

Nielsen) felt obliged to seek the unanimous consent of the House for tabling his notice, which he read very quickly in order to have his notice read into the record and prepare his case for this morning. It was past six o'clock—this is important—and he asked for unanimous consent. The mere fact that the hon. gentleman asked for unanimous consent proves, in my opinion, that he had dropped the idea that he could do so without seeking the unanimous consent. In any case, I say we do not need this argument to win our case. Consent was denied, and the hon. gentleman seemed to anticipate what I was going to ask on a point of order. If the Chair had recognized the Hon. Member, I was going to say that I would advise the Opposition later that evening of the business of the House today, and I was certainly not going to rise to argue that unanimous consent was not necessary.

When my hon. colleague says that he felt I was going to argue his case, he is wrong. My purpose in rising on a point of order was to say that since unanimous consent was not forthcoming, I was not going to challenge the Chair's decision. Later, I would inform the Opposition of the business of the House for tomorrow, which is today.

Subsequently, about half an hour later, I managed to reach the House Leader of the New Democratic Party personally, and I confirmed that the business of the House for this morning would deal with Bill C-155. I personally tried to reach the Member for Yukon, but unfortunately, there was no answer. Maybe I had a wrong number. In any case someone in my office, as the Hon. Member acknowledged earlier, managed to reach him around 8:00 or 8:30 to confirm that the Orders of the Day would include Bill C-155. I spoke to the Clerk of the House myself to let him know that consideration of Bill C-155 would be on today's Orders of the Day, and I was not obliged to do so before six o'clock.

In the circumstances, the point raised by the Opposition House Leader is purely academic. He is not losing an opposition day, because today is not a designated day, and as they say, I undesignated it. I changed its designation. Today's Orders of the Day were determined yesterday. They were advised in time. That is our prerogative. It is Bill C-155, there is no problem. However, if the Opposition House Leader wished to reserve the right, in future, to table a notice after six o'clock but before the end of the sitting day, this is another issue on which a debate could be held if the situation warrants. It is a point that could be discussed. There are those who will say that a notice of motion which according to Standing Order 62(4)(a) requires twenty-four hours' notice, must, according to Standing Order 47, formerly S.O. 42, be tabled before six o'clock, and incidentally, in the citations from Beauchesne mentioned by my hon. colleague there is a reference to Standing Order 42, now Standing Order 47. Thus, when he says that S.O. 47 does not apply here, he should not refer to citations that are based on S.O. 47, formerly S.O. 42. There is a contradiction here.

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

There are those who will claim that by analogy, the twenty-four hours' notice mentioned in S.O. 62(4)(a), must be given before six o'clock, pursuant to S.O. 47. I can live with that, and I think that is the opinion we have received up to now. Once again, the problem is purely academic, because the Orders of the Day were changed yesterday to accommodate the Opposition. We were polite and we advised them. The Hon. Member for Yukon cannot deny this, since he himself felt obliged to seek unanimous consent, which was not denied by us but by someone else in the House.

Finally, to stress once again the perhaps pointless aspect of this argument when he refers to Citation 399 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, I feel the decision does not contradict the point I am trying to make, and in any case, even if the Hon. Member for Yukon claims that Citation 399 contradicts what I am saying, let it suffice for me to say that the citation dates back to 1913, when the House did not adjourn automatically and sat until late at night. There was no set adjournment at five or six or nine o'clock, which explains the comment that the exact time at which notices are handed to the Clerk at the Table is of minor importance. In 1913, no one ever knew at what time the House would adjourn. I do not think my hon. colleague was here at the time, but I am sure that if he cares to check what I just said, he will realize that his point is not a valid one. This citation can not apply here because it does not refer to the same Standing Orders.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I said that I would be brief. First of all, pursuant to S.O. 22(2), it is up to me to determine the Orders of the Day. That is clear. Changes were made and this has happened before. We decided to change an Opposition day when the Progressive Conservatives played a trick on our colleagues who were in Europe. We can do it again if necessary. We did so yesterday evening, not as a response to that kind of trick, but to another kind of manoeuvre. My hon. colleague is smiling, and he knows very well what I mean. We did so to accommodate them, and S.O. 22(2) gives us the authority to determine that the Orders of the Day will include Bill C-155.

Second, I have some comments on the Hon. Member's notice that was not submitted in time. If he had not sought the unanimous consent of the House, what he said this morning, would have gained in credibility. Third, I think that, by analogy, we have no choice but to apply the time provision in S.O. 47 when dealing with the issue of twenty-four hours' notice pursuant to S.O. 62(4)(a).

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has a problem at this time. There are a number of Hon. Members asking to be recognized. In fairness to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), who should be recognized, the Chair would like to give the Hon. Member for Yukon an opportunity to reply afterwards, if that is agreeable.