Privilege-Mr. Flis

Mr. Kempling: He is getting out of the kitchen.

Mr. Nielsen: Perhaps if the Minister of Finance-

Madam Speaker: Order, please. If the hon, member has a point of order he must raise it now, regardless whether the minister is in or out of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister of Finance obviously heard me raise the point of order and call his name three or four times. Nonetheless, he chose to leave the chamber. My point of order was based on the exchange yesterday between the government House leader and myself with regard to members planning their constituency obligations next week. I know the government House leader cannot give a reply now as to the date of the budget so I will have to put the question again next week. There seems to be a clear indication from the Minister of Public Works that we might have been accommodated since he announced the date of the budget as November 9. I hope that is true.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance who is unavoidably absent at this time, is aware that I intend to discuss with him some time during the next few days, the request presented to me recently from the members of the opposition. So I do feel that at one of the upcoming meetings of the House leaders, which are the best place for discussing and deciding on this type of question, I shall be able to report on the matter to the hon. member.

[English]

PRIVILEGE

MR. FLIS-S.O. 43 MOTION OF MR. BOSLEY

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parkdale-High Park): Madam Speaker, my question of privilege arises out of a motion under Standing Order 43 proposed by the hon. member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley). He clearly tried to mislead the House when he said that he had agreement from all three parties on his motion. When I gave him my agreement, it was an agreement from the member representing Parkdale-High Park, because I do have a large Hungarian constituency. I made it very clear to him that he did not have the agreement of all—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. This explanation is not necessary. That motion was dealt with by the House. Since it did not get unanimous consent, we have to consider that it has been dealt with.

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, what I did say was "members of all parties". I did not say "parties".

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of State (Mines)): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the Annual Report in both official languages of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

PETITIONS

MR. NYSTROM—VIA RAIL—CUTBACKS IN PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Madam Speaker, I ask leave of the House to lay upon the Table a petition signed by some 2,375 people in my constituency, primarily of the city of Melville and the town of Ituna, concerning the discontinuance of VIA Rail on the CNR main line which runs through our constituency. They are asking that the rail line and the passenger service be maintained and also be improved as a service to the people of my constituency.

Madam Speaker: Motions. The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe; stand. The hon. member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore; stand. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra; stand. The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe; stand.

Is the hon, member for Yukon rising on a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. NIELSEN-PROCEDURE RESPECTING CALLING OF MOTIONS

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I have noticed in the last couple of days the Chair has been calling the names of only the three members who have motions standing under this item on the Order Paper, notwith-standing that in two instances there are several items standing in the name of a particular member. For instance, the member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke) has several motions standing in his name. The case is the same with respect to the hon, member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty).

• (1210)

I would not want to see our getting into a practice whereby we simply lump all these items together. In saying this I mean no criticism of the Chair. I know that the Chair wishes to save as much time as possible in trying to lump these motions under a single name, but I believe the practice is that each of the items should be called. If that were the case, then one could follow what the Chair is doing. However, in the case, for instance, of the last four items under the name of the hon.