

but he will recall that. He sought that meeting in order to discuss this matter with the Speaker, but was unable to do so because of the events that were occurring during that time.

On that occasion, as reported at page 14954 of *Hansard*, I said the following:

Let me read now the Order Paper following upon the announcement Thursday by the government House leader, the Order Paper and Notices for Friday, February 5, 1982. At page 2 the Chair will note that Friday, February 12, has been designated as (Allotted Day—Supply).

That situation is on all fours with the situation that is before us here. In that case, the words "Allotted Day—Supply" appeared in italics and in brackets. I was making the argument that the Government, having announced that allotted day, could not smuggle in a change on the Order Paper by the use of the Standing Order allowing it to set the business of the House. The point I am making is that under the Order Paper of that day appeared this heading:

Notices of Supply Proceedings Pursuant
to Standing Order 58(4)(a)—

That is now Standing Order 62(4)(a).

NOTE: Friday, February 12, 1982—Third allotted day for the supply period ending March 26, 1982.

Today's Notice Paper goes that far. That much is printed. I want to emphasize and underline the fact that that notice which has been carried throughout the week on the preceding Friday stipulated, following the word "Note", the date of Friday, February 12, 1982. I would underscore that as I underscored the appearance today on the Order Paper of the announcement by the House Leader yesterday making today an allotted day.

I shall now deal with the motion. In the precedent that I cited on page 14954 of *Hansard* for February 12 appears this passage:

As the Chair appreciates, under our Standing Orders there must be 24 hours' notice filed in order to set the allotted day down for debate. It is past history that notice of that motion was set down at 1.12 in the afternoon of Thursday, February 11. The motion that was set down first, I point out, bore no date. It was as follows:

The notice that followed was printed in the Order Paper under Standing Order 58(9). The point of that debate as it relates to this one was that the motion itself was in the possession of the Table. The House was seized of it, having been given it during the sitting, and it was printed in full on the Order Paper. The Speaker reserved her judgment with respect to the right of Members to have motions printed on the question of alterations and I would like to cite briefly from her ruling of February 15, 1982, at page 14997 of *Hansard*, under the subheading:

MR. NIELSEN—PRINTING IN ORDER PAPER OF FILED
OPPOSITION MOTION—RULING BY MADAM SPEAKER

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to rule on the point of order which was brought up last Friday by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). His point of order was that the notice filed by him in the name of the Leader of the

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

Opposition (Mr. Clark) pursuant to Standing Order 58(4)(a) did not appear on the notice paper of Friday, February 12, 1982.

Before dealing with this point, I should like to clarify certain references made to the Order Paper by the Hon. Member in his submission on Friday last. The Hon. Member alleges that the government, merely by verbal announcement, has altered an item appearing on the Order Paper.

I respectfully submit to the Hon. Member that the government does not alter the Order Paper. Only decisions by the House can have that effect. On the other hand, the notice paper is made up of notices given by members of the House in accordance with the Standing Orders. The production of these papers is under the direction of the Clerk of the House.

Reference was made to page 2 of the Order Paper which is entitled "Projected Weekly Order of Business". Although it is not an official part of the Order Paper, it is inserted for the information and the convenience of Hon. Members. The same is true of the notes projecting dates—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has brought his instances to the attention of the Chair and has argued his case very well. The Chair has listened patiently to his argument. The Chair is now in the position of being able to make some observations that might perhaps be of assistance—

Mr. Nielsen: There are other points to be covered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair must at some point decide and—

Mr. Nielsen: There are other points to be covered which you have not even heard yet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has been given ample opportunity. This is the third occasion he has been recognized on the same point of order. With all due respect to the Hon. Member, I would like to repeat to him a remark that I made before. What he is doing to Parliament by this procedure is something for him to weigh with his own conscience and his accountability to the people of Canada.

Mr. Nielsen: Is that a threat?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At this point, with all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair is prepared to make an observation on the point.

Some Hon. Members: Point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is prepared to make an observation. The Hon. Member is seeking to substitute a procedure different from that which has been the practice of the House. The Hon. Member for Yukon very correctly pointed out that Standing Order 62(4) cannot be taken literally. Twenty-four hours' notice cannot be given and has not been given. The Hon. Member for Yukon, in a very learned and well prepared presentation, has cast reflections upon whether or not Standing Order 47 is relevant. The Chair has some concern as to whether or not it is relevant. However, the Chair must ask the Hon. Member for Yukon what he is arguing. He is arguing that the sitting time of the House should be the limit and not six o'clock. That is his argument.

I call to the attention of the Hon. Member the fact that yesterday there was a motion in the name of the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) which, if granted by the Chair,