

Adjournment Motion

When you consider that the first question I asked was about the government's total advertising budget for the fiscal year 1979-80 and the proposed budget for the fiscal year 1980-81 and that the estimates have already been tabled for fiscal year 1981-82, it raises questions about the government's seriousness in dealing with these issues. We will be into a new fiscal year before I learn about the advertising budget of two years ago.

The first part of question No. 1,450 asks the government to go back in time and give information about its advertising budget, and it may be the case that the government feels it is not possible to give that information or that it would be too costly to do so. What the government should be doing is simply to say so in a direct way as part of an order for return or as part of a response to this question.

● (1640)

I think the other elements of the two questions asked are fairly easily answerable and that the House is entitled to an answer to them. I would appreciate the parliamentary secretary giving some priority to answering these questions, which have stood on the Order Paper for more than half a year.

Mr. Collenette: Madam Speaker, I take note of the suggestion made by my colleague opposite. I want to assure him sincerely that the government is not dragging its feet in answering these questions. I have been pursuing the matter quite diligently. We have a number of the answers, but there are five or six pieces of information required to complete the picture, so to speak. As soon as we have the whole picture, we will table the answers in the House.

I should inform the hon. member that we did answer a series of questions asked by his colleague, the hon. member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens). I believe No. 1,740 was answered and a few more after that in that series. That was a few weeks ago. The answers dealt with this question but on singular issues involving singular departments.

We have also answered questions about the media-buying contract, as it is known. This clearly illustrates that we are not trying to hide anything. We are certainly committed to getting these answers before the House. I realize there has been some press speculation about delay in answering these two questions, but I can assure you, Madam Speaker, and all other members that we shall be answering these questions soon.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Madam Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for

Victoria (Mr. McKinnon)—Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Reported removal of "E" Division from Victoria, B.C.; the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie)—Energy—New Brunswick oil shales development; the hon. member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie)—Health care—Request for legislation to ban extra billing by doctors.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION TO EXTEND SITTINGS DURING DEBATE ON CONSTITUTION

On the order: Government Notices of Motions:

March 19, 1981—The President of the Privy Council:

THAT WHEREAS the Prime Minister tabled in the House of Commons on October 6, 1980 a document entitled "Proposed Resolution for a Joint Address to Her Majesty the Queen Respecting the Constitution of Canada";

AND WHEREAS the motion to refer the said document to a Special Joint Committee of the House and Senate was debated in the House on 11 days between October 6 and October 23, 1980, allowing some 78 members to speak;

AND WHEREAS the Joint Committee, on which some 132 members of this House served, held 106 meetings, sat for 267 hours, received over 1,000 written submissions and heard testimony from 95 groups and 5 individuals;

AND WHEREAS the Joint Committee, having had its reporting date extended twice, reported on February 13, 1981 with the recommendation that the government introduce a motion for the presentation of the Address as modified by the committee;

AND WHEREAS the motion of the Minister of Justice implementing the Joint Committee's recommendation was moved on February 17, 1981;

AND WHEREAS the honourable member for Provencher moved an amendment to that motion on February 17, 1981;

AND WHEREAS the said amendment has been debated by this House for some five weeks, with the result that as of March 18, 1981 there have been 52 speakers on behalf of the official opposition, 15 speakers on behalf of the New Democratic Party, and 31 speakers on behalf of the government;

THEREFORE until the motion of the Minister of Justice for an Address to Her Majesty the Queen respecting the Constitution of Canada and any amendments thereto have been finally disposed of, Standing Order 6(1) and Standing Order 40 shall be suspended and, notwithstanding any other Standing Order, Private Members' Business shall be suspended, and the House shall sit from 10.00 o'clock a.m. to 1.00 o'clock p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays for the consideration of government business; and Standing Order 6(3) shall be read as if it said "At 11.59 o'clock p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays, at 10.00 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday and at 7.00 o'clock p.m. on Fridays, Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House until the next sitting day."

