

*Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen*

would have had the effect of allowing for a sitting beginning at eight o'clock and continuing until an undetermined hour. I call the Hon. Member's attention to the fact that there are a number of provisions in our rules to allow for the extension of the sitting time of the House. I call to his attention that if we are to substitute a rule that a motion can be put down any time while the House is sitting, that would in effect make for a chaotic situation. In fact, there was once a time when we sat for 26 hours. If that kind of a sitting had preceded a designated day, there would have been no limitation whatsoever, according to the rule put forward by the Hon. Member for Yukon, on the time for which a motion would have to be set down.

The Chair is therefore required by the logic of the situation to look at the practices that have evolved in the House since 1968. With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the procedures of the House in 1913 may be relevant but the Chair has some difficulty relating them to the revised procedures that we have adopted since 1968.

● (1230)

It is therefore the decision of the Chair—

**Mr. Nielsen:** A point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:**—that the practice of the House of requiring a six o'clock deadline for the submission of motions is a legitimate practice of the House established since 1968 and the logic of the situation requires that it be observed. The Chair rules that the Hon. Member's point of order is not well taken.

**Mr. Nielsen:** It is an observation, not a ruling. I have a point of order.

**Mr. McKnight:** On a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

**Mr. McKnight:** Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Standing Order 33 reads as follows:

When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

At this stage we have had before us a point of order which has been decided on by the Chair.

**Mr. Nielsen:** I have another.

**Mr. Taylor:** I have another one also.

**Mr. Malone:** I have another one.

**Mr. Taylor:** I have an entirely different one.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon. Again, the Chair will fall back on an

observation made before on procedures of a dilatory character. In the British House, the authority of the Chair to deal with dilatory motions is clear. In our practice in the past it has not been so clear. However, at some point Hon. Members in this House will have to ask themselves at what point are they going to have confidence in the Chair to deal in an orderly way with the business of the House in an absolutely neutral and impartial way.

If a series of dilatory motions can be put forward now, one after another, the effect of which is to prevent the House from proceeding to its business, Hon. Members will have to reflect on what they are doing because the procedures that are being followed now in their custom of precedent will not lightly disappear from the record. Whether or not orderly government is possible in the House of Commons if such procedures are followed through to their logical conclusion is a matter for Hon. Members to consider.

The Hon. Member for Yukon has the floor.

**Mr. Pinard:** This is not Schefferville. The Speaker is right.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, we would have that confidence in the Chair, but when an occupant of the Chair rises and clearly and repeatedly states that he intends to make observations and then, in the course of making those observations, it suddenly becomes a ruling before Members are heard, that we cannot accept from an occupant of the chair because it is simply not upfront.

**Mr. Pinard:** So you are blaming the Chair. You are accusing the Chair.

**Mr. Nielsen:** I was making a point which I was prevented from making when the Chair made its ruling.

**Mr. Pinard:** You are reflecting on the Chair.

**Mr. Nielsen:** The record will clearly show that I raised the point in my initial submission to the Chair and the Chair has chosen, for whatever reasons, to ignore that second point upon which a ruling should be made.

I ask the Chair now to consider the points that I was interrupted in making by the ruling the Chair made during its observations when I was attempting to make additional new points which were not before the Chair in order to assist the Chair in its ruling. How can we—

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know if this is a new point of order. If not, you have ruled and I suggest that the Hon. Member should respect the Chair's ruling. If he is blaming the Chair for having made a decision and is now trying to argue again because you had not given him, according to him, full opportunity to be heard—which is, of course, not true—then I suggest he is not respecting the Chair and should no longer be heard.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Usually the Government House Leader makes intelligent observations.

**Mr. Pinard:** I do not waste the time of the House.