

*Transport and Communications*

the procedural debate, which I gather may take some time judging from the interest of many members who have indicated to the Chair that they would like to take part in such a debate, should take place immediately, later today, or on another day. The Chair would appreciate receiving the guidance of hon. members on this point.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On this point, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour has made clear, it is the right of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) to present his motion now and to precipitate the procedural discussion at this point. But it seems to me that his suggestion is a sensible one, that we should defer the presenting of the motion and the consequent procedural debate until after today's question period. At this point I think there is clearly nothing else to discuss and, if there is agreement to do this, let it be so ordered.

**Mr. Baldwin:** I concur, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Reid:** We concur also, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The understanding of the Chair is that there is agreement to postpone the submission of this motion and the hearing of the point of order until after the—the hon. member for Yukon.

**Mr. Nielsen:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Chair has knowledge of a motion to be made under Standing Order 26. If Your Honour accepts that motion it may well be that it should supersede any debate that may arise on this procedural point after the question period. Therefore, subject to the Chair's ruling on the Standing Order 26 motion, perhaps we might make the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre an order of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Obviously the suggestions that I am hearing now are that we consider all sorts of matters except those that are on the order paper today. In any event, the hon. member for Yukon has to take into account the possibility that, if the Chair accepted the motion to be proposed by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, the debate on that motion would take place this evening. But that is highly hypothetical at this point.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

#### CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Gaston Clermont (for Mr. Duquet)** moved that the first report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders presented to the House on Wednesday, June 13, 1973, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Speaker.]

### MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

#### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

##### INDIAN LAND CLAIMS, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES— ALLEGED SUBVERSION OF FEDERAL COURT TO POLITICAL ENDS

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion to adjourn the House under the provisions of Standing Order 26 in order to debate a matter of urgent public concern requiring immediate consideration by the House, namely, the action of the executive in subverting the Federal Court to political ends by causing it to invade a matter under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories, which action Mr. Justice Morrow has described as an unwarranted attack by the executive of the Canadian government upon the integrity and independence of the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has given the Chair notice of her intention to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of considering the matter to which she has just alluded. This has given the Chair ample opportunity to give very serious thought to the several aspects of the matter raised by the hon. member and principally, of course, to the procedural aspect of the matter.

Upon reflection the Chair has very serious doubts whether this is the kind of situation which is contemplated by the Standing Order. Reading very closely and attentively the motion proposed by the hon. member, I have to interpret it more as a motion of censure against the government than as one referring to a situation which requires immediate debate under the terms of Standing Order 26. As I say, having looked at the matter and considered it as sympathetically as I could, I have to suggest to the hon. member that this is more in the nature of a censure motion, the type of motion perhaps which was proposed by the hon. member for Don Valley the other day and which should come to the House under the guise more of a non-confidence motion or censure motion rather than for debate under the provisions of Standing Order 26.

For these reasons I would suggest to the hon. member and to the House that it would not be in order for the Chair to allow an adjournment debate to consider the matter raised by the hon. member.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

#### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

##### INFLATION AND SUPPLY OF HOUSING—STATEMENTS BY MINISTER OF FINANCE AND MINISTER OF STATE FOR URBAN AFFAIRS—GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Acting Prime Minister who, I presume, is the President of the Treasury Board. Which of the two ministers is stating government