

Yukon Act

It interests me, Mr. Speaker, that the country is wondering how this institution can adapt itself to the day by day proceedings which are before it. If we are to be frustrated by what I might refer to as wilful men with wilful opinions, then this institution can be validly criticized by the public who do not understand—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fairweather: I had better keep quiet, Mr. Speaker, and leave you with the rules which are clearly there to meet the situation which the house leader sees.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this point. I believe weight should be given to the suggestion made by the house leader. Standing Order 44 is in the book and provides, in this circumstance, for a motion to proceed to another order. I recognize that any such motion should not run afoul of any other Standing Order, and I shall deal with that in just a moment.

First of all may I point out, as has the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather), that citation 189 of Beauchesne's fourth edition lists motions which can be made without notice. One of them is for proceeding to another order.

May I also draw attention to citation 195 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which deals at some length with superseding motions of various kinds. This paragraph is relevant and reads as follows:

Dilatory motions are designed to dispose of the original question either for the time being or permanently. They are the following: "That consideration of the question be postponed to (date)." "That the orders of the day be read." "That the house proceed to (name another order); or that the house proceed to the next business." "That the debate be now adjourned." "That this meeting be now adjourned." Adjourned motions are in this class because they may sometimes be used to stop a debate which will never be resumed.

I have read the whole paragraph, Mr. Speaker, but the relevant part indicates that there is provision for a motion to proceed to another order of business. The motion made by the government house leader is in those terms.

However, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) has quite properly drawn our attention to Standing Order 18 (1) and he has been supported by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and perhaps by one or two others. I think one has to look carefully at Standing Order 18 (1).

What Standing Order 18 (1) does is to provide the order of private members' business within private members' hour.

The hon. member for Lapointe is perfectly correct in drawing attention to this rule. If this were private members' hour, if we were now between six and seven o'clock, it certainly would not be in order to move and to decide by a majority vote that the first 65 items be passed by, whether or not their sponsors wanted them to be passed by, and that we take item No. 66. But we are not in private members' hour, Mr. Speaker; we are in government time.

I submit that if the government wishes through one of its own ministers to ask the house to supersede government business for a private member's motion, then that is quite a different story from seeking to sit one private member's motion against all the others within private members' time. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if this motion is accepted and passed it has effect only up until six o'clock. At six o'clock the question would then arise: What do we do in private members' hour? At that juncture I would support the point made by the hon. member for Lapointe, supported in turn by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

However, at this point it seems to me that we are in government time, and if the government wishes to make a proposal which does not infringe on private members' rights but in fact gives something which private members do not have then that is not in violation of Standing Order 18 (1). Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think consideration should be given to the legality of the motion moved by the house leader as being operative for the period from now until six o'clock.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I think this is a most unusual occurrence, Mr. Speaker, and has the danger of setting a very bad precedent. I suggest, sir, that the government is attempting to encroach upon the order of private members' business with no request on the part of private members. It is attempting to select from private members' orders a certain numbered motion which the government says must be discussed now. I think this encroachment should not be allowed.

If Your Honour declares that the motion is in order, then I suggest it would be subject to amendment. It would be proper for us to amend it by striking out "Order No. 66" and putting in "Order No. 1", which would put us back to supply and into the supplementary