AND during debate on the said motion of the Minister of Justice and any amendments and sub-amendments proposed thereto,

(a) notwithstanding Standing Order 31(1) no member shall speak for more than 20 minutes;

(b) when no member rises in his place to participate in the debate, or at 15 minutes before the time of adjournment provided for by this order on the second day during which the motion of the Minister of Justice or any amendments and subamendments proposed thereto have been under consideration following the adoption of this motion—whichever occurs first—the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of any amendments and subamendments then under consideration;

(c) if, at the time provided for in paragraph (b) there is no amendment or subamendment under consideration, the Speaker shall put every question

necessary to dispose of the main motion; otherwise, after the amendment and any subamendment have been disposed of, the debate on the main motion may be resumed;

(d) at 15 minutes before the time of adjournment on the second sitting day following the resumption of the debate on the motion of the Minister of Justice pursuant to paragraph (c), the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the motion, including any amendments and subamendments proposed thereto; and

(e) any member who, not having spoken in the debate either on the main motion or on an amendment or subamendment may at any time before the fulfilment of the conditions set out in paragraph (b) deliver to the Clerk a written speech relevant to the debate of not more than about 3,000 words, which will be printed as an appendix to the House of Commons *Debates* on the day following the conclusion of the debate.

Madam Speaker: I recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on a point of order.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I have a point of order.

Madam Speaker: I recognized the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, it is customary to recognize first the official opposition. What is happening today?

Madam Speaker: I am terribly sorry. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre gave me notice yesterday that he would rise on a point of order at this time. I know it is customary that I recognize a member from the opposition first, and I usually do. However, when I do get notice I try to put things in the order in which I receive them. In this particular case, I received notice yesterday from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. He told me precisely what his point of order would be. Subsequently, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) gave me oral notice of a point of order, but his was of a general nature. Therefore, I think it is fair at this point today to recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I would appreciate the point normally. The normal courtesies and traditions have it that members of the official opposition are usually recognized first.

I am aware that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) gave you notice, Madam Speaker. If the matter were a question of privilege, then I think that notice would have had some validity; but it is not a question of privilege and the notice is not critical in terms of giving recognition first to any member on a point of order. I know of no practice which exists in this regard. As the House leader for the opposition, I claim the right, if I may do so, in the normal traditions and passage of events, to be recognized first. That is the position I take.

I do not think we should depart from the normal practices of the House. I am aware of the notice that was filed. I indicated to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—and I am not catching him by surprise—that I intended to exercise the right that I feel, by tradition in this House, falls upon Her Majesty's loyal opposition and upon the official opposition. It happens to occupy the position of opposition House leader. It is

Point of Order—Mr. Knowles

a position, for better or for worse, which is recognized in the House of Commons Act.

I could go on for some time because, with respect, Madam Speaker, I think I do have the right to advance an argument. It may well be the argument I would advance would encompass part of the argument that will be made by my friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, because he was quite precise about the argument he will be dealing with and he will have his opportunity in the normal course. Therefore, I claim the normal courtesy in this matter.

Mr. Knowles: Madam Speaker, I simply want to say it is true that the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) told me he would try to get ahead of me on this matter. I told him that I could not stop him from trying to do so, but that I would claim my right, having given notice yesterday.

Mr. Nielsen: Notice is not necessary.

Mr. Knowles: I think perhaps I shall leave that determination to the Chair. Of course, if hon. members are not satisfied with the person on whom the Speaker has called, they can move a motion under Standing Order 29.

Madam Speaker: I recognize the arguments which the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton has just put forward. It is true that members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition have certain privileges in this House, but I am not sure they apply in this circumstance.

It is true that, as a matter of courtesy, members of the opposition are usually recognized first on points of order which deal with government business. However, in this particular circumstance it seems to me that I owe the courtesy to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre because he gave me notice of it yesterday.

I am just trying to be as courteous and as fair as it is possible to be. The same situation occurs when members rise during question period. Sometimes five members rise at the same time and they have to be put in a certain order. But if one rises before the other, the first one to rise is usually recognized. The hon. member has said, quite rightly, that it is a matter of courtesy. I accept that as being a matter of courtesy, but this time I think I owe the courtesy to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I will recognize him.

I see the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is rising.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, with respect, it is not a matter of courtesy; it is a matter of long-standing usage, custom and practice in this House to recognize the opposition House leader. I, for one, resent that kind of departure from our customary practices. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling):

That the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton be now heard.

