

just referred to. Finally, when my hon. colleague says that the Chair must put the motion of the Minister of Transport before the motion of the Member for Vegreville, I must insist that this indicates a poor comprehension of Standing Order 82. The Standing Order provides, and I quote:

Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

The motion of the Minister of Transport.

Therefore, the matter of calling a vote on the motion of the Member for Vegreville must be disposed of before putting the motion of the Minister of Transport. I think that is clear, and I feel we must not lose sight of what is involved here, unless we want to create a precedent that may prove troublesome for the Official Opposition in the future. It seems to me the Standing Orders are sufficiently clear. If the Chair says the Member for Yukon is right or if it refrains from interpreting Standing Order 82 as we just did, it will subsequently be impossible for the House to vote on a matter in the case of time allocation, because an Opposition Member would be able to move, not only a dilatory motion but another motion that is not dilatory, and the Chair would have no justification for terminating the proceedings at 6:00 p.m. on the grounds that the motion in question was dilatory.

Consequently, we might well find ourselves with limited debates that would be limitless. Thus, the Chair made the right decision, and we support it. The Standing Orders are clear and Beauchesne is clear. I think my hon. colleague from Yukon is satisfied. In any case, the House will adjourn at six o'clock before disposing of the items scheduled before getting to the Order of the Day, and I think the ruling made by the Chair will prove very useful in future as a contribution towards more orderly proceedings in this House, so that when we limit debate, it will in fact be limited and Members will not be able to make undue and abusive use of dilatory measures.

[English]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Madam Speaker, since the Government House Leader is interested in the facts, I would suspect that he might be interested in what actually transpired in the House during the course of the exchange, according to the "blues". If he will check he will note, according to the "blues", that you, Madam Speaker, called for motions. At that time an Hon. Member raised a point of order and it was followed by:

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.

Then Madam Speaker said:

The minister of Transport.

The Minister then said:

Madam Speaker, I move—

And then the following appears:

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.

MR. NIELSEN: A point of order.

MR. EPP: A point of order.

MR. MCKNIGHT: A point of order.

Time Allocation

Then Madam Speaker said:

The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: I move that the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard, Madam Speaker.

The exchange went on from there. If the Hon. Government House Leader is interested in the facts, it should be clearly noted that, according to the exchange that took place in the official record of *Hansard*, it was very clear that I was on my feet before the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and that it should be so recognized.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I think my hon. colleague from Vegreville should make the distinction: I said that the Member had not been recognized before the Minister had started his speech, and that is the Standing Orders.

Madam Speaker: May I start by answering the point made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. It is quite possible that *Hansard* has recorded in a certain order what has been heard on the floor of the House. If someone is in a room and several people are speaking at the same time and there is some secretary who is taking a verbatim report, that person will certainly organize it in a certain order.

What has to be clear and what I reaffirmed before the House is that several Members rose at the same time, and at any rate the Minister of Transport did catch the eye of the Speaker, in my view first. Then I heard points of order and I recognized the Hon. Member for Vegreville. I think the House has to allow that the Speaker, standing or where she is sitting, is supposed to be well placed to determine inasmuch as it is humanly possible who has risen first and who has risen second and third. However, that being said, we have entered into a proceeding and at this point we are deciding on something else.

I listened very carefully to the presentation made by the Hon. Member for Yukon and the only thing I did not really like about it was that he was inviting me to shirk my responsibility, not make a decision, pretend that the clock was just ticking by and that I need not make a decision now. That is not the kind of Speaker you have.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I will live or die on the decision but I feel impelled to make it because I did decide to come into the House at 5.12 p.m., indicating then that that was my interpretation of the Standing Orders.

The rest of the Hon. Member's remarks I enjoyed very much because he is always very careful to bring forward arguments which help the Chair to take its decisions. It seems to me that the Hon. Member was inviting me to let the bells ring until six o'clock so that I could lapse the motion that an Hon. Member be now heard, as I have lapsed other motions at six o'clock. Indeed, that motion probably would have lapsed at six o'clock. I could have lapsed it but the situation is quite different in that we were in the midst of a proceeding whereby a motion had been presented by the Hon. Minister of Trans-