

*Point of Order—Mr. Mazankowski*

toward allowing more statements, provided we had a commitment or agreement from the other side not to abuse the length of time allotted to asking questions of Minister who make statements. I look forward to discussing that with my counterparts in the near future, if they are still willing to negotiate in good faith.

Finally, in so far as tomorrow is concerned, I admit that I am much surprised by the reaction of the Hon. Member for Yukon. I was expecting him to applaud. Since he is not applauding but shouting and crying, I will reconsider with pleasure—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The Minister is not now discussing the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). I must remind him that if he is rising now, he must discuss the point or order.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pinard:** You are right, Madam Speaker, but I just wanted to make things perfectly clear. With regard to the business for tomorrow, the decision is not final. I am prepared to reconsider my suggestion and to postpone this debate until the following Wednesday so that following consultations we might come to an agreement. There have been consultations in the past but they did not bring any positive results. I hope this time, that the results will be more encouraging but if such is not the case, we shall proceed on the following Wednesday to the striking of Committees and the adoption of the report.

[English]

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, I am very happy to hear the Government House Leader say that he will reconsider the matter and allow us a normal Private Member's day tomorrow. I thought I heard him say, however, that he may be disposed to carry the notice to concur on to the following Wednesday which, of course, would be just as objectionable. However, we can discuss that.

In any event, I was going to alert the Chair to the possibility of a point of order tomorrow questioning the ability of the Government to displace Private Members' day, now Wednesday, by this device. Quite frankly, I very much doubt that the Government has the prerogative of displacing Private Members' day by the use of this kind of device. While I attribute the best of motives to the Government House Leader in changing his mind, I am very doubtful that it could have been done in the first place and I would have raised that point tomorrow.

**Mr. Deans:** Madam Speaker, I am glad there is a reconsideration for tomorrow. I want to raise—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. We are discussing two matters at the same time. I am a little bit uneasy about orderly discussion in the House. I want first to rule on the point of order brought forward by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. We can then continue discussion of Government business.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Madam Speaker, may I be heard on this point of order?

**Madam Speaker:** I do not think the House needs to be further enlightened on the point of order.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Madam Speaker:** It is quite clear in the Standing Order which deals with Statements by Ministers that the Standing Order is permissive, but does not place an obligation on the Government to make statements of Government policies under Statements by Ministers. It is purely permissive.

I appreciate the point of order brought forward by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. He probably feels very much aggrieved by the situation. However, it is the choice of the Government to make its statements at whatever time the Government feels it must.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### DISPOSITION OF STRIKING COMMITTEE REPORT

**Madam Speaker:** Now that we have cleared this particular point of order, I see that it is the desire of Hon. Members to return to the discussion of Government business. In the interest of what appears to be a desire to come to some kind of agreement, I will allow the House to return to that discussion and I will recognize for that purpose the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), who had the floor before I ruled.

**Mr. Deans:** Madam Speaker, I had wanted to raise a point very similar to the point raised by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). I want to make one comment, if I may, on the statement made by the Government House Leader.

The Government House Leader said in response to the question about the making of statements that if he could get agreement for a short debate on Statements, he might consider implementing once again the practice of having Ministers make statements.

I consider that to be a direct attack on the Speaker. It is quite clearly the responsibility of the Speaker to determine the length of time to be allocated for reply to statements made by any Minister in the House. It is not the responsibility of the House Leader, it is not the responsibility of the Opposition House Leader and it is not my responsibility to set up in advance some agreement as to how long will be taken. It is directly the responsibility of the Speaker to determine when there has been sufficient discussion on any statement made.

I therefore suggest, in the interests of the people who are most affected by the actions being taken by the Government today, that a Minister of the Crown should stand in his place today and make a statement with regard to the changes to the Crow rate. It should be done now. I have nothing further to say on the other matter.