Madam Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Point of Order—Mr. Knowles

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Nielsen), which was negated on the following division:

● (1650)

(Division No. 49)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre	Friesen	McKinnon
Beatty	Gamble	McKnight
Blenkarn	Gass	McLean
Bosley	Gilchrist	McMillan
Bradley	Greenaway	Mitges
Cardiff	Gurbin	Munro
Carney (Miss)	Gustafson	(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Clark	Halliday	Neil
(Yellowhead)	Hamilton	Nickerson
Clarke	(Qu'Appelle-Moose	Nielsen
(Vancouver Quadra)	Mountain)	Oberle
Cook	Hargrave	Paproski
Cooper	Hawkes	Patterson
Corbett	Hees	Reid
Cossitt	Hnatyshyn	(St. Catharines)
Crombie	Howie	Roche
Crosbie	Huntington	Schellenberger
(St. John's West)	Jelinek	Scott
Crosby	Kemping	(Hamilton-Wentworth)
(Halifax West)	Kilgour	Scott
Crouse	Korchinski	(Victoria-Haliburton)
Dantzer	Lawrence	Shields
Darling	Lewis	Stevens
Dinsdale	MacDonald	Stewart
Domm	(Miss)	Taylor
Ellis	MacKay	Thacker
Elzinga	Malone	Towers
Epp	Mayer	Vankoughnet
Fennell	Mazankowski	Wilson
Forrestall	McCain	Wise
Fraser	McCuish	Wright
Fretz	McDermid	Yurko—86.
	McKenzie	

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse	Campbell	Desmarais
Anguish	(Miss)	Dingwall
Appolloni	(South West Nova)	Dionne
(Mrs.)	Chénier	(Chicoutimi)
Axworthy	Collenette	Dionne
Bachand	Comtois	(Northumberland-
Baker	Corbin	Miramichi)
(Gander-Twillingate)	Corriveau	Dubois
Bégin (Miss)	Cosgrove	Duclos
Benjamin	Côté (Mrs.)	Dupont
Berger	Cousineau	Duquet
Blackburn	Cullen	Erola (Mrs.)
Blaikie	Cyr	Evans
Blais	Daudlin	Ferguson
Bloomfield	Dawson	Fleming
Bockstael	Deans	Flis
Bosy	De Bané	Foster
Breau	de Corneille	Francis
Broadbent	de Jong	Frith
Bujold	Demers	Fulton
Bussièrès	Deniger	Garant

Messrs.

Gauthier	Lapointe	Pepin
Gendron	(Beauce)	Peterson
Gimael	LeBlanc	Pinard
Gingras	Leduc	Prud'homme
Gourd	Lefebvre	Rae
Gray	Lewycky	Regan
Guilbault	Loiselle	Reid
Harquail	MacBain	(Kenora-Rainy River)
Herbert	MacEachen	Roberts
Hervieux-Payette	MacGuigan	Robinson
(Mrs.)	Mackasey	(Burnaby)
Hopkins	MacLaren	Robinson
Howdebo	MacLellan	(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Hudecki	Malépart	Rompkey
Irwin	Maltais	Rose
Isabelle	Manly	Rossi
Johnston	Massé	Roy
Joyal	Masters	Sargeant
Kaplan	McCauley	Savard
Keeper	McRae	Schroder
Kelly	Mitchell	Skelly
Killens (Mrs.)	(Mrs.)	Smith
Knowles	Murphy	Stollery
Kristiansen	Nicholson	Tessier
Lachance	(Miss)	Tobin
Lajoie	Nystrom	Tousignant
Lalonde	Ogle	Turner
Lamontagne	Olivier	Veillette
Landers	Orlikow	Waddell
Lang	Ostiguy	Watson
Laniel	Ouellet	Weatherhead
Lapierre	Parent	Whelan
Lapointe	Parker	Yanakis
(Charlevoix)	Pelletier	Young—151.
	Penner	

● (1800)

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Motion (Mr. Nielsen) negated.

Madam Speaker: Therefore, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has the floor.

It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. this evening.

At 6.11 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, it is interesting the new things that can happen to one no matter how long he stays around this place. This is the first time I have had 151 members of the House vote to hear me speak.

Mr. Herbert: Don't abuse it.

Mr. Knowles: At any rate, Madam Speaker, I rise to press the point of order of which I gave you notice yesterday. It has to do with the final paragraph in the proposed motion on today's Order Paper in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard). I will not take the time to read that final paragraph for, as members know, it is the one in which provision is made for members not to speak in the rest of the debate on the constitutional package but yet to have their speeches printed in *Hansard*.