

Yukon Act

estimates with which we should be dealing today.

● (3:40 p.m.)

I should like the government house leader to consider this point because it involves a concession of government time. Is he prepared to give government time for the discussion of private members' motions, including No. 66, up to the extent that it might be required by private members of the house? I doubt very much that he will find available government time for that purpose. Yet I am told that there are as many hon. members yet to speak on No. 66, the capital punishment debate, as have already spoken, which means that another three days would be taken up. I do not know whether it is advisable to try to squeeze them in now and attempt to reach a decision today. That means putting pressure on private members to refrain from making speeches which they were promised an opportunity to make, and it is taking unfair advantage of the house.

I conclude by saying that I think the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) deserves credit for drawing Standing Order 18 to the attention of the Chair and the house. I think it would take precedence over Standing Order 44. However, should Your Honour, on the contrary, incline to the view that the motion is in order I reserve the right to move an amendment such as I have suggested.

Mr. Lambert: I rise on a point of information, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister mention that the debate would continue until seven o'clock or until six o'clock?

An hon. Member: Seven.

Mr. McIlraith: No, I did not give any time. I shall read the motion again. I move:

That the House do now proceed to the Order appearing under Private Members' Notices of Motion No. 66 on today's Order Paper, resuming debate on the Private Members' motion proposed by Messrs. Byrne, Nugent, Scott (Danforth) and Stanbury, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. Lambert: Until what time, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask whether the house leader has authority under Standing Order 44 to make the motion he has made. I think you should take into consideration what is now being done under the provisions of Standing Order 44. I believe that the purpose is one for which it was never intended to be used. I say that, Mr. Speaker, with great

[Mr. Churchill.]

sympathy for the problem the house leader has because of the procedural impasse we are in as a result of the manner in which the capital punishment resolution was brought before the house.

In so far as the argument advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is concerned and his reference to citation 195 dealing with dilatory motions, I think he only took out of it that part which was useful in achieving the end he wants to achieve. The same paragraph says that dilatory motions are designed to dispose of the original question. If we are going to rely on that, then surely this procedure is designed to do away with the consideration of the bill to amend the Yukon Act. It would raise a problem in that regard.

Mr. Knowles: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Medicine Hat is accusing me of reading only part of a paragraph. Now he is reading only part of the sentence I quoted.

Mr. Olson: I am reading the rest of the paragraph which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did not read.

Mr. Knowles: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I read the entire paragraph. The hon. member is now reading only part of a sentence taken out of that paragraph.

Mr. Olson: I am giving the proper weight to the words that precede the rest of the subclause where the words are in quotation marks. I think we should be very careful about this matter because if we set a precedent whereby the government can, at any time it feels it wants to, move a motion under Standing Order 44 to get away from ordinary government business and into private members' resolutions and bills and so on, we shall in fact be doing something that was never intended under Standing Order 44.

Standing Order 18 says very clearly in paragraph 2:

Except as provided in Standing Order 56, government orders may be called in such sequence as the government may think fit.

I do not disagree with that. What we are now doing under the aegis of Standing Order 44 is to attempt to get around the hard and fast provisions of other Standing Orders, namely, Nos. 15 and 18. It is very clear in the Standing Orders that hon. members are entitled to notice of such a motion. This is for the protection of those members who want to be