

Point of Order—Mr. Deans

House shall now adjourn. In fact, under Standing Order 27 of the United Kingdom, it suggests that the debate shall be confined to the matter of such a motion.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, that that would indicate that there is a difference in how a motion that the House do now adjourn should be treated between Canada and the United Kingdom. I would draw that to the attention of the Chair.

If the Government House Leader wants to use part of the Standing Orders of the United Kingdom, I suggest that the Chair, in ruling on the matter, must refer to the Standing Orders as a whole, and I know that the Chair would not want to pick and choose between different parts of the Standing Orders of the United Kingdom in order to support the Government House Leader.

Madam Speaker: I thank Hon. Members for their contributions. I want to say to the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) that I will look into these matters, but the other day when I acted upon those motions at six o'clock, I did not fall back on Standing Order 1 which says that when the Standing Orders do not provide for something, one can use the Standing Order of Great Britain. I think that must be done very carefully because those Standing Orders could in some ways be contradictory to our own Standing Orders and should only be used when there is no other way of interpreting a particular situation.

I relied on Standing Order 8(1) when I adjourned the House the other day and explained that after six o'clock, when the House was indeed supposed to adjourn, a motion to adjourn had lapsed and had become a nullity. A motion to adjourn made no sense any more because the House is supposed to adjourn at that time.

Now, if that logic is accepted, and I know that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) has accepted that logic, the same logic must be accepted pertaining to a motion to proceed to the Orders of the Day. After six o'clock there is no way to proceed to the Orders of the Day, so the motion again lapses; it becomes a nullity and has no meaning. It cannot be applied and it cannot be acted upon because it is past the time at which the House can consider the Order of the Day.

● (1610)

The Hon. Member very briefly mentioned that he was not part of the consultations which took place before I acted upon the situation which occurred in the House yesterday. I want to remind the Hon. Member that on the floor of this very House I did discuss with him, and asked him if the Members of the New Democratic Party were intending to come to vote; and I did say that something will happen at six o'clock, in the way of a warning. The Hon. Member had his comments at that time and I had my own comments. However, we did discuss briefly on the floor of this very House, right in front of these steps.

There were no consultations, I want to tell the Hon. Member, with other Parties except for a phone call which I made, as I have on other occasions, to the Whip of the Conservative

Party, who I could not reach, to the Deputy Whip, who I could not reach, and then I spoke to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nielsen), who I reached immediately, and asked the simple question; "Are the Members of your Party prepared to come and vote?" Very simply, there were no consultations. Of course, the Speaker does not consult before making a ruling except if she needs some clarification.

The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is quite right. The Speaker may not evaluate a motion. I believe I can comply with that plea entirely. I did not evaluate a motion in another case. The Hon. Member will remember that on a certain day when Hon. Members were not coming in to vote on a motion to introduce a Bill, I did not adjourn the House but simply suspended the sitting, precisely because the House has to resolve these matters. The motion to adjourn, or a motion to proceed to Standing Orders, was not disposed by the Chair. It was disposed by our Standing Orders, and I refer to Standing Order 8(1). That is quite different. The Speaker should interpret the Standing Orders and should inject certain logic into the proceedings of the House, referring herself to the Standing Orders; and that is what I did on those two occasions. However, when there was a matter of evaluating a motion, the Chair did not do that but simply suspended the sitting.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Madam Speaker, I rise on another point of order. The Chair, and the Chair's predecessors, have ruled frequently in the presentation of petitions that there shall be no debate. May I ask the Chair, on a point of order, if the moving of a motion during the presentation of petitions constitutes debate, either the entering into or the starting of a debate? And if it does constitute a debate, Madam Speaker, I would like to have your advice on this matter.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is discussing the ruling which I made nearly an hour ago.

Mr. Benjamin: No, I am not.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member may not do that. I believe he knows the rules.

Mr. Benjamin: I did not do that.

Madam Speaker: I even disposed of his argument, which he is now repeating, before I ruled. In answer to the Hon. Member, I did not rule, and I did not have to rule, on whether or not debate was permissible in the course of presenting a petition. The Standing Orders are quite clear. No debate is allowed in the course of presenting a petition. Simply, the reading out of the title or the substance of that petition is allowed. I have often reminded Hon. Members that they were taking too long in presenting their petitions, and some of them were in fact debating them. I only reminded Hon. Members that they could not debate their petitions. Therefore, the Hon. Member is referring to something which is quite outside of this particular question. I did dispose of that argument and I will not allow him to come back to it.