

*Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen*

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, I really think it would be helpful if I made the additional point so that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain could deal with it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Briefly, the Hon. Member for Yukon.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The Government House Leader raised a question which I really did not develop fully for consideration of the Chair, and that is the rights of Members to have their motions printed in the official documents of the House. The Chair will note that that motion last night which was left with the Table during the sitting does not appear on the Notice Paper of the Order Paper. It does not appear anywhere.

I have not had the time to be able to cite specifically the precedent, but the House will remember that within the last year we had put down, after being notified of an allotted day, a motion, filing it with the Table. It was printed in the records of the House. The New Democratic Party on the same occasion put down a motion for the same allotted day, which would have caused the Chair to have to make a decision. But that is not relevant here. The relevant point here is that both of those motions were printed on the Notice Paper and both appeared in the official records of the House. Indeed, the Government changed the allotted day and the printing of both of those motions was carried on until the allotted day.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In fairness to the Hon. Member, he is developing an area where a good deal of argument could take place. The Chair is not persuaded that it is absolutely relevant to a decision on a matter that must be before us. The Chair at this point would like—

**Mr. Nielsen:** It is before you now.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is before us at this point.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The second one is before you now.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There are other points that obviously could be considered. The Chair is trying, with the greatest attention that the Chair can offer, to focus on the essential points and would recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain at this point.

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal only with the question originally put before you, if I may. At the outset I want to make it clear that I am obviously sympathetic to the purpose of the point of order of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). It would evidently be to the advantage of the Opposition to be able to file, should this Chair find in favour, a notice at any point after six o'clock.

● (1150)

The question before us, however, is a different one, I think. I hesitate to say it but the Hon. Member for Yukon and his colleagues are the authors of their own misfortune. It has been the practice in this House for some long period of time, as I understand it, that the filing of an Opposition day notice has

been required to be done prior to six o'clock. In fact, yesterday when I was informed at about one minute to six that no motion had been filed, my immediate reaction was that perhaps the Opposition day was intended to be ours and that we had not been informed. Knowing how competent the Hon. Member for Yukon usually is in these things, I could hardly believe that he had been so tardy and slipshod. Nevertheless, it turns out that this was the case and I regret having to say that.

There are two matters before you, Mr. Speaker. The first is whether it was required last evening that unanimous consent be sought to have the motion filed late. The Hon. Member for Yukon clearly believed that it was required, otherwise he would not have raised a point of order and sought that unanimous consent. The events of the day were not so filled with turmoil as to make it impossible for a Member to have filed notice prior to six o'clock.

Immediately upon calling orders of the day after three o'clock there was a dispute about whether the Minister or the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) had the floor. Subsequent to that the decision of the Chair was made that the Minister had the floor. The Minister moved his motion under Standing Order 83 and spoke for the ten minutes he is allotted. The Hon. Member for Vegreville followed with his speech, and for some reason that escapes the majority of sensible people in the House of Commons, he moved to go to the orders of the day. Effectively, what he did was eliminate the opportunity for any other Member to speak against the Government's attempt to impose time allocation. I can only assume that was his intention since no other intent could be read into his action.

What he effectively did was to make sure that only the Minister and himself were able to speak during the two-hour debate allotted for the purpose, thus excluding any Member of this Party or any individual Member of the House from speaking. The result was that at the end of the two-hour period prescribed in the Standing Orders the Chair, quite properly in my opinion, put all of the motions necessary to dispose of the question. That occurred at 5.15 in the afternoon so there was still lots of time to file an opposition motion.

The Hon. Member for Yukon then rose to argue on a spurious point that somehow or other the vote should not take place until six o'clock. It was an interesting but quite irrelevant argument, I thought, and he took up, as he has this morning, about half an hour of time making this argument based, I submit, on faulty background information. Nevertheless, he made it and time went by.

The vote was taken on the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville that we proceed to orders of the day. My Leader rose at that point and sought unanimous consent to extend the time of sitting to allow us to continue through the proceedings prior to orders of the day in order that he could move a motion, or at least receive a ruling on a motion for an adjournment debate on the very important question of the invasion of Grenada. That was refused. It is an important point to recognize that it was refused. In refusing to extend orders of the day it became quite clear that at the precise