

Speech from the Throne

the House to consider the message from His Excellency as the primary matter of business for today. Our rules have always provided, and it has been traditional as long as the minister has sat in this House and long before, that the Prime Minister, on behalf of the House, should move the traditional motion involving the rather empty and symbolic bill regarding the administration of oaths of office merely to show that the House is the master of its business and is not taking direction from the message of His Excellency. I therefore suggest to Your Honour that that argument falls to the ground.

Second, if the matter of a question period looms larger today, the answer lay in the hands of the government yesterday. The government which through what would I call almost parliamentary sharp practice—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):—decided to summon parliament back and to have Your Honour prepare and distribute an order paper with items of unfinished business listed thereon. But the treasury benches then directed that the messenger from the other place should arrive almost as soon as Your Honour entered the chamber. The treasury benches decided when that intervention should be made and, in saying this, I am not guilty of lese majesty or otherwise. If a question period had been granted yesterday, as it should have been, there would not have been this pressure today. On that score I say that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is acceptable in principle for today's deliberations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I have to indicate to hon. members that in my view the contributions which have been made to this brief procedural debate have not been addressed principally to the procedural point. Hon. members have suggested that it might be proper today to have a question period, that there ought to be a question period today because there was not one yesterday, that it is the duty of the government to provide an opportunity for hon. members to ask questions, and that it is our duty to go on with Routine Proceedings. I suggest this does not have anything at all to do with the point that I brought to the attention of hon. members.

My suggestion when the matter was raised was that the amendment was not procedurally correct. I have not received much assistance from hon. members in this respect, and I think my ruling will have to be that the amendment is a substantive motion and is not an amendment which can be attached to the motion before the House.

Dealing with the matter in a substantive way, hon. members have suggested that we should proceed in the usual way with Routine Proceedings and that the motion made by the Prime Minister was made under Standing Order 43. With respect, I cannot agree with this suggestion. The motion was made on the basis of parliamentary tradition. My understanding is that this is the kind of motion which is proposed and the proceedings which we have today are based on 100 years of Canadian practice and, I am sure,

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

many more years of British practice. I think the Chair has a responsibility to recognize this.

One hon. member suggested that perhaps this should be changed. That may be so. Hon. members may feel that on the first day of the session the procedure should be changed, that we should not have the formal motions that are made and should not proceed in the way that we do, without Routine Proceedings, to the consideration of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I believe that one of the responsibilities of the Speaker is not to change these traditions but to protect them. I am prepared to do so in this particular case.

I am not suggesting that the motion cannot be amended. It could be amended. If a procedurally acceptable amendment were submitted for the consideration of the Chair, I would have no hesitation in putting the amendment and calling in the members. But my conclusion, and the ruling I must make is that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre cannot be accepted. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.
Motion agreed to.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I request leave of the House to table a list of the titles of the several bills which were referred to in His Excellency's speech. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this list be printed in today's *Hansard*.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, we would be prepared to give consent. However, to facilitate hon. members in studying this list, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the list showing all these bills will show which are carry-overs from the last session and which from the session before?

Mr. MacEachen: Would you also like to know the ones we will be doing next session?

Mr. Baldwin: In addition, I would like to ask the government, particularly the President of the Privy Council, if these bills will be brought forward shortly so that the House will not be compelled to wait, as it had to in the last session, for these bills to be produced so they can be examined?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1210)

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if the research assistants of the opposition were properly engaged rather than looking for ways to trample traditions concerning the monarchy and parliament—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Prime Minister seeks permission to table a document and have it included in *Hansard* as part of today's proceedings. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: The list referred to above follows.]

1. A Bill to Amend the Criminal Code.
2. A Bill to Amend the British North America Acts 1867-1965.