

Adjournment Debate

period, and the effect of yesterday's proceedings on the Supply motion that was to be debated and voted on yesterday.

The House will remember that at 3 p.m. yesterday the Chair heard comments at length on an alleged question of privilege before taking the matter under advisement. Accordingly, Routine Proceedings were delayed and the House was still considering Routine Proceedings when it adjourned at six p.m. I will go through the details of that in a moment.

I have reviewed the precedent referred to by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Lewis). The events in that precedent were as follows. First, on Wednesday, June 6, 1972 the sixth and seventh allotted days for that period were designated to occur on Thursday, June 8, 1972, and Friday, June 9, 1972. Second, the Notice Paper shows a notice of motion of Supply for Thursday, June 8, 1972. Third, on June 8, 1972, the House began Routine Proceedings and debate ensued on a motion under the then Standing Order 43. Fourth, at 10 o'clock p.m., when the House adjourned it was still considering the motion under Routine Proceedings. The order for Supply was not reached or called on June 8, 1972. Fifth, the Order Paper for June 9, 1972, shows under the continuing order of Supply: "the sixth allotted day" with the same motion on the Notice Paper and an additional motion.

● (1800)

At this point it is important to note that since the order for Supply was not reached on June 8, it reappeared still as the sixth allotted day on Friday, June 9, 1972. It was not a lost allotted day because the order had not been called.

The sequence of events yesterday was as follows: When Question Period ended, there was an alleged question of privilege. Debate on this lasted from three o'clock to 4.30 p.m. This was followed by a statement by the Hon. Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Bouchard) which, including replies, lasted 10 minutes. The House then moved under Routine Proceedings to petitions. There were petitions presented. During the presentation of petitions, the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) moved: "That the House do now proceed to Orders of the Day". That occurred at about 5 p.m.

As Hon. Members know, if this motion had passed the House would have gone to Orders of the Day and the opposition motion would have been called at about 20 minutes to 6, which is the time the vote on the motion of the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap was completed. At that point the allotted day would have commenced. However, the motion to proceed to Orders of the Day was defeated and the House continued with Routine Proceedings which were then at the petition stage.

The Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) rose, presented a petition, and moved: "That the House do now proceed to Introduction of Bills". That motion is non-debatable. A division was called for. Before the vote could take

place, the ordinary time of daily adjournment was reached and the Deputy Speaker lapsed the motion. I am not ruling on that aspect at this time. It was raised and I will return to the Chamber to discuss that.

However, I repeat that before the vote could take place the ordinary time of daily adjournment was reached and the Deputy Speaker lapsed the motion. The day was then done. In the words of the old hymn: "The day thou gavest Lord, had ended". Consequently, I must rule that the allotted day was never in fact commenced and, therefore, two allotted days remain in the current period.

The Chair wants Hon. Members to understand that it is not for the Chair to comment on how or on whose motions the day ended as it did, only that it did end without the allotted day having commenced.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 36(2) the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

HEALTH—REQUEST FOR BAN ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING. (B)
PLEA BY PHYSICIAN'S ORGANIZATION

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, on October 30 I raised an extremely important question with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp). I have raised this question with regard to the Government's failure to introduce a policy against cigarette advertising on a number of occasions. In reply to my question, the Minister of National Health and Welfare stated, as reported at page 908 of *Hansard*:

● (1805)

It is not simply a matter of banning advertising so that people will no longer smoke, thereby ending lung cancer. Obviously that which the Hon. Member continually puts forward is not the complete answer.

I never said that a ban on cigarette advertising is the complete answer, and neither has anyone else. The point is that it is part of the answer.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare said that he is in favour of a smoke-free country. He is certainly not working toward that end but he has given that as an objective of his Department.

It is an extremely important part of a comprehensive strategy. Of course, I am not able in a question to give the entire strategy. I have had an opportunity to discuss it in the