

standing in the name of another Member if that specific request were not present. If that were to be the case, there could be chaos in this place.

However, here we have a specific request by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton in whose name the motion stands, a specific request made of the Hon. Member for St. John's East who is now attempting to exercise the right of the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton to have the motion which stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton heard.

Therefore I submit that inasmuch as the Hon. Member for St. John's East has been authorized to move concurrence in the sixth report of the Special Committee—

Mr. McGrath: And is a member of the Committee.

Mr. Nielsen: —is also a member of that Committee and has been authorized by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton in whose name the notice of motion stands, the Hon. Member is within his rights to proceed with moving concurrence in that report and should be permitted to do so.

On the basis of those precedents, I submit that the Chair has no obligation to seek consent. Indeed, what is being sought by seeking unanimous consent is the right of the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton himself to make that specific request of another Member and specifically to authorize that other Hon. Member to move the motion standing in his name.

● (1510)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, there are three points I wish to make. First of all, the Chair asked the unanimous consent of the House, and we made it clear that we were not giving our consent. Consequently, the remarks made by the Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) are somewhat belated, and if the Chair agrees to consider them, I submit this would be tantamount to allowing an appeal from a ruling made by the Chair, because asking for unanimous consent means the Chair had decided that such consent was necessary for the motion to be moved. In fact, the Chair was correct in saying that unanimous consent was required, because my second point refers to Citation 402 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, as interpreted by the Hon. Member for Yukon.

The Member for Yukon mentioned a difference between the texts of the Fifth and the Fourth Editions. He said that a comma in the Fourth Edition was deleted in the Fifth Edition. However, aside from the adjustment that may have been made, I think his interpretation—in the Fifth Edition a number of adjustments were made in texts that were erroneous in the Fourth Edition, and the purpose of the Fifth Edition was to adjust and modernize the Fourth Edition. However, upon reading Citation 402, we realize that taking the text in its entirety, no other conclusion is possible: the requirement that there should be no objection applies both to tabling documents

Report of Special Committee

and the adoption of a report. Practically speaking, which of the two is more likely to raise objections, tabling documents or presenting a report? As far as I know, there has never been any objection to tabling documents, while when a report is tabled, if there are no objections, requesting concurrence becomes a formality, since the Parties will have consulted beforehand, and if the chairman of a committee or anyone else who was to move a motion for concurrence is absent for some reason, since consultations have been held and no objections raised, there is agreement and unanimous consent is given, although according to Citation 402, it would not be necessary. However, sometimes there are objections to committee reports, and that is the case today. I therefore submit that Citation 402 does cover this case and that the Chair was correct in requesting unanimous consent before allowing the Hon. Member to move the motion on behalf of another Member. In the circumstances, Citation 402 seems quite clear: it does not allow another Member to move a motion or the adoption of a report if objections are anticipated. In this particular case, no one indicated to the Chair that consultations had taken place between the parties and that everyone was prepared to concur in the adoption of this report. On the contrary. Therefore, since the Chair has not been notified of the absence of any objections, the Chair must apply the general rule and, since this is a departure from our usual practice, request the unanimous consent of the House, which was denied. We did so for two very simple reasons, and I would like to put them on the record, because I do not wish to cast any doubts on the reasons that the Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) may have for being absent.

The first reason is that the House has before it a very controversial bill, and that obviously, debating the report today will prevent us from proceeding with the debate on Bill C-155. That is the first reason why we did not give our unanimous consent, and why we object to the report being tabled, which was ample justification for the Chair to request the unanimous consent of the House. This is a dilatory manoeuvre to prevent us from continuing debate on Bill C-155, as the Progressive Conservatives did last Friday. They are doing so now. They are wasting the time of the House of Commons by debating subjects other than those the Government wishes to introduce for debate under the Standing Orders as is its prerogative.

The second reason is that by moving the adoption of this report, as we said before during the debate last Friday the Chairman of the Committee on Procedure and Organization, that is of the Special Committee on Parliamentary Reform, stressed this in the House, as did Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) and other Members as well; it is all on the record the Progressive Conservative Members are renegeing on an understanding that was reached in committee that no motion to concur would be moved for the time being, and since they are not respecting the understanding that was reached by committee members, there is no reason why we should agree to