

Time Allocation

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: He learned it from you, Erik.

Mr. Nielsen: I hear the Hon. Member over there with his usual loud voice, saying that he is learning from me. If the Minister had paid closer attention he would know that there is a way to do this properly and not contemptuously as he has done. This could have prevented the problems from arising yesterday had they done it the right way. The right way is to do it during Routine Proceedings and not on any sneaky, contemptuous point of order. In my submission that is the way it should be done, during Routine Proceedings. The Chair will remember that I presented no less than 28 precedents to the Chair last year when discussing this very subject. The Chair agreed at the time that, in addition to other areas in our proceedings, Routine Proceedings could be used for giving such notice. That is what should have been done yesterday and what should have been done today. The Government would have avoided all of the difficulties that it encountered yesterday.

This contemptuous way of proceeding is indicative, of course, in this whole question. To give notice which triggers closure in this fashion just shows the level to which a ragtag bunch on that Treasury bench are prepared to stoop.

Madam Speaker: For the benefit of the House, I believe I should read Standing Order 82 under which the Hon. Minister acted and the House will see what the restrictions imposed upon a Minister are in such a case. Standing Order 82 reads:

A Minister of the Crown who from his or her place in the House at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached—

Those are the restrictions.

Mr. Nielsen: That does not apply.

Madam Speaker: What the Hon. Minister did was perfectly in order.

Mr. Nielsen: That Standing Order does not apply.

Madam Speaker: I remember the Hon. Member's submission last year and a number of cases that he cited, but he should remember that I also cited a number of occasions when such a motion—

Mr. Nielsen: One.

Madam Speaker: Well, that is enough.

Mr. Nielsen: Out of 28.

Madam Speaker: It does not say otherwise that you cannot do it.

Mr. Nielsen: Twenty-eight went the other way.

Madam Speaker: It never said you cannot do it on a point of order, and it has been done. Therefore, I have no choice but to declare that it was perfectly in order.

Mr. Deans: While this matter is being discussed, would the Speaker enlighten us on another question? Since it does not say specifically how the question can be raised, whether or not the Minister can raise it on a point of order, could the Speaker point out which Standing Order says that a motion will lapse at six o'clock?

Madam Speaker: Is the Hon. Member reflecting on a ruling of the Chair?

Mr. Deans: Just asking a question.

Madam Speaker: Will the Hon. Member resume his seat. If he wants to do that—

Mr. Deans: I am asking a question.

Madam Speaker: There is a procedure that he can use and I invite him to do so. Otherwise I would ask him to please not mention anything else in the House. He is reflecting on a ruling of the Chair, and that cannot be allowed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: On a point of order.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member has another point of order?

Mr. Deans: Yes, thank you.

Madam Speaker: I hope it has nothing to do with the ruling.

Mr. Deans: Nothing at all. Since there are numerous precedents for what the Minister has done. I would like to know if Your Honour would be kind enough to provide for the House the precedents on other motions and how they too should be handled from now on?

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is again reflecting on a decision I made. I said that this motion was perfectly in order. If the Hon. Member wants supplementary information on precedents of the House on how matters should be handled, he knows—

Mr. Deans: Why don't you go and sit beside them.

Madam Speaker: —that the Table officers are willing to inform him at any time on any procedure he may use, as they always do.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, if I heard correctly what you were reading from in support of the Minister's action, it was Standing Order 82 which deals with the motion which follows the notice. With great respect, that is not applicable in the case of the Minister giving notice. As the Chair and most Members are aware, this process follows three stages: first the notice, second the motion following the notice, which follows 24 hours later if the Government wishes, and third, the allocation process of the allocated days.