

Air Canada

his empathic remarks that no agreement was possible. That is what happened.

I suggest that my hon. friend from Windsor West wishes to structure the words "I say, you say, she says, he says", as we go through this consultation. I have been on both sides of these consultations. My friend, Mr. Yvon Pinard, had them on several occasions when I was Deputy House Leader and House Leader of the Official Opposition. They were not structured discussions. He followed through with a motion under S. O. 117 or whatever number it was at that time and we never raised this specious argument that we had not worn a red tie and bowed or been officially designated. That is a specious argument.

We have had discussions with respect to the debate on this Bill. We have brought forward the motion. I submit that nowhere in the Standing Orders does it lay out exactly how these discussions are to take place, as my hon. friend from Windsor West suggests they should be put forward.

Lastly, I want to say this. There is a time to protest and make your point and that time was Friday afternoon. If you look at *Hansard* and the comments I made, they were not made after two o'clock or at two o'clock. There was plenty of time for the Official Opposition or their formally designated representative, whoever he or she might have been, to protest. They had time to say, "Wait a minute, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister has given notice under the rules but he has not consulted". When would this protest take place? Surely it would have had to take place at the time I gave the notice.

I say with respect that the other arguments I make are valid, but I also say that my hon. friend is too late. If that protest had any validity at all, it should have been made on Friday afternoon by the House Leaders of the Opposition or the people they formally designate to represent them when they are not here, and I understand Members sometimes have to be elsewhere. If they did not make that protest on Friday, then they are too late.

To sum up, I submit that the consultations took place. They were not as fruitful as I would have liked them to be. However, my hon. friend from Yorkton—Melville was as forthright on Friday as he was this morning. There is obviously not going to be any consultation, and I understand that. That is why we are moving under S. O. 117. I submit that the Government is fully entitled to move that motion.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, we have dealt, at least in part, with the specific situation, but I think it is important to put on the record the Government's view about S. O. 115, S. O. 116 and S. O. 117. Those Standing Orders all deal with the issue of time allocation. The basic difference between S. O. 115 and S. O. 116 as a package and S. O. 117, and the most important difference for the House to be concerned about, is the giving of notice. S. O. 115 and S. O. 116 define the conditions under which notice can be waived, and you can proceed immediately in the case of S. O. 115 to the putting of the question. In the

case of S. O. 116, you proceed immediately to the two-hour debate followed by the putting of the question.

S. O. 117, on the other hand, requires notice of the time allocation procedure. I suggest to the House that this is the essential difference between the three Standing Orders. Indeed, the Government gave notice on Friday.

The House Leader for the Official Opposition has taken the words "agreement could not be reached" and somehow attempted to turn them into "consultation is required". Our House Leader has indicated that it is a pattern of the Government, which I think operates frequently in the best interests of the House, to ensure that consultation takes place. However, consultation taking place and the requirement for consultation to take place, are phrases somewhat different and ideas somewhat different from the notion that agreement could not be reached.

• (1150)

Agreement cannot be reached for many and varied reasons. All you need do is to put your imagination to work. You cannot reach agreement because a particular Party in the House has not named an official representative at the moment in time when you would like to do something. You cannot reach agreement when, as I think the Member from Saskatchewan has made clear, from the beginning of dealings on this particular Bill it has been clear that the third Party in the House would not agree to any kind of time allocation.

You can reach the conclusion that agreement to waive notice on time allocation, with which Standing Orders 115 and 116 deal, would not have been forthcoming in this particular case and in many cases in the future.

You can have intransigence within the government Party on the issue of agreement to waiving notice. Surely it is a dominant principle in the Chamber that the business of the Chamber, for the most part, proceeds on the basis of advance notice. That is where our privileges are very much affected. If we have advance notice, we can be present for the debates and the votes. In the best interests of the smooth functioning of the House we have seen the wisdom, over time, of providing procedures for the waiving of the notice. Those procedures, in all instances, tend to have the characteristics of some degree of agreement.

Standing Order 115 suggests agreement of all Parties and it is silent on independence in the Chamber. Standing Order 116 deals with a relationship between the Government and the Official Opposition as a way of proceeding more quickly despite the objections of a third or fourth party.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of motion may come back on the table occasionally in the next few weeks or in the more distant future. I think it important, in whatever statement you make about it, that you pay attention to the basic difference between the three Standing Orders. The first two deal with the waiver of notice under specific conditions,