

Debating Time Allotment

should not be adopted, that it should be voted down and we should proceed later on with another motion, then it is up to them to take this course. Hon. members should not ask the Speaker to do this on their behalf. My duty and my responsibility is to rule according to the rules that hon. members adopt and pass, and which they expect the Speaker to respect on their behalf. I think it might be a dictatorial act on the part of the Chair to assume the responsibility that hon. members are suggesting be placed on its shoulders, and I am not prepared to do so. As the servant of the house I must respect the rules. Therefore, I suggest to hon. members that the motion is properly before the house at this time and must be considered.

Whether I approve of the procedure, whether I think it is in accord with the new and exalted role that we would like to assign to our committees, is another matter. I am not sure whether I am entitled to have an opinion about this; certainly if I do have one I cannot tell the house what it is. I will humbly and with good grace accept the role which hon. members accord to their Speaker and be the servant of the house, rule according to the rules which they themselves have adopted, and say that this motion is properly before the house at this time.

● (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on another point of order. I now wish to place before Your Honour the second of the three points of order I wish to raise with regard to this particular issue. Your Honour has decided on one and we have no recourse except to consider what action the house may take with respect to an hon. member who, as chairman of a committee, has not carried out instructions the house gave to him. My second point relates to an entirely different point of order. The house is asked to consider and adopt the recommendation of the standing committee of this house. It is also asked to adopt a motion of the President of the Privy Council. I submit to Your Honour that the motion is out of order in as much as it proposes that this house shall adopt a Standing Order already rejected by this house in this session as a substantive part of proposed standing order 16A which was negated on December 20, 1968. Many hon. members in this house, and many outside the house have noticed a striking similarity between the government's present proposed order and the order which was negated. On December 20, 1968, the order was

read for resuming debate on the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) the order being that the fourth report of the special committee on procedure of the house, presented to the house on Friday, December 4, 1968, be concurred in.

With the unanimous consent of this house the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) moved, and I quote:

That the motion be amended by inserting... after the words "Procedure of the House," the words "except the proposal with respect to the proposed Standing Order 16A".

I repeat the last words, "except the proposal with respect to the proposed Standing Order 16A". It is now well known that the motion of the President of the Privy Council was agreed to. The main motion as amended was agreed to. That motion, as amended, then read:

That the Fourth Report of the Special Committee on Procedure of the House, except the proposal with respect to the Standing Order 16A, presented to the House on Friday, December 6, 1968, be concurred in.

The report, as so amended, was then concurred in. The standing orders proposed in that report are now in effect, except standing order 16A. The house made its will known last year. Obviously, the main motion as amended put a positive question and a negative question, and to these questions the house answered that it did not concur in the committee's recommendation to adopt rule 16A but that it did concur in the remainder of the committee's recommendation. If it had been intended that no decision be taken on rule 16A, the procedure exists under which this matter could have been deleted or withdrawn.

The rule of the United Kingdom House of Commons which was adopted on April 2, 1604, is as follows:

That a question being once made, and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again, but must stand as a judgment of the House.

That rule has been accepted in this house over and over again. In the face of the judgment of this house made last December that rule 16A should be negated, the house is now being asked to adopt rules 75A, 75B and 75C. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that essentially the two proposed standing orders are the same. Each provides a procedure under which a minister of the Crown may, subject to agreement or consultation with a designated committee or group, bring in or move a time allocation order. In the case of rule 16A,