

Business of the House

not been uttered in this House. This is simply another example, and a gross example, I might add. I attribute no responsibility or blame for it; it has happened. In my submission in support of the opposition House leader, I say it should not have happened at all.

My recollection of the events of that day were that the Clerk Assistant very briefly called the subject matter of the motion. By no means did he read it word for word as it now appears in *Hansard*. At that point, Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rose, the Chair recognized him and there arose as a result of that an exchange as to the traditional practices, courtesies or whatever of the House. I moved a motion that the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton be now heard, the division bells rang, the vote followed its normal course. At no time was the motion read by you, Madam Speaker.

In support of what the opposition House leader has said, not only does the fact that it appears in *Hansard* now as though it had been put, which it has not, affect the options which are available to the government, but it affects the submissions that the Chair is now in the process of hearing. As you know, Madam Speaker, I am next on my feet on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton. Depending on whether or not the House is seized of the motion is the direction in which the procedural arguments are going to go, because there are also different options available to the Chair, according to whether or not the House is seized of the motion.

In my submission, Madam Speaker, it leaves you in a much more flexible position to deal with this matter, as Mr. Speaker Michener dealt with a similar situation some years ago, if the House is not seized of the motion. In any event, I do not think there can be any doubt that the motion was not read, that the appearance of the verbatim transcript in *Hansard* should not be there because it did not happen in this place. I certainly submit to you, Madam Speaker, that your direction on the clarification requested by the opposition House leader should be, in view of the events that have transpired, that the motion has been called but not put.

Mr. Knowles: Madam Speaker, if I may, I should like to say a word about this matter. I do so because to my knowledge many times, perhaps scores or hundreds of times, *Hansard* has had to insert "On the Order:" and then whatever the subject was about. As I say, that has been done hundreds of times.

All that has happened in this case is that *Hansard* has put something in there so that it would be clear what we were talking about. Members do not get the floor or the right to speak if there is nothing before us; there has to be a point of order, a question of privilege, or some motion that has been moved. All that *Hansard* is doing in this instance is indicating that the discussion that follows is on the order of that particular motion. The motion is spelled out in *Hansard* so that readers of *Hansard* will know what we were talking about. There is no suggestion in *Hansard* and no suggestion in *Votes and Proceedings* that the motion was put or dealt with as such.

Mr. Nielsen: It wasn't put.

Mr. Knowles: I just said it was not put. If my hon. friends have not looked at *Votes and Proceedings*, it says:

The Order of the Day for Government Business No. 41 in the name of the President of the Privy Council having been called;

And the Chair having recognized the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles);

Pursuant to Standing Order 29, Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Kempling, moved,—That the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) be now heard.

The vote is there and so on. If one looks at today's Order Paper, item No. 41, it is the same as it was the other day. There is no suggestion in any of the documents—*Hansard*, *Votes and Proceedings* or the Order Paper—that that motion was proceeded with. All that you have in *Hansard* in the printing of the motion is an indication of what we were talking about on the point of order. I suggest that *Hansard* is following a practice it has followed for a great many years and that it does not deserve this criticism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I will start with the last intervention. I would say that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put it almost as well as I could!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Madam Speaker: If the motion appears in *Hansard*, it is only there for the purpose of members knowing what we were talking about. I want to make it quite clear that the order was called. The fact that it appears in *Hansard* does not indicate that the question has been proposed. The motion was called. I am now hearing points of order on that motion. In no way does *Hansard* indicate that the Chair has proposed the motion to the House. It has been called but not proposed.

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Cossitt: Madam Speaker, on several occasions I have asked the President of the Privy Council about certain bills now on the Order Paper. He replied that they have not been called and, in effect, blamed the opposition for holding them up by debating the Constitution. I would ask if he can enlighten the House—that is, when he has time to listen to what I am asking him—whether he is prepared to call some of these other bills or whether the government is prepared to introduce further bills to deal with high interest rates and inflation, which are far more important subjects than whether the BNA Act comes back. After all, it has been in England for 114 years. Actually, it is within his power and that of the government to withdraw the Constitution resolution and proceed to other business which is far more important at this time to this country. We can go back to the other later.

Has he forgotten that people are suffering from the effects of high interest rates and inflation? What is this government going to do about the situation in this country? Does it simply want to make a hero of the Prime Minister so that he can get into the history books?