

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 28, 1971

The House met at 2 p.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR CONSENT BY MEMBER FOR BATTLE RIVER
TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43—RULING BY MR.
SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday when the hon. member for Battle River proposed a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43 the Chair declined to put the motion as proposed and undertook to study the circumstances and make a ruling. After careful consideration it seems to me that very little can be added to my comments as recorded at pages 9073 and 9074 of yesterday's debates.

I suggest to the House that the purpose of Standing Order 43 was never intended to permit an hon. member to launch a unilateral debate. It is my view that it is not in accord with the practices and proprieties of this House to use the Standing Order for such purposes when in effect it is intended only to suspend the notice requirement for a motion. It is my judgment that a member, when proposing a motion under Standing Order 43, should restrict his comments to the necessity or desirability of suspending the notice provision for a motion. It seems to me that any enlargement of that prior condition would end inevitably in great difficulty as the same Standing Order could be used from both sides of the House for the purpose of questioning the conduct of any or every member of the House.

As hon. members know, the House has developed well established and recognized procedures for the purpose of discussing the conduct of ministers and of members of the House. It is a prime duty of the Chair to safeguard the interests of all hon. members. Under the circumstances I cannot ask the House whether the hon. member for Battle River has the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion to which he alluded yesterday.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INCOME TAX

TABLING OF FURTHER PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
BILL C-259

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) I would like to table further proposed amendments to Bill C-259, and I would ask that these be printed, with the consent of the House—

Mr. Woolliams: How many amendments this time?

Mr. Benson: A few. I would ask that these be printed in *Votes and Proceedings*.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I raise a question? Yes, we get these amendments one way or another, but in view of the fact that we are, in right of the House, dealing with Bill C-259 in committee where amendments are moved, would it not be better for the minister to present those amendments when we are in committee? It seems to me this is a bit of an abuse of Standing Order 41(2).

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, really what I am trying to do under Standing Order 41(2) is to inform the House of amendments that may be made as we move through the subsequent sections. I thought it best to present them to the House so members will know what we are going to do.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: It does not follow that we will know what you are going to do.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DECISION BY UNITED STATES TO PROCEED WITH
AMCHITKA NUCLEAR TEST—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS
CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I seek, pursuant to the terms of Standing Order 43, to obtain the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent and pressing necessity, namely, the decision by the President of the United States to proceed with the Amchitka blast. As a result of the announcement yesterday and the insensitive and offensive disregard by the United States of appeals to stop the irrelevant and unnecessary Amchitka Nuclear test, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose):

That the government of Canada immediately initiate steps, with the co-operation of its allies in the United Nations, to have the matter of the Amchitka nuclear test raised in the Security Council.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Skeena which requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.