

Air Canada

the third one is the procedure to be followed when notice is given. It does not require consultation, it requires a conclusion of the Minister that agreement could not be reached on the allocation itself and, in particular, the waiver of notice.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, the Deputy House Leader said that these instances of delay are occurring far too often. The situation in which we presently find ourselves is certainly not one of delay but a bona fide disagreement on the procedure and the rules of this House. We on this side have a bona fide position which we want to state.

The Deputy House Leader has said that it is too late to make an intervention, and I will return to that later. First, he said that he held consultation with Members of the Official Opposition, that he consulted the Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) and that the Member for Papineau said there were going to be other speakers.

The Member for Papineau is this Party's critic on External Affairs. I know what the Deputy House Leader asked the Member for Papineau because I was sitting right next to the Member for Papineau and I am this Party's designated representative on privatization, the heading under which this Bill is before the House of Commons. When this matter goes to committee I will also be this Party's representative on that particular committee. The Deputy House Leader obviously did not bother to check to see whether the proper representative of this Party was in the House at the particular time in question.

To go back to the suggestion that the objection had to be brought up at that particular time, the Deputy House Leader gave absolutely no indication that he was going to be moving time allocation. As far as I was concerned and, evidently, as far as the Member for Papineau was concerned, he wanted to know how many more speakers we were going to be presenting. There is no indication that there had been or had not been discussion among the House Leaders of the three Parties in the House of Commons. The House Leader spoke to the Member for Papineau quickly and then was gone. He asked one question and then was gone. That certainly was not a consultation, it certainly was not—

Mr. Lewis: Is that the only time I talked to him?

Mr. MacLellan: The only time that I know of. The Deputy House Leader certainly did not indicate more than one meeting with the Member for Papineau. I was here all Friday afternoon and he never asked me whether we could negotiate time allocation.

Standing Order 115 specifically says, "people who have been officially designated by the Party". There were not discussions among officially designated representatives of the three Parties in this particular case. As the Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) has said, the Party designates its official representatives. The Government does not pick the official representatives in the opposition Parties and there were not official representatives designated by this Party. The Deputy House Leader

asked that question, presumably moved on to the New Democratic Party, and then proceeded to move his motion.

He says that this is being dragged out, he says that there have been 20 speakers on this particular Bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not even 10 per cent of the Members of this House. We are dealing with a Bill which is very important to this country, the privatization of a Crown corporation which has existed in this country for 51 years. This is a very important Bill to which both opposition Parties have expressed their opposition and to which other Members wish to express their opposition. There has been no attempt, certainly by this Party, to try to delay debate on this Bill.

I submit that Your Honour has been fair to Parties in this House, but there comes a time when the rules have to be enforced. If the rules can be so liberally interpreted as is suggested by the Deputy House Leader, then the rules will become meaningless. There has to be a format upon which all Parties in this House can rely. If that format does not exist, the good will which we in this Party hope to engender among all Parties in this House will certainly break down. It cannot help but do so because we cannot find a reference point. We cannot go to the texts and get our interpretation and know what Your Honour will favour.

The motion put forward by the Deputy House Leader is completely out of order and should be so stated by Your Honour.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal very briefly with some points raised by the Deputy Government House Leader and his Parliamentary Secretary. First, the Deputy Government House Leader has argued that our point of order is not valid because it should have been raised at the time he gave notice on Friday. I am informed that Mr. Speaker Lamoureux ruled in 1971 that the time to raise the kind of point of order which we are currently arguing was not when the notice was given but when the motion was proposed. I am sure you have advice as to whether my recollection of Speaker Lamoureux's ruling is correct, and you will so inform us.

• (1200)

The rule in question refers to agreement, and the *Oxford Illustrated Dictionary* defines agreement as follows:

mutual understanding; covenant, (law) contract legally binding on parties; accordance in opinion.

If one accepts this definition, it is impossible for there to have been any attempt to ascertain whether the agreement contemplated by the rules in question could have been reached, unless the Deputy Government House Leader went specifically to representatives of the Parties and said: "First, are you willing to agree unanimously on a motion to allocate time? If you are not willing to agree unanimously, can there be an arrangement among a majority?"