

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, that is precisely what I intend to do. I would like to refer the Chair to Standing Order 55 which reads as follows:

Whenever the Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the rules and privileges of Parliament, the Speaker shall apprise the House thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and quote the Standing Order or authority applicable to the case.

My submission, Mr. Speaker, is that if there was doubt as to the procedural acceptability of a notice of motion filed after 6 p.m., the proper procedure was not for someone to decide not to include it in the Orders of the Day today and to prejudice my rights, as an Hon. Member, to deal with that motion, but rather for it to appear on the Orders of the Day and for the Speaker now, before calling the motion, to deal with the question of procedure. I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that my rights as an Hon. Member are prejudiced when a decision is made arbitrarily that a motion which is submitted by an Hon. Member on this side of the House in good faith, believing fully that it is within the rules of the House, is summarily not included in the Order Paper for today.

If one looks, even in a cursory way, at the Standing Order 55, the procedure which should be followed is very clear. For someone simply to make the decision that the notice of motion would not appear because it was filed following six o'clock departs from the principle established in Standing Order 55 and gravely undermines my rights, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Parliament to deal with this matter and have my motion considered. I consider that element every bit as serious as the matters raised by my House Leader and the House Leaders for the other two Parties, because it is my rights as a Member which are in jeopardy as a result of this decision.

● (1210)

If you were to accept the argument that since it does not appear in the Orders of the Day today because it was filed after six o'clock we are to go to Government Orders and not debate an Opposition day motion, then I suggest that deeply undercuts my rights as a Member and prejudices my ability to defend an action which I believe, and which my House Leader believes, was entirely in order and consistent with precedent.

Mr. Fisher: You can say that without blushing?

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I believe that on the basis of Standing Order 55 alone a compelling case can be made for the procedure followed last evening, and that not including my motion on today's Order Paper was wrong and my rights have been prejudiced. Additionally, I believe the argument by my House Leader was compelling since there is no question that when the order was filed last night it was filed consistent with the practices of this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to Hon. Members, the Chair has heard a good deal of argument—

Mr. Mazankowski: Procedural acceptability.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, the Chair is not going to listen to a series of repetitive arguments; but if the Hon. Member for

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has a short point of order, the Chair will listen to him. But the Chair does not intend to listen to a lengthy repetition of arguments.

Mr. McKnight: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Pinard: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I move:

That the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster be now heard.

Mr. Pinard: A point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: The motion must be put without debate.

Mr. Ouellet: The motion is not yet put.

Mr. Pinard: I got up on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: The motion has to be put.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville has moved that the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) be now heard.

Mr. Fisher: Who seconded the motion?

Mr. Nielsen: I seconded the motion.

Mr. Pinard: I raised a point of order before the motion was made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those in favour please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those opposed please say nay? Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): I rise to follow my House Leader and the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty) on the matter of the allotted day assigned by the Government House Leader with the caveat that it may be changed. As my House Leader and the Hon. Member in whose name the motion stands have expressed, that motion was subject to withdrawal.

The rationale for rising in his place to ask for unanimous consent, which I think would have facilitated the movement of the business of this House much more rapidly than we have this morning by carrying on this debate, was the time that had elapsed. If we are indeed to be consistent concerning the ability of Opposition Members to have allotted days, it would appear to be incumbent upon those of us on this side and on