

● (8:50 p.m.)

I agree completely with the ruling Your Honour made last July 3, that we must not confuse the issue of priority with the rule of anticipation. The rule of anticipation, of course, is involved here, but it should not prevent the transfer of this motion from notices of motions to government orders. That is what we are dealing with now. The second point that is extremely important is that after Your Honour was in the position where you transferred—as I said, in compliance with the decision you made—the motion to government orders, we were not dealing with the process under routine proceedings but were dealing with the sequence of those matters called by the government. Hon. members opposite will agree that is the proper thing at this stage. Then, of course, it is the prerogative of the government house leader to call any one, in any sequence that he sees fit, of those matters that are listed on the order paper under government business. That is precisely what is happening at this point in time. Therefore I suggest there has been no valid point of order outlined by hon. members opposite.

In this connection I would refer to May's 17th edition, page 400, which gives a number of prohibitions respecting the rule of anticipation and reads as follows:

In determining, however, whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, the Speaker must have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the house within a reasonable time.

As has been clearly stated by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and other members who were on the committee, they did not wish this motion put before the house. Now, they are taking exactly the opposite side of the argument.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Baldwin: I never said that.

Mr. Olson: The record of the vote in that committee has been read out twice. They were not in favour of this motion being brought before the House of Commons. Having voted that way and having made that decision, it seems to me the absolute apex of hypocrisy to now argue for and insist upon the motion being brought before the house. In addition—

Mr. Danforth: What about the Liberal members?

29180—691

Debating Time Allotment

Mr. Olson: That has nothing to do with the point of order; that is just a point of argument. In addition, as I am sure Your Honour is well aware, this motion is not exactly the same as the motion moved by the hon. member for—

Mr. Baldwin: No, it is worse.

Mr. Olson: That is the opinion of the hon. member for Peace River. This motion is not exactly the same as the motion moved by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). As has been said not only dozens and scores, but indeed hundreds of times, the government has to take the responsibility for moving motions under that section of the order paper which deals with government business. That is precisely what is being asked at this point in time.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Olson: Certainly.

Mr. Aiken: I ask the minister whether he considers that the order standing in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), chairman of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, is a government order. If it is not how does he justify its not having precedence under Standing Order 18, which gives only government orders priority?

Mr. Olson: Item 99 of government orders in our Orders of the Day, which is that part of the day with which we are now dealing, is the motion that has been moved by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), and any other motions on the order paper do not apply.

Mr. Stanfield: Why don't you answer the question?

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate because I had, if I may say so with respect, a great deal of sympathy for the position into which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) pushed Your Honour by putting a motion on the order paper. I was not at all sure that any contribution I could make would be of assistance to Your Honour in deciding the point of procedure. But I was raised to my feet by the arrogance of the President of the Privy Council—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.