supplementary estimates, including motions to restore or reinstate any item in the estimates, interim supply, the passage at all stages of any bill based thereon, and opposition motions considered on allotted days.

Citation 476 reads:

The action taken by the House of Commons, upon the request for aids and supply for the public service made in the Speech from the Throne, is for the appointment, pursuant to S.O. 58(1), of a continuing order of the day for the consideration of the business of supply.

Citation 477:

The estimates of a department or agency of the government are referred to and considered in the various standing committees, where the members have an opportunity to agree to, negative, withdraw, reduce or supersede each vote of the estimates.

Let me submit at this point of my argument that if the House has received the report of estimates from committee, notice of concurrence normally appears at the back of the Order Paper in the same place that allotted days appear. Once received, they stand there day after day after day until concurrence is moved by a member. Then they drop off the Order Paper. That again is in support of my contention that notice is there. An allotted day should be treated in a similar fashion. More important, Citation 478(1) at page 167 of Beauchesne states:

Under the terms of SO 58(5), twenty-five days are allotted to the business of supply in each year. Although technically the business under discussion is government business, motions given precedence on these allotted days may be moved only by members in opposition to the government.

Here appears the important sentence:

To this extent, there is a distinction between the business of supply and other government business with respect to SO 18.

There is a clear distinction. This perhaps comes close to touching on the ruling of the Chair yesterday, but I am focusing my argument on my right as an opposition member in the name of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition to have that motion on the Order Paper.

Citation 478 goes on to spell out, in subparagraph (2), the supply periods and the limitation of the number of votes on the allotted days during each supply period. Subparagraph (3) is irrelevant for the purposes of my argument. Citation 479(1) is relevant. It reads:

The choice of subjects to be raised on allotted days rests with the opposition; hence, the interchangeable terminology "allotted" or "opposition" day.

Citation 479(2) reads:

The opposition prerogative is very broad in the use of the allotted day and ought not to be interfered with except on the clearest and most certain procedural grounds.

The authority for that is cited as *Journals*, November 14, 1975 at pages 861 to 862. I advance that citation in support of my argument that no one has the right to refuse to publish in the orders of the day the text of the motion filed yesterday, and certainly not on the mere oral fiat of the government House leader. It must not be interfered with "except on the clearest and most certain procedural grounds." If there were clear and certain procedural grounds as to why the text of that motion did not appear on the Order Paper, I would have thought that not only would I have been extended the courtesy of an explanation why it was not there, by telephone or otherwise, but also that some kind of explanation would have been forthcoming as to what kind of clear and certain procedural grounds justified the elimination of the printing of the text of that motion.

Citation 480 reads:

On an opposition day, when a non-confidence motion may be proposed on a subject to be chosen by the mover, the Speaker should not intervene to prevent debate unless the motion is clearly and undoubtedly irregular. When the procedural aspect is open to reasonable argument, it is the duty of the Speaker to accept the motion and to allow the House to make a decision on the question of confidence.

A *Journals* citation appears as authority.

There follows Citation 481, which is not relevant.

Citation 482 reads:

On an allotted day, during consideration of the business of Supply, an amendment must not provide the basis for an entirely different debate than that proposed in the original motion.

That does not apply either.

The substance of the argument I am advancing for the retention on the Order Paper of the text of the motion filed yesterday in the name of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition applies equally, in my submission, to the text of the motion filed during question period yesterday by a member of the New Democratic Party. I am not aware of the name of the hon. member in whose name that motion stands, but, in my submission, that too should appear subsequent to—since it was filed subsequently—the text of the motion of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the back of the Order Paper. The importance of that rests in Standing Order 58(4)(b) where an onus arises that must be discharged by the Chair. I will just read that for the record:

● (1240)

(b) When notice has been given of two or more motions by members in opposition to the government for consideration on an allotted day, Mr. Speaker shall have power to select which of the proposed motions shall have precedence in that sitting.

If my contention is correct, I strongly urge it upon the Chair that the text of those motions should have appeared on today's Order Paper, and then it would be at the election of the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), or myself, on the advice of our respective leaders or of caucus members, to see that it remains there and is dealt with next Friday. That is our decision; it is not the decision of the government House leader or of the Table. Then that onus rests on your Honour which must be discharged by you in selecting which of the