

Procedure and Organization

Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald goes on with the quotation in respect of this proposal regarding the proceedings of the house after saying:

I have sent for *Hansard* of that day and it has just arrived. The reference reads as follows:

"Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister):—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends are applauding, but he got ticked off that day by the Speaker. He said:

"I beg to move the motion of which I gave notice yesterday:

"That when this house adjourns on Friday, the 21st instant, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 25th instant'.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out, as I did yesterday, that this motion requires two days' notice and only one day's notice has been given. It can therefore only be entertained by unanimous consent.

Sir Robert Borden: I do not know whether it is applicable or not, but my attention has been directed to the language of rule 40 which says that the rule requiring notice shall not apply to the times of meeting or adjournment of the house.

"Mr. Speaker: I think the interpretation which has been given to the section under that rule is that it refers to the hour for meeting because in the French edition 'heure' is used. That being so, as at present advised, I am still of the opinion that two days' notice would be required to be given."

That was the Speaker's judgment in respect of Sir Robert Borden's motion in 1920, and Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald cited this decision in making a ruling in respect of the kind of a motion that could or could not be made under this rule. Mr. Speaker Ross Macdonald went on to conclude by saying:

I would agree with the decision given by Mr. Speaker Rose, and that if this motion referred to days it would not be in order. But as it refers to time, I would rule that the motion is in order.

That was said by Mr. Speaker Macdonald in a ruling on December 20, 1951, in reference only to the times of sitting on that day. Mr. Speaker Macdonald, having considered a serious point of order raised, and having cited various precedents, said it was in order. He repeated himself two or three times and I do not think there is any harm in my doing so as well in order to make it clear that the reference was to the times of sittings. Because this motion referred only to the hours of sitting it was in order.

That was the basis on which I made the motion last Thursday, which was similar to this one. It dealt with only a question of hours on a particular day. That is what we have

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

before us now, a motion that does not deal with days that parliament is sitting, but only with the hours of sitting, and for this day only. At the moment we are dealing with the motion before us which deals only with the hours of this day, and I submit therefore it is in order under the terms of Standing Order 42(1), which states:

Forty-eight hours' notice shall be given for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for placing a question on the order paper; but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the house.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the requirement to give 48 hours' notice does not apply when a motion relates only to the times of meeting or the times of adjournment. I think I am entitled to separate that and use the singular and say that when it relates only to the time of meeting or the time of adjournment of the house such a motion is in order under rule 42(1).

● (3:30 p.m.)

That is what this motion deals with; therefore, I submit it is in order. I would like to make the point again that this whole question is very narrow, very specific and deals with just one point; and it is a point that is clearly covered. After the motion had been put and accepted by the house last Thursday there was discussion about it. It is the kind of thing one does discuss with various people. I was involved in such discussions. Some friends of mine wondered about the motion and asked what would have happened if the house had wanted to adjourn earlier. That is no problem. The Standing Order for today is for us to adjourn at six o'clock. If we want to adjourn earlier, it can be done. We can adjourn at any time.

Under the motion we are discussing the house is being asked to adjourn at four o'clock. If we wanted to do so, we could adjourn before that. It is a little difficult now because it is 27 minutes to four, but a motion to adjourn before four o'clock would be perfectly in order. That point could be met by extra wording in the motion, but why quibble about words when we have the authority under Standing Order 42(1) that any private member may make a motion having to do with the time of adjournment?

Before resuming my seat I should like to return to one of the points the President of the Privy Council sought to make when he read citation 88(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edi-