

*Extension of Hours*

**Mr. Collenette:** It's a real put down, a gentleman's put down.

**Mr. Deans:** Don't be silly, David.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. The essential argument made by the Hon. Member for Simcoe North is that this new Standing Order 9 ought to be interpreted as broadly as possible. However, if the Standing Order does not prohibit an amendment as to the type of Government business which must be done during an extension of hours, if the Standing Order is silent as to that aspect, then we ought to interpret the generality of our rules as meaning that it is not prohibited; and therein lies the difficulty. It would suggest that under Standing Order 9 Hon. Members other than those on the Government side could decide what the Government business is.

**Mr. Deans:** No, they can propose.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** That, as a general principle, does not appear to be acceptable under our Standing Orders.

Second, I would also refer to the interpretation of Standing Order 9, which speaks in terms of extended hours. An amendment which would order the business of the House during the extended hours seems to me to be one which goes beyond the interpretation and meaning of Standing Order 22 and the matter of the Government having control over the business of the House.

However, it is the argument which was made by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain which is most telling in one sense, and that is that if the Chair were to interpret Standing Order 9 in such a fashion as to limit the meaning of the Standing Order in the way proposed by the President of the Privy Council, the result would definitely mean that on another occasion when Standing Order 9 is used, if there is a proposal to put certain orders of Government business by the Government, then the Chair would have to be consistent and find that that kind of amendment would not be acceptable, or would not be admissible.

● (1600)

On the ground that the amendment goes beyond the scope of the motion and on the ground that this interpretation and ruling must be extended consistently, regardless of the source of any amendment at any time, the Chair finds that the amendment is out of order.

I do want to underline that that is not strictly an interpretation of Standing Order 9 as it stands but extends also to the general principles of admissibility of an amendment. I refer Hon. Members to Citation 437 of *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*. Debate.

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, it is nice to get on with this. Needless to say, I have been looking forward to it for days.

At the outset I want to say to the House that the list of legislation put forward by the House Leader of the Official

Opposition, whether in that order or any other order, is acceptable as far as we are concerned. We are quite prepared to deal with and make every effort to pass all of that legislation and more between now and the end of June during the existing sittings of the House and the extended sittings of the House. I have already made that offer and I believe the Government House Leader would acknowledge that I have frequently made that offer to deal with most, if not all, of what is contained in the list that the House Leader for the Official Opposition proposed as an amendment.

Our Party's position is quite simple. We would be quite content to deal with the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. We would be quite content to deal with and pass the Farm Improvement Loans Act amendment. We would be prepared to deal with the Regional Development Incentives Act. We would be prepared to deal with the Canada Student Loans Act post haste. We would be quite willing and eager to deal with the amendment to the Constitution of Canada if it were dealt with in an orderly and proper process. That amendment deals with aboriginal rights. We will make every effort, with some limited debate in the House, to deal with the resolution that directly deals with those matters to provide an opportunity for some committee work to be done on the amendment since it is, after all, an amendment to Canada's Constitution. We will be quite content to deal with that before the end of June.

At least in its early stages we will deal with the Canadian Aviation Safety Board Bill that has been proposed by the Government. We would be prepared to expedite dealing with that and sending it to committee for careful study. We are in no way opposed to proceeding with the organization of the Government of Canada legislation. We certainly do not have any particular worry about finding an appropriate way to begin to deal with the sports pool legislation that has been sitting on the Notice Paper for some time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will note the degree of co-operation that is just flowing from this side of the House to the Government. There is very little about which we disagree to such a level that we would stand in the way of the orderly dealing with those pieces of legislation.

I want to go even further than that. For instance, consider such a controversial matter as the new security legislation. We are quite content to have the subject matter of that dealt with by a committee. We understand the Government's desire to have public hearings on that subject; therefore we are prepared to deal with that.

We go even further. You would appreciate the amount of co-operation we have extended over the course of the last few months anyway, Mr. Speaker, but we would go even further and be prepared to deal with two-thirds of the proposals put forward for the transportation, shipment and handling of western grain contained in Bill C-155. We would be prepared to deal with the question of the upgrading of the railroads which we understand to be an absolutely necessary act on the part of Canada. We would be prepared to deal with the