

putting of a motion. But Standing Order 43 provides for the case where, if the matter is urgent and if hon. members unanimously consent, the member is dispensed from giving notice and can put his motion. That is all what is stipulated in Standing Order 43. This Standing Order does not authorize us in any way, as you pointed out so pertinently, to debate the question or put it to a vote. The consent is to dispense with notice and to put the motion. Then where do we go once the motion has been put? As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 15(2) was introduced provisionally in our rules on March 24, 1975 and became a permanent feature on December 12, 1975. That Standing Order 15(2) stipulates very clearly, and I quote:

(2) Not more than two minutes after the reading of prayers, the business of the House shall commence. Members, other than ministers of the Crown, may propose motions pursuant to Standing Order 43 at this time. Not later than—

And this standing order is very clear, I point out, Mr. Speaker—

—Not later than 2.15 p.m., or 11.15 a.m., as the case may be, oral questions shall be taken up. At 3.00 p.m., or 12.00 noon, as the case may be, the House shall proceed to the ordinary daily routine of business, which shall be as follows:

So, that second standing order which is relevant to this debate and which I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is very clear, that is there is no choice. The legislator, hon. members and parliament have asked under that standing order to proceed with the oral question period at 11.15 or 2.15, depending whether it is a Friday or another week day. I do not think that we have any other choice. This standing order is quite clear and compels us to interrupt our proceedings and proceed with the oral question period.

There is a third relevant standing order when it is 2:15, as happened today, but the standing orders leave us no alternative nor any choice but to interrupt our proceedings and proceed with the oral question period. What happens then to the motion under consideration as is the case today? Then we have to refer to Standing Order 45(2) provided for that purpose and which reads as follows:

When a debate on any motion made prior to the reading of the orders of the day is adjourned or interrupted—

—such is the case now—

—the order for resumption of the same shall be transferred to and considered under government orders.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be clearer than that standing order which provides that when the debate on a motion is interrupted, as it has been today, the said motion is transferred under government orders. This is the point we are at now. What should we do once time comes for the government orders? Again, the answer is in the standing orders, Mr. Speaker. I refer you—and I suppose Your Honour has not mentioned this before because you thought that all members knew it—to Standing Order 18(2), and I quote:

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

*Point of Order—Mr. Hnatyshyn*

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to determine the sequence of the proceedings of this House and it will be ours, pursuant to the standing orders to decide when the debate will continue. The government decides which matter is more important than others. It is the government's responsibility and it must be accountable to the public. Hence, what the hon. member suggests to the Speaker is to withdraw the government's prerogative to decide the order of the proceedings of the House. If we were to accept his arguments and give priority to the debates on motions pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, once it has been agreed to do without the notice pursuant to Standing Order 42, the opposition would determine the order of the debates of the House through the expedient of a motion under Standing Order 43. This is absolutely contrary to tradition and absolutely contrary to the standing orders, particularly the provisions of Standing Order 18(2). We determine the order of business of the House and what is urgent or what is not. In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, if we stick, as we should, to the rules of the House pertaining to the business of the House and if we refer more particularly to the four relevant standing orders which I mentioned and which are quite clear, then there is no problem at all. The answer to your question is that at 2:15 the discussion of motions under Standing Order 43 for which notice was waived with unanimous consent and debate started, is interrupted, the debate is stood as a government order, and the government decides when the matter will be debated.

There is another point, Mr. Speaker, that was raised by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). They referred to the date when Standing Order 45(2) came into effect or one or the other of the standing orders. There is also a principle that must be respected here, Mr. Speaker. It must be taken for granted that when members amend the Standing Orders they want the amendment, be it a new standing order or an amendment to a standing order, to read in agreement with the other provisions of the standing orders. That must be presumed, Mr. Speaker, even if Standing Order 15(2) which directs you to interrupt the debate at 2:15 is subsequent to the others that existed. A case can hardly be made for the previous practice when Standing Order 15(2) did not exist. That is another story then. My reasoning is that by accepting Standing Order 15(2) without amending the other standing orders, members wanted the procedure to apply, as I just mentioned, that Standing Orders 15(2), 18(2), 43 and 45(2) apply in correlation with one another. Otherwise Standing Orders 45(2) and 18(2) could have been amended and Standing Order 43 might have been amended, but they were not. Standing Order 15(2) was introduced, and that produces a situation like the one we have now. We have no choice, we are bound by the Standing Orders. We must assume that those who drafted the Standing Orders knew what they were doing. If practice shows that it is not too advantageous for one party or another, the standing orders can be amended later on. That is