

Point of Order—Mr. Pinard

is the modernization of our NATO alliance and of the theatre nuclear weapons within that alliance. As the hon. member knows, a good many other countries will be taking part in that. It will not just be the American position, but the position of the United Kingdom, West Germany and a good many other countries. That is the one in which we will be involved.

There is no question that there is opposition to it from Norway, Denmark and The Netherlands, but it is a different kind of opposition than the hon. member would seek to leave with the House, because the various positions of these three countries are in no way the same. Therefore, what we will be seeking to arrive at at that meeting is a consensus on which all NATO countries can come to agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I want to call the attention of the House, in order that it may not always be seen that I have only negative comments about the question period, to the fact that I recently asked for the co-operation of the House to try and operate in a way at the beginning of the question period which was in balance with that expected at the end of the question period. Today members will note that the exchange at the beginning of the question period was ideal in nature and still very forceful on a very important subject. The result was that participation in the question period was much more generous than it has been in recent days. I think I am expressing the views of most members of the House in thanking the members for their co-operation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I have received six notices of questions of privilege, one application for an emergency debate pursuant to Standing Order 26, and I believe I observe a point of order which has arisen during the question period. I believe it is my duty to take that even before I take the questions of privilege in respect of which I have received notice; that is to say, the items which arise during the question period and by our recent practices have been deferred until the end of the question period have priority on their own, had they been taken during the time they arose during the question period. I think I should take those now.

* * *

[Translation]

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. PINARD—ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS DURING ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to page 9595 of *Hansard* for November 16, 1971 when the situation was absolutely identical to what happened today during oral question period. Mr. Speaker Lamoureux was in the chair and the hon. Mr. Stanfield, in the middle of the question period, moved the adjournment of the House without debate and without postponing the debate until after question period. The Speaker put the question—

[Miss MacDonald.]

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The House should understand that Standing Order 25 does indicate that a motion to adjourn the House is always in order. However, I have ruled in the past that a motion being always in order surely means the hon. member must have the floor for the purpose of putting a motion. For example, I asked the hon. member—and our recent practices are perhaps not enshrined in the Standing Orders—could a member put a motion pursuant to our period at the beginning of the day for the calling of motions pursuant to Standing Order 43? Motions pursuant to Standing Order 43 must receive the unanimous consent of the House.

Standing Order 25 says that a motion to adjourn the House is always in order. Could the Chair, therefore, on the hon. member's reasoning, take a motion to adjourn the House on a motion pursuant to Standing Order 25 during the period of motions pursuant to Standing Order 43? I think not. That period is reserved for motions to be put only upon unanimous consent. Obviously a motion to adjourn the House does not require unanimous consent. How do the two blend?

Similarly, as indicated quite clearly on February 21 of this year when an attempt was made at that time by the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga) to adjourn the proceedings pursuant to Standing Order 25 during the course of the question period, I had the following to say:

The hon. member will know that I recognized him during the course of the question period. A motion to adjourn is always in order, according to the Standing Orders of the House. However, such a motion must be put forward, as I have ruled on more than one occasion in the past, at a time when a member has the floor for the purpose of putting a motion, which is not done during the question period. When a member has the floor at a time which motions are received, then that motion is always receivable.

That reason remains for the reasoning I have applied. I could not controvert it today. To do so would be a direct contradiction of my own ruling only months ago.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if I may simply and shortly express my point of order. I understand you are saying you will not contradict yourself. What I was saying is that you contradicted Speaker Lamoureux. I was referring you to a precedent at page 9595 of *Hansard* for November 16, 1971 when Speaker Lamoureux was in the Chair. This very situation occurred when Mr. Stanfield rose during question period and moved the adjournment of the House.

May I also refer you to Standing Order 25 which is very clear in its wording. It reads:

A motion to adjourn, unless otherwise prohibited in these Standing Orders, shall always be in order—

First, I would like to know the meaning of the words "shall always be in order". Second, before you give your final ruling, may I seek your guidance as to how your ruling compares with Speaker Lamoureux's ruling in 1971 when the very same situation occurred during question period. Mr. Stanfield rose and simply said:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the kind of answers we are getting this afternoon, pursuant to Standing Order 25 I move the adjournment of the House.