

I submit it is in order to read those orders of the day. It would not be my prerogative to say what order I think should be called; that would be in the hands of the government. But I hope that if this motion is accepted the government will pick some other item, rather than the one on which we are making so little progress thus far. It seems to me the making of the motion is in order. I was careful not to get the floor on a point of order. I waited until it was my turn to have the floor.

Mr. Pringle: You bulldozed your way in.

Mr. Horner: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the House is master of its own procedure. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) should rise in the regular course of debate on Bill C-176 now before the House and seek to move the adjournment of the debate, the House could vote on the motion and then, if it chose to proceed with new business, the government could choose a new order. I would suggest item No. 75 on the order paper, Bill C-243. We would then be in a position to pass the Judges Act, which encompasses the whole question of the Auditor General.

We on our side have been vehement in our support of the Auditor General and we would have been glad to give passage to that bill even at this late stage in the session. I urge the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to move the adjournment of the debate on Bill C-176 in the hope that the government will proceed to order No. 75. Bill C-243 could pass this evening even if it were necessary for us to sit by agreement for an extra 20 minutes or half an hour in order to help the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: Perhaps we might make an effort to help the Minister of Justice and the Auditor General by reverting to the debate on Bill C-243. In this way perhaps the House could wind up that item of government business. Then, after a difficult session, we could adopt a co-operative mood.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my personal opinion on this matter and bring to the attention of the House that we have undertaken consideration of Bill C-176 following many requests by opposition members, hoping that we would succeed in having it passed with the co-operation of all hon. members.

I believe that the tactics used by the opposition merely tend to delay the passing—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the point he is raising might lead to a debate and is not relevant to the motion before the House, which is the matter of acceptability.

24171—54

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

[English]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could be allowed to draw something else to your attention. The motion moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was based on a Standing Order which has been in existence for many years and was not changed by the recent revision. I would refer Your Honour to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation No. 195, which I feel has some relevance and should be taken into consideration.

If Your Honour will look at that citation you will find that the hon. member's motion is in fact in order in that it relates to what is a substantive motion. We are not dealing with a nebulous amendment, because the motion of the hon. member is substantive. I would refer Your Honour to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, citation No. 195 at page 165, which indicates what "privileged" means. It reads as follows:

Privileged motions which must not be mistaken for questions of privilege, deal with situations arising from the subject-matter of, or the debate on, the original question either in consequence or in anticipation of a vote or through the necessity of resorting to new proceedings.

The motion was moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in respect of what we consider a necessity to resort to new proceedings. It arises out of the debate on the original question because it became obvious during the course of the debate that we were not going to make any progress this evening on the original question. The citation thus reads:

They must be given the right of way when proposed during a debate.

This is important in terms of the urgings or propositions of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson). The motion on privilege was proposed during the debate by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. He rose in his place and caught the eye of Your Honour. This took place in the normal courts of the debate. The remaining part of the paragraph to which I have referred states:

They are divided into *superseding* motions and amendments.

There is then a classification or specification in respect of motions, the first in relation to superseding motions, which reads:

Superseding motions, though independent in form, are moved in the course of the debate on questions which they seek to set aside. They are divided into two classes, namely: *dilatory motions*; *the previous question*.

Dilatory motions are designed to dispose of the original question either for the time being or permanently.

The intention of the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was to dispose of the original question, the report stage of Bill C-176, for the time being in order that the government could proceed to some other item which we consider to be of importance and which probably would pass. Let me refer again to this reference to dilatory motions:

They are the following: "That consideration of the question be postponed to—(date)." "That the orders of the day be read."