

Time Allocation

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Call in the Members.

● (1710)

And the division bells having been rung:

Madam Speaker: Order, please. It now being 5.12 p.m., under the provision of Standing Order 82, the two hours since the commencement of the proceedings on the motion now before the House have expired. Accordingly, under the terms of the Standing Order, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the motion. The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I thought you would be seeking advice from Members prior to putting the question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I am still prepared to listen to advice. That is why I recognized the Hon. Member; I thought he had some advice to give me.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the Chair was faced, of course, with a problem in the interpretation of Standing Order 82. Since that Standing Order found its way into our rule book, this is the first time upon which an occasion has arisen where we are confronted with a situation of voting on a procedure established under Standing Order 82 with a dilatory motion, which the Chair has described so often, in front of it, namely the motion put by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

That was brought about, with no intention whatsoever of reflecting on the actions of the Chair, by the process of this afternoon when at the same time the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) rose, the Hon. Member for Vegreville rose, and I rose. It came to the application of Standing Order 33 which sets forth:

When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

I have had the opportunity during the interval prior to 5.12 p.m. to examine the "blues". What transpired was that the Minister of Transport had risen in his place and the Chair recognized the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Transport got so far as to say "I move". That is where it stopped. Then the Hon. Member for Vegreville, who was on his feet at the time—

● (1720)

Mr. Mazankowski: Before.

Mr. Nielsen: Let us be fair and say that we were all on our feet at the same time. He then sought recognition and he was recognized by the Chair. He had the opportunity of putting the full text of his motion. That appears clearly on the tapes and on the "blues". We, of course, believe that at that point the Chair was boxed in, as I submitted before, but the Chair has made a contrary ruling. That has brought on this dilemma with which the Chair is now confronted.

This all stems from the application of Standing Order 82. Without reading the entire Standing Order, the last sentence—and this deals of course with the motion made by the Minister of Transport for the allocation of time—on page 87 reads:

Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon—

That is on the motion of the Minister of Transport.

—the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

Two matters arise here that should be taken into consideration in deciding whether we are in the right time frame in taking this vote. I intend to support my submission that the vote should be taken at six o'clock rather than at 5.12 with my submissions to the Chair.

If we were only confronted with the motion of the Minister there would be no problem, because there can be no question that during the time the bells were ringing the clock was running and the debate would have terminated at 5.12, two hours after the proceedings had commenced. Normally, had debate continued, at the end of that two hours there would have been a 15-minute bell and the vote would have been taken. But here we had, in front of the motion for time allocation made by the Minister, a dilatory motion.

The two points I have to make with respect to Standing Order 82 have to do with the interpretation of the word "motion" where it is referred to in the final sentence of Standing Order 82—"to dispose of the said motion", namely the motion made by the Minister of Transport. The other point I have to make has to do with the interpretation of the word "proceedings". I will be contending and supporting it by authorities that the word "proceedings" in effect means debate.

To deal with the first question with respect to the interpretation of the words "to dispose of the said motion", I submit that the obligation of the Chair under Standing Order 82 is to put every question necessary to dispose of the motion of the Minister of Transport, and I contend that in the ordinary case that would be done two hours after the debate had commenced by the initiative of the Minister of Transport. However, in this case we had an intervening proceeding, namely a dilatory motion, a motion which the Chair has so often ruled is a dilatory motion, in front of the motion of the Minister of Transport. That led me to the interpretation of this Standing Order and, in the absence of any precedent whatsoever with respect to the interpretation of these particular circumstances, to the conclusion that the dilatory motion could only be disposed of regularly by waiting until six o'clock. Then, based on the precedents the Chair has repeatedly set in defining