

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore the motion cannot be put.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

MOTION TO ADJOURN—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I seek unanimous consent to discuss the urgent matter of the relations between the province of Quebec and Ottawa.

For a few weeks, the federal administration has been under heavy attack throughout the province of Quebec.

First of all, there was the minister's tirade—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member should get to the point. He seems to be launching into a speech, but he knows he cannot do so. Under the Standing Orders, he should explain the urgency of the motion he is submitting to the House.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, as clearly stated in Standing Order 43, an hon. member who moves a motion under that Standing Order must explain why it is urgent. I do not think that anyone can deny that this is an urgent matter, when it is a known fact that the very future of our country is at stake, and if we do not want, within a year or two, Canada to go back to square one—or nine as you wish—it is urgent to debate this matter today so that the atmosphere that now exists in Quebec, with all the controversies which involve our country's future itself, may not destroy Canada.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue):

That this House be adjourned to discuss the pressing matter of relations between Quebec and Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's motion is out of order. Such motion should usually be introduced under Standing Order 26. The hon. member calls for the adjournment of the House, and he cannot do so under Standing Order 43. Therefore, his motion cannot be put.

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Again, Sir, we are being treated to the same kind of asinine behaviour that is a complete waste of the time of the House. I again appeal to the acting House leader, who is at the moment speaking on behalf of the government, to bring some order and sanity back to these proceedings. The only way he can do it, I suggest to him in the name of sweet reason, is to assure the Social Credit party that they will get the full day's debate that they were hampered from having today.

Surely, we are entitled, not only in this country but in this House, to a modicum of leadership from the government and from the Acting House Leader in breaking this deadlock and getting down to the business of the country.

Ontario-Quebec Relations

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member what he obviously does not know: unless orders of the day are reached today, then by the operation of the rules hon. members will have an allotted day at some future date. I should also point out that if hon. members are interested in having a sensible question period, we could go ahead and have it. But if they are not interested in having that, I suppose they will continue with this charade of moving motions under Standing Order 43.

Mr. Nielsen: On that point, Sir, the acting government House leader knows, as do all other hon. members, that the assurance that the Social Credit party is seeking and that other parties on this side of the House are seeking is that it will not be an opposition day that is usurped in order to come back to the motion by the Social Credit party. This is the undertaking we are seeking from the government. Surely this is not without reason.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, there is no way that representatives of the government can take away opposition days that are assured by the rules.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, having sat in this Chamber for the last few hours, I completely agree with the acting House leader that the present charade involves us all in the House of Commons. But I come back to a ruling made by Your Honour earlier today. While the rule may be 105 years old, I do not believe that in 105 years of parliamentary democracy of the British institution—or Anglo-Saxon institution, to get the two languages involved—there has been either an interpretation or an implementation of a ruling by the Chair which has brought the House into such utter confusion.

Frankly, I completely agree with the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) that unless the acting House leader can assure us that the Cr ditistes will have their opposition day, then I suppose we will have to sit out the next 20 minutes. But so far as I am concerned, after sitting here for the last three four or five hours of complete insanity, I don't see why we cannot call it ten o'clock and start fresh tomorrow.

I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It has been suggested that we call it ten o'clock. Is it agreed that the Chair shall call it ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not agreement.

Mr. McKinley: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There are some important questions that were supposed to be asked today and we are not going to have a chance to ask them. What has happened today has brought up something that has concerned many of us for quite an extended period of time. This is the fact that hon. members who belong to the Creditiste party are situated to the left of the Speaker in the far end of the chamber. I think normal tradition was that the opposition were seated immediately to Mr. Speaker's left, and others who formed