

Debating Time Allotment

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

PROCEDURE

NEW PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEBATING
TIME ALLOTMENT

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the Standing Orders of the House be amended by adding the following new Standing Orders immediately after Standing Order 75:

75A. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that there is agreement among the representatives of all parties to allot a specified number of days or hours to the proceedings at one or more stages of any public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of such agreed allocation; and every such motion shall be decided forthwith, without debate or amendment.

75B. When a Minister of the Crown, from his place in the House, states that a majority of the representatives of the several parties, including that of the Government, have come to an agreement in respect of a proposed allotment of days or hours for the proceedings at any stage of the passing of a public bill, he may propose a motion, without notice, setting forth the terms of the said proposed allocation; provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages of a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

75C. A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the House at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the House or in any committee and has given notice at that sitting of his intention so to do may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage; provided that the time allotted for any stage is not to be less than one sitting day and provided that for the purposes of this standing order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages on a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13). During the consideration of any such motion no member may speak more than once or longer than ten minutes. Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, Mr. Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Mr. Baldwin: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am wondering whether there are two or three points of order or just the one. The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring Your Honour's attention to the fact that the translation system is not working and we have been unable to find out what is happening.

Mr. Speaker: I am just wondering whether the hon. member is complaining that he did not understand the French translation. He must have heard me put the question in English.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I have been reading, as you may understand, with great care and anxiety, and I hope with some benefit, the decision that was delivered by Your Honour last Thursday, July 3, and which appears at pages 10778 and 10779 of *Hansard*. In delivering your decision with respect to the point of order that I had raised the day before, a decision that is binding on the house and which is not being challenged in any way, Your Honour ruled that the point of order I had raised should not be upheld. However, as I construed Your Honour's words, I think Your Honour was ruling that the point of order had been raised prematurely; that what I had said at the time and been supported in by other members of the house was not sufficient for the Chair to hold that the government notice of motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council should not be transferred to government orders pursuant to standing order 21.

Your Honour went on to say, as reported at page 10779:

• (8:10 p.m.)

Once the motion has been transferred for debate under government orders it becomes the government's decision and the government's responsibility to decide whether it will proceed with its motion. It is at that point that the anticipation rule might become operative in the sense that the minister's motion, if proceeded with, might block consideration of the committee report.

I know Your Honour was not inviting further discussion, but I gathered from the words that were used that if there was merit in the substance of the point of order I raised I should be given an opportunity to raise that point again at an appropriate time, that time