

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Nowlan: Order, you say. The orderly way is what we have done today.

Mr. Lyle Kristiansen (Kootenay West—Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I would just make it very clear that it is not my intention to deny unanimous consent, but I know one of my colleagues from Newfoundland will know perhaps why I am rising.

I cannot personally support the motion out of respect for some of the activities of Mr. Smallwood over the years, but because it is Christmas I will not deny unanimous consent.

Anyone who has been a long-time member of the International Woodworkers of America will never forgive a premier who was the only premier in the history of Canada ever to banish a free trade union from the entire province of his jurisdiction. For that I will never forgive him.

Mr. Ross Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, Joe Smallwood is a constituent of mine. Joe Smallwood is a man who I, as a very little boy and a student, used to visit just to talk about the history of Newfoundland and some of the things in the future.

Perhaps the biggest compliment that we could pay to him today is the nature of the debate we have heard in the last five minutes. For the man who is living on the Roaches Line in Newfoundland to inspire the controversy in the House some 90 years after he was born, this may be the biggest compliment to him.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent was denied three times during the last few minutes before this motion was agreed to. I would like to know why, when the Chair asks for unanimous consent and it is

denied, the motion is carried just the same. Could the Chair indicate on which Standing Order its decision was based? We had no prior notice of these motions, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would like the hon. member to come to the table so that I may discuss it with him and the clerks before we make a decision on it. It was adopted on division. He can come to the table and we can discuss it a little further.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, following the point of order that was raised by my hon. colleague, the member for Shefford, I, too, would like to raise a point of order. In explaining the Chair's position, as I understand it— and I may have misunderstood—the Chair stated that the reason that the member for Shefford was not recognized on a point of order was because the minister stood and every time a minister stands in the House, the minister must be recognized.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, and correct me if I am wrong, but in a point of order it is always the person raising the point of order who is recognized before the mover of another motion and, in particular, when there has not been a formal notice of motion given.

I may not agree with the point raised by my hon. colleague from Shefford, but the fact is that everybody in the House is supposed to be treated equally and, if somebody has a point of order, the point of order has to be heard before they can be denied out of hand. You cannot rewrite—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would like to say to the hon. member that I saw the hon. minister rise and I saw the hon. member for Shefford rise. I did not know whether the hon. member for Shefford was rising on this motion or on the motion regarding Mr. Smallwood. Therefore, I recognized the hon. minister in that respect. That was the reason I did it.

I will recognize the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls on the same point of order, and then I will recognize the hon. member for Shefford.

Mr. Baker: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is correct by custom that, when two persons rise in their places, from custom the Speaker does recognize the one who is a cabinet minister.

As far as the business that was raised concerning unanimous consent, perhaps if members could be a little