

Speaker's Rulings and Statements - (Continued)

Government Motions - (Concluded)

The order being called - (Concluded)

or practice of the House to set down similar motions on the Order Paper, and that as S.O. 21(2) vides for automatic transferral of the Government notice of motion to Government Orders, its further progress became a Government decision. At this point, the anticipation rule might become operative in that the later motion might block consideration of the earlier one. However, priority of the earlier motion cannot be used to block consideration of the later one. Priority on the Order Paper should not be confused with the rule of anticipation, 1289-90.

During debate on the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) to amend S.O. 75, a point of order was raised by Mr. Baldwin that the said motion anticipated a motion on the Order Paper. Mr. Speaker ruled that the anticipation rule, if applied, would block whichever of the motions had not been moved, but as the government motion had been put before the House, it must be considered. He also stated that the duty of the Chair was to rule according to the rules the House adopts, and it would be a dictatorial act for the Chair to substitute its judgment and ruling for that of the House, 1316-8.

Motions:

During debate on motion for second reading of Bill C-116 (Post Office Act amendment), Mr. Skoberg proposed to move, -That the House proceed to another government order, 156. Mr. Speaker ruled that a motion to so proceed may be moved only by the House Leader, 157.

Statement by Mr. Speaker on filing of various notices when House is suspended, 623-4.

Privilege, Question of:

On a question of privilege raised by Mr. Roberts on Mar. 27, 1969, concerning terminal gratuity when leaving Public Service, Mr. Speaker ruled in favour of the member, 853.

On a question of privilege raised by Mr. Woolliams on Mar. 28, 1969, and the subsequent proposed motion to refer "the question of information of the announcement of the new Montreal international airport having been given prior to said announcement...." to the Privileges and Elections Committee, Mr. Speaker ruled that insofar as the technical and procedural aspects of the matter were concerned, allegations against a Minister on the performance of ministerial duties did not come within the purview of parliamentary privilege. If the matter was to be dealt with further, it should be by way of substantive motion or by motion of non-confidence in government. Therefore motion not accepted, 869-73.

On a question of privilege raised by Mr. Saltsman on June 3, 1969, concerning advanced information on the presentation of the Budget being given to the press and not to Members of Parliament, Mr. Speaker ruled that the entire matter of advanced briefings could be considered by the Executive for future budgets, however there was not a *prima facie* case of privilege, 1105-6.

On a question of privilege raised by Mr. McGrath on June 9, 1969, and the subsequent proposed motion to refer "the article in the Montreal *Star* of Tuesday, June 3 by John Gray..." to the Privileges and Elections Committee, Mr. Speaker ruled that as the question had not been raised immediately, and as the proposed motion was a substantive motion requiring notice, the motion could not be accepted, 1136-8.

Quorum:

During debate on Motions (Papers) standing in the name of Mr. Orlikow, a point of order was raised by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) that a quorum was absent, whereupon the House was counted and a quorum was found to be lacking. The names of Members present being taken down, there was found to be a quorum. A further point of order was raised by Mr. Knowles that as the original count of the House had shown lack of a quorum, the House must stand adjourned. Mr. Speaker stated that Members had been entering and leaving the Chamber during the taking of the count making accuracy difficult. However, for the purposes of Citation 60 of Beauchesne, it cannot be the number of names inscribed in the record which is decisive but the number of Members present at the time of the original count. Mr. Speaker ruled that he could reach no other conclusion than to apply the provisions of Citation 60 and adjourn the House, 1329-30.