

Procedure and Organization

discuss the problem and bring about a solution that would avoid a long drawn-out debate.

It amazed me that the last speaker in this debate, the Liberal-Labour member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid), spoke about the residual responsibility having been given to the governing party by the electorate. In fact it surprises me very much that he runs under the name Liberal-Labour. I am certain that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) at this particular time, and wherever he may be in his travels, must find small chills going up his spine when he hears of the Liberal-Labour member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) talking about residual rights.

Labour has well documented its case that it does not believe in the managerial prerogative. I suggest that what the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) advocated in his speech was managerial prerogative to the worst degree possible, because proposed rule 75c is recognized as nothing but managerial prerogative. I suggest that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) has made it very clear that he does not believe in the theory of residual right or authority but believes in the rights of individuals, whether in management or labour, to express themselves as they see fit. In fact he does not believe in such a thing as a managerial prerogative or labour prerogative and recognizes that there must be co-operation.

The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River is now suggesting something that is heartily disliked by those people who possibly supported him because he ran under a partly labour banner. I hope that he will have an opportunity later this month, or next month, to speak on another amendment to the motion and clarify his position in this regard.

When speaking of proposed rule 75c I think we should at this time assess the responsibility of the person introducing this proposal. Somehow or other I find it difficult to think that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) introduced it, but I find it quite easy to suggest and think that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) issued the running order to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and that he had no alternative but to follow those directions. May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills, public bills.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the items that are listed under this heading hon. members will be aware of the fact that the first four are in the name of my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), and that they are similar in the papers that they seek. My colleague has suggested, and I put it forward on his behalf, that the house might be willing to deal with all four in one motion or one debate. In other words, if there is to be debate we would accept the one hour and 40 minute limit to cover all of them, and if there is a vote we would accept the one vote to cover all four.

If hon. members will look at them they will see that we are not trying to pull a trick of any kind. It is a straightforward matter. It is a case of dealing with these four motions in a way that will make more time available for some of the other notices of motions for the production of papers that are on the order paper. This could be done by having the debate on the first one and when it is disposed of we could consider that the other three have been disposed of, or there could be unanimous consent to consider the four of them as one motion.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I can say that we have no objection to the four motions being discussed as one. We have no objection to the procedure outlined by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

● (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Further, Mr. Speaker, if there is a vote, one vote will suffice and the time limit of one hour and 40 minutes will apply to the one debate on all four.

Mr. Forest: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, before you call the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) I wonder whether we might have the unanimous consent of the house to call notice of motion No. 63. At the time the motion was made the agreement referred to