

Disposition of Supply Motions

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have heard about this. I will inquire of the department and see whether there was such a communication.

Mr. Forrestall: I wonder whether in the course of his inquiries the minister would determine—

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I am not contradicting the hon. member, but is he talking about the Maritime Employers Association of Montreal?

Mr. Hees: That is what he said.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Excuse me, I did not understand a right. There is a request for help; there is no doubt of that.

Mr. Forrestall: I wonder whether the minister could indicate how the government intends to react to this request?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I think we are going to try to help, not in terms of granting any money but in terms of perhaps guaranteeing some loans from the bank so that the company can carry out its obligations under the agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member might ask a supplementary and then I will call orders of the day.

Mr. Forrestall: I wonder whether the minister would indicate to the House if he has sought very firm advice from the law officers of the Crown as to the procedural capability of the government assuming debts on behalf of private organizations?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, we have studied this problem very seriously. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the settlement of the Montreal strike some time ago he will see that we committed ourselves to guaranteeing work for the longshoremen at the port of Montreal. If they wish to reduce the pool of longshoremen, then we accept no financial responsibility, but we have to guarantee loans or money borrowed by the Maritime Employers Association in order to solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

● (1510)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in respect of the proceedings of the House for today. As hon. members will be aware, there are seven different notices on the order paper for today, and it seems to me it would be useful if the Chair could indicate how we are to proceed. Three notices are in respect of motions that could be debated starting now. One of these motions is in the name of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), a motion of non-confidence in the government, and the other two are in the names of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), both of which relate to concurrence in the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

We had some discussions about these two motions last Thursday, and I would say, Sir, that in spite of the impor-

[Mr. Forrestall.]

tance of the housing question which they raise, no one would contend that they should take priority today over the non-confidence motion presented by the Leader of the Official Opposition. That, of course, is for Your Honour to rule under the terms of Standing Order 58(4) (b).

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hear some objections from my friends to the right. My purpose in raising this point is that it seems to me it would be helpful if Your Honour had any suggestion as to when either of those motions respecting housing might be debated, and by "when" I mean on what day or under what order they might be debated. I assume that we shall proceed today with the motion in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

Apart from those three motions, Sir, there are four which would seem to come up for consideration at 9.45 tonight. Again, I think it would be useful if we knew at this stage how we are to proceed. To begin with, there is a notice of opposition filed by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) under Standing Order 58(4) (a) which in my submission is faulty. It is not a notice of opposition to an entire item, but rather a notice of opposition in respect of \$16,999.99 of that vote. The hon. member's motion refers to the salary of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald), minus \$1, but the figures in the motion make it minus one cent.

An hon. Member: And that's just about right.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I would point out, Sir, that motions are supposed to make sense, and since the \$15,000 salary of the minister, and his \$2,000 car allowance, are not in the estimates at all but rather in two separate statutes, it seems to me it is faulty, indeed misleading, to try to import that issue into this motion. Indeed, the item in the supplementary estimates to which opposition is taken in part is not even an administrative item of the department but—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The time is rapidly moving along, and all that is happening now is that the time for speeches is being cut down. Surely, the time for this point to be raised is tonight when these motions are called, rather than now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to enter caveats now and deal with the matter at 9.45 tonight if that is the wish of the Chair. It did seem to me that these various points should be considered now, so the House would know how we are proceeding today.

An hon. Member: We know how we are proceeding; do you know how you are proceeding?

Mr. Bell: Further to what the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has said, Mr. Speaker, we realize there may be some controversy about this matter but we were hoping everybody in the House would have the same interest in the motion now before us as we have, and rather than lose time by having a long procedural argument at this stage