

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not, and therefore the motion cannot be put.

* * *

● (1420)

[English]

AIRPORTS

TERMINAL TWO, TORONTO INTERNATIONAL—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 43 and on a matter of pressing necessity I move, seconded by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens):

That this House do direct the Minister of Transport to present to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications all plans, specifications and designs now available and to be available for the extension and alteration of terminal two at Toronto International Airport so that these plans, specifications and designs can be reviewed by the committee to ensure that the minister will not once again create facilities designed not for people but, at the best, for freight—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I bring to the attention of the hon. member that that is not a motion but a speech, and I hesitate to submit any speech in the House to the test of unanimity. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hope this is the proper time to raise it. On today's order paper two motions appear under notices of motions, one by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) and the other by the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Grier). Both are in exactly the same terms as the motion of the hon. member for St. John's East now standing on the order paper under motions.

I have two points to make with respect to the regularity of these notices of motions appearing today. First, they are couched in precisely the same terms as the motion now standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East. Second, if these notices are allowed to remain and are then transferred, as they would normally be on Monday and are placed under the heading, "Motions" on the order paper, then Standing Order 19 would be a nullity.

Standing Order 19 sets forth that notices of motions put by hon. members, if they are not taken up when called, may be allowed to stand with the consent of the government. That means they stand in their regular place. If the notices that are now on the order paper in the names of these two hon. members are allowed to remain there and are transferred, as would normally be the case on Monday, then Standing Order 19 would be totally ineffective.

I suggest, Sir, that you take the matter under advisement before they are transferred, which would normally be on Monday. The timing might prove a little difficult in

Notices of Motions

this case but Your Honour might make a decision some time later today on the point I raise that they should not appear on Monday in a place following the motion now standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am quite prepared to make a ruling immediately on the point raised by the hon. member for Yukon, with which I do not agree at all, but apparently there are hon. members who wish to contribute to the procedural point and I will hear them before making the ruling.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I only wish to say that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) had and has no citation to back up his point. If the motion of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) were in the possession of House, another motion like it could not be moved, but even that would not stop another member from placing the same notice of motion on the order paper. Sometimes there are two or three bills on the order paper dealing with the same matter. The point at issue is whether or not the House has taken possession of a particular motion. Since this has not happened, and since no decision on the matter has been taken, I am sure there is no reason why a dozen members could not put the same motion on the order paper.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention and that of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) to the daily routine of business as it appears in today's Order of Business and Notices. You will find under "Motions" that the second and third motions, standing respectively in the names of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) and the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), are identical. Further, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the first motion, standing in the name of the hon. member for Skeena, is identical with a motion presented by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands which was debated and subsequently transferred to government orders. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), that this a typical ruse by the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have a citation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will hear the hon. member, but I suggest that there should not be two or three speeches by the same member on a point of order. The hon. member says he has a citation. I will hear him and then make a ruling, depending, of course, on what the citation might contain.

Mr. Nielsen: The citation is found in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition at page 167. It is citation 200, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, which have a bearing on the matter. In reply to the parliamentary secretary, I wish to say that the point was raised sincerely and not as a ruse. That statement, being a political one, is obviously being made for the benefit of the delegates in the gallery.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member indicate again the citation to which he referred?