

Extension of Hours

leads me to believe that business at his service station is probably not as good as he expected and he is advertising to attract customers.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

MR. WADDELL—EARLY RETIREMENT IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) on Tuesday, June 14, 1983 meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION TO EXTEND SITTING HOURS

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 9, I move:

That, commencing Thursday, June 16, 1983 up to and including June 30, 1983, the House shall continue to sit beyond 6.00 p.m., and shall adjourn at 11.00 p.m., on every sitting day provided for in the Standing Orders with the exception of Fridays and days reserved for Private Members' Business.

The motion is seconded by the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde).

Madam Speaker: Is the House—

[English]

Mr. Lewis: Madam Speaker, in speaking to this motion to extend the sitting hours, we note that it comes under Standing Order 9(1), a new Standing Order that was adopted as a result of the—

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Did the Hon. Minister asked to be recognized right after he moved his motion? I did not see him rise.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, out of courtesy to the Chair, I was going to let you finish your sentence. You were asking: Is the House . . . and I did not want to interrupt, but I do have something to say. However, if you would rather not recognize me, I have no objection to giving my colleagues a chance to speak.

Madam Speaker: No, that was not my intention. I was about to put the motion to the House, and I thought the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) was rising on a point of order. I therefore interrupted the proceedings. But I was about to say: Is the House prepared to adopt this motion?

Mr. Deans: No.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, the motion is an important one, and I realize that the debate has started.

[English]

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, recognizing that the procedure is quite different from any procedure previously used, and having looked at a similar situation that arose under a different motion some time ago, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young):

That we proceed to the Orders of the Day.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member was recognized on a point of order quite clearly. He knows that in order to make a motion to proceed to the Orders of the Day he must have the floor legitimately. He did rise on a point of order, so a motion to proceed to the Orders of the Day is not acceptable at this particular time.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, as you can see, the debate has started. I wish to speak to the motion. If the Hon. Member insists—

[English]

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would draw to your attention that on a day about three weeks ago the Chair, in ruling on the appropriateness of rising to move a motion of this type, used as a precedent the example of my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) rising on November 13, 1970, as reported at page 1138 of *Hansard*. The Hon. Member rose on a point of order and said:

Arising out of the discussion and of the whole situation, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Comox-Alberni, that the House now proceed to Orders of the Day.

That was the precise reference used by this Speaker to rule me out of order some three weeks ago when I rose to argue the inappropriateness of the Government House Leader moving that precise motion to go to the Orders of the Day during the proceedings then under way, which at that time was the reading of petitions. When I brought to the attention of the Chair that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre had risen on a point of order and moved that motion, the Chair indicated that that was an appropriate way to do it and used that as the precedent. Having used it as a precedent, the Chair can hardly now turn around and say that I may not now do what the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre did, which was the very precedent on which the Speaker hinged her ruling of some three weeks ago.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is quite wrong. The two situations are not at all analogous. The Hon. Member is now discussing a time at which a similar motion was presented. I just made remarks to the Hon. Member about the way in which he proposed his motion. The Hon. Member may not on a point of order proceed to Orders of the Day because he is, in a sense, taking the floor illegitimately to do something that the Chair is not legitimately aware will be coming up. Therefore, the Hon. Member is out of order because of the fact that he