

*Procedure and Organization*

if the assent of the Chair, as aforesaid, be not withheld, any question so claimed shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

3. When a clause or schedule is under consideration, a motion may be made that the question, that certain words of the clause or schedule defined in the motion stand part of the clause or schedule or "That the clause (or the clause as amended) stand part of the bill", or "That this schedule (or, this schedule as amended) be the schedule to the bill", or "That the clause or schedule be added to the bill", be now put and if the assent of the Chair, as aforesaid, be not withheld, the question on that motion shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

4. This order shall be put in force only when Mr. Speaker or, in committee, the Chairman of Ways and Means or Deputy Chairman is in the chair; except that,

(a) during any proceedings on or in relation to the business of supply, and

(b) during proceedings upon consideration of the report of a bill, the order may be put in force when Mr. Deputy Speaker is in the chair.

Standing order 32 reads:

If a division be held upon a question for the closure of debate under Standing Order 31 (closure of debate) that question shall not be decided in the affirmative unless it appears by the numbers declared from the Chair, that not less than one hundred members voted in the majority in support of the motion.

● (4:30 p.m.)

That is the effective rule under which the British parliament operates as a matter of course.

**Mr. Crouse:** Will the hon. member permit a question? Is he aware that these rules precipitated a major row in the British House of Commons in which nearly 500 members mounted a clamour of insults over a decision by government leader, Fred Peart, to impose a guillotine on a controversial bill, and that in this row members hurled books and paper missiles at each other? The row was unlike anything the United Kingdom house has seen for a very long time. Is he aware of this?

**Mr. Reid:** If the hon. member wishes to refer to the overseas edition of the *Times* he will find in there a full report of the debate. He will be interested to learn that the row broke out over the provisions of the United Kingdom redistribution of boundaries act. It seems that the Socialists were trying to gerrymander electoral boundaries and so prevent the Tories from winning the next election.

**Mr. McGrath:** But that is not a federal parliament.

**Mr. Reid:** I should like to continue by reading British standing order No. 43, some aspects of which, incidentally, have not been effective because they have not been generally accepted by the people directed to perform certain duties, namely the chairman's panel. I quote rule 43:

There shall be a committee, to be designated the Business Committee, consisting of the members of the Chairmen's Panel together with not more than five other members to be nominated by Mr. Speaker in respect of each bill to which subparagraph (b) of this order applies. The quorum of the committee shall be seven. The committee—

(a) shall, in the case of any bill in respect of which an order has been made by the House, allotting a specified number of days or portions of days to the consideration of the bill in committee of the whole House or on report, divide the bill into such parts as they may see fit and allot to each part so many days or portions of a day so allotted as they may consider appropriate;

(b) may, if they think fit, do the like in respect of any bill to the consideration of which in committee of the whole House or on report a specified number of days or portions of days has been allotted by general agreement notified orally to the House by a Minister of the Crown; and

(c) shall report their resolution (or resolutions) to the House, and on a motion being made for the consideration of such report, the question thereon shall be put forthwith and on consideration of the said report the question "That this House both agree with the committee in the said resolution (or resolutions)" shall be put forthwith and, if agreed to, shall have effect as if it were an order of the House.

Proceedings in pursuance of this subparagraph, though opposed, may be decided after the expiration of the time for opposed business.

I have quoted some of the rules under which the British parliament operates and I find it difficult to believe that these rules, much more onerous than proposed rule 75c, could be regarded by opposition members as being destructive of democracy. In any event, it appears that the opposition in the United Kingdom has performed under those closure rules to such good effect that it seems very likely the Tories will win the next election. And those rules are far more Draconian than proposed Standing Order 75c. The opposition's argument that democracy is going to collapse because of these new rules just does not make sense.

We must ask ourselves, who really is to run parliament?

**An hon. Member:** Who is to be master?

**Mr. Reid:** Precisely. Someone must be master. We can go a long way if there is co-operation and good feeling, and I expect that this will be the main way in which we