

*Debating Time Allotment*

This house directed the committee to bring in a report. The house must consider the committee report and not the government motion. I say further, with all due respect, that the Chair was elected to protect the rights of the house, and not just by fiat of the government to accommodate its desires. Under those circumstances I say to Your Honour with the greatest respect that the privileges and rights of this house must be protected. This includes all hon. members of the house and not merely the government which seeks either to direct the debate in the house or to act in a particular way.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):**

Mr. Speaker, in considering this point of order, I ask Your Honour to consider that you are being asked to consider a very fundamental question, not just a procedural one. The reason it is fundamental is the fact the government has come in right over top of the committee which the house appointed, that committee which the house requested to report, which did report and is now being overruled by action of the government. Therefore it is a fundamental question on procedure whether the house is seized of its own business or whether the government has superiority or priority over the house itself. It is a very serious fundamental question that must be determined at this point.

The remarks of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), as I heard them, added up to this: Why proceed on the basis of a committee report when the government is so much more effective? What the minister is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the government with its majority can crush the opposition faster in the house than it can in the committee, so why go through this long roundabout way of crushing the opposition through committee reports? Why not bring it into the house where the government has a majority, and where they can crush the resistance effectively once and for all? Those are the questions being raised.

This is one of the most serious constitutional and parliamentary questions that has ever been raised. I think the government has engaged in an outrageous abuse of the powers which by custom and tradition have been given to government to direct the business of the house. These powers are not being used in a proper manner, but in an improper, immoral and illegal manner to thwart the ordinary business of the house. This is an inadequate way to consider a committee report. I was also opposed to the committee report and I

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

would be very strongly voting against it. Nevertheless it is a priority item, ahead of the one the government has brought forward. It must be considered in that manner.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. This is not the case of the government's overruling a committee report it did not like. That would be bad enough. This is even more outrageous, in that the government is trying to overrule a committee report which only their own members supported, and which came in as a majority report. In other words, not only are they reversing the whole membership of the house represented on that committee, but they are reversing their own members on the committee by suggesting in this manner that the committee did not make a proper report. They are reversing their own decision in the committee.

● (3:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** During the last 45 minutes or so hon. members on both sides of the house have cited numerous rules, authors and precedents which would have to be considered very seriously by the Chair. If hon. members will allow me to do so, within the next few hours I will have an opportunity to study the presentations made in the chamber by hon. members who have taken part in this procedural debate, and without delay give a decision, which I am sure will not please everyone. The motion in the name of the President of the Privy Council will stand for the time being.

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**CERTIFICATES OF IDENTIFICATION TO U.S. CITIZENS****Question No. 1,228—Mr. Lewis:**

1. Is it the policy of the Department of Manpower and Immigration to refuse Certificates of Identification to Americans who come to Canada and voluntarily give up their United States citizenship?

2. Is it possible for such individuals to travel outside of Canada without a Certificate of Identification?

3. What is the basis for this treatment of such American immigrants?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. In the absence of special compassionate reasons, it is not the policy