

*Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen*

the Government side to inform my House Leader whether the offer of an allotted day would stand or be withdrawn.

When my House Leader rose to seek unanimous consent and read the motion, as he did last evening, it would appear he was trying to facilitate the business of the House. That motion appeared to be agreed to by the Government House Leader. I thought I saw his head nodding in the affirmative and he had no objection to that happening. For some reason Members of the NDP refused to give unanimous consent, and therefore at the first opportunity my House Leader—

**Mr. Althouse:** Get your facts right.

**Mr. McKnight:** —presented the argument for the Opposition day. I fail to understand why anyone would not consent to a motion which would remove Revenue Canada from the backs of the taxpayers in Canada.

**Mr. Althouse:** A point of order.

**Mr. Nielsen:** We are on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster is on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** We have been on a point of order all the way along. The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Althouse:** I am sure the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster would not wish to break the rules of the House and impute motives to any Members or any Party, particularly when, if indeed there was a “no” yesterday, it was not clear where it was from.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster has the floor. The Chair requests the Hon. Member, in the interests of the House, not to repeat arguments but to deal with essential items concerning the point of order raised by his House Leader.

**Mr. McKnight:** Mr. Speaker, I did not realize I was casting aspersions on anyone. I just said that the NDP denied unanimous consent.

**Mr. Keeper:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it not necessary for a Member to tell the truth?

**Mr. McKnight:** The Hon. Member who put this motion feels that he was denied the right of a Member of Parliament to have a motion which he feels very strongly about debated on the floor of the House of Commons. Rather than repeat myself, I now move:

That the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard.

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Pinard:** By unanimous consent.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The concern the Chair has at this point is that motions of a particular form, repeated with a dilatory purpose, raise some fundamental questions about the way in which this House conducts its business.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Then hear us out.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair will hear the Hon. Member for Yukon and then render a decision on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Yukon.

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

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice in this place for many, many years for the Chair to listen to submissions and hear Members out who feel they have a contribution to make to a procedural debate. I urge the Chair to reconsider the imposition of any guillotine on a procedural debate.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sure the Hon. Member, being an experienced Parliamentarian, is well aware of ample precedents in which the Chair has listened patiently to arguments, and beyond a certain point has decided the argument has been sufficient for the purpose of the Chair to render a decision to the House. The Chair has listened for well over one hour, and listened patiently, to the Hon. Member. I am sure the Hon. Member, who has a great respect for Parliament and who at some time may face even greater responsibilities than he has now, will realize the implications of what he is doing.

**Mr. Pinard:** Oh, never!

**Mr. Nielsen:** There is no doubt about the truthfulness of your last two sentences, Mr. Speaker.

I have now had provided to me the precedents in order for the Chair to come to a balanced decision with respect to the rights of Members to have their motion printed in the official records of the House, which is part of the point of order I raised initially. Perhaps while I am presenting my argument, these precedents could be obtained for the Chair or I will pass mine up. However, I think it would be helpful if the Chair had them while I am arguing.

● (1220)

I shall refer to *Hansard* of February 12, 1982, at pages 14953 to 14966 inclusive. At that time, a very full debate on this question was raised and the Chair reserved its decision. Three days later, on February 15, at page 14997 and page 14998, the question was resolved. On February 12, 1982 I raised a question under the subheading:

MR. NIELSEN—PRINTING IN ORDER PAPER OF FILED  
OPPOSITION MOTION—CHANGES TO ORDER  
PAPER MADE BY GOVERNMENT

I made a lengthy argument at that time on the basis that the Order Paper had been changed. At that time as well, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain sought a meeting with the Chair to discuss the subject. He is not present at the moment