

*Debating Time Allotment*

that very little need be said about the point of order brought forward by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) in that it is really covered by the ruling of the Chair as recorded at page 10780 of *Hansard*. This ruling points out that the question of anticipation was not to be confused with the question of priority; that the notice of motion in the government's name was entitled to be transferred to government orders, and that at this point I would be entitled to seek priority for that particular motion. Therefore, I think the decision is quite clear on this point and little more need be said about it.

This whole matter will require few words from me because I do not think we need take seriously the remarks made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). They are two members who, according to the passage quoted by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, voted expressly against the instruction to the committee chairman to introduce the committee motion. In other words, the two hon. gentlemen who, several days ago, found it expedient to vote against the introduction of the motion have now risen to their feet asking that it be called.

**An. hon. Member:** That is not true.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I hope it is true because I am only repeating what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre read out. If hon. members opposite insist I will be glad to read it again.

**Mr. Bell:** Read it many times.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I know hon. members opposite are afraid to get to the substance of this matter. I quote:

Mr. Macdonald moved that the committee report 75A, 75B and 75C to the house and that the chairman be instructed to seek concurrence in the report.

That was the motion that was adopted. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the hon. member for Edmonton West and the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) voted against it. So these hon. members, who several weeks ago did not want the report introduced in the house, are now complaining because it was not introduced. I think I can say on behalf of hon. gentlemen on this side of the house that they concur in the notice of motion I have put on this particular matter. I believe they will agree that, while it is not verbally the same motion that the committee chairman was

instructed to introduce, it does represent an improvement because of amendments made which will bring about greater certainty. The procedure now proposed will give the house what it did not previously have and, incidentally, for which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre argued last December when he suggested that this type of procedural change be not made by motion to adopt a report but by motion to concur in the actual wording of the rule change.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** In committee of the whole.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** In committee of the whole, yes; but I would point out to the hon. member that in 1965, when the then prime minister and house leader introduced a motion to amend the rules, he took no exception to the fact that it was moved by a minister with Mr. Speaker in the Chair. There is a good precedent for what is being done in these circumstances. I consider that this is the most efficacious way of dealing with this matter and, accordingly, I propose that we proceed with the motion.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I was a member of this ill-fated committee set up to make a report. I was not present at the time the vote was taken,—

**An hon. Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Aiken:**—for a very good reason. If you follow the argument of the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), then the fact that I was not there to vote leaves me free today to criticize the action he has taken. If that is the viewpoint he takes, that is the one I adopt. I ask him where the Liberal members of this committee—the majority of six—are tonight. Where is the chairman of the committee? I see he is sitting in his seat, but why is he not moving the motion his colleagues asked him to move?

• (8:40 p.m.)

There has been no reason given to the house why this report has not been presented, and why the motion of the President of the Privy Council has been given priority. The committee spent many hours discussing a great many other matters than the allocation of time in respect of which the report was made. Many meetings were held and good progress was made. When the time came for the report the government was interested in only one item, and that was the allocation of