

proceedings over which I preside. However, with all due respect to hon. members who participated in this debate, let me point out that that is the limit of my authority, and unless procedural changes are made that remains the limit and I do not propose to attempt to exercise a non-existent authority to decide appeals of standing committees in procedural matters.

As I said, my reasoning is obvious and clear in respect of a situation in which one hon. member asks questions on one day and answers them on another. I exposed my reasoning on that, and one can only speculate as to what I would do if I were sitting in the chair of the standing committee involved. I do not propose to cross that line unless in some way members of the House deem it proper, in their wisdom, to amend the procedures that have been followed so carefully which keep the Chair out of questions of order—and essentially this is a very serious and important question of order—in the standing committees. A question of order it is, and the Chair will not sit in appeal on questions of order in standing committees.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order arising out of the remarks you just made. I am sure you must recall the time when in the twenty-ninth parliament I was chairman of the Standing Committee of Transport and Communications presenting the fifth report of that committee and I was ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker disagreed with the chairman of the committee and said that a ruling made by the chairman of that committee had been in error, and therefore the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications was not in order and could not be introduced and concurred in at that time. I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that in the twenty-ninth parliament Mr. Speaker felt that as part of his responsibility for accepting and approving committee reports he had the right to change, and perhaps at times overrule chairmen of committees.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in a moment.

The hon. member for Crowfoot has raised a point of order in respect of a precedent. The fact is that the Chair has stayed out of the proceedings of standing committees, as required by the citation in Beauchesne's before the proceedings of a committee are reported to the House. Once the proceedings of a committee are reported to the House, the House has authority to come to grips with what has taken place in the standing committee. That is the clear distinction.

If, for example, the matter before a standing committee is legislation, the matter then comes to the House at the report stage if amendments have taken place in the standing committee. The fact is that an appeal against procedural rulings in a standing committee is not provided for, but the same amendment can be, and frequently is, introduced in the House at the report stage that was refused on procedural grounds in the committee. Therefore, the House has to address itself as a whole to the very same decision that was taken in the standing committee.

When the proceedings of a standing committee, such as the one referred to by the hon. member for Crowfoot, are reported to the House, a number of arguments may be put

Order Paper Questions

forward relating to the proceedings that took place leading up to the report. Then the House is seized with the proceedings that take place in the House in a regular, procedural way. That is quite different from asking the Chair to make a judgment on a second-hand description of a decision that was taken in a standing committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief. I merely wish to point out that not only is there the precedent in the twenty-ninth parliament to which the hon. member for Crowfoot referred, but there is a precedent in this parliament in which Your Honour did what you now say is your right to do. I refer to the report which came back from a standing committee on Bill C-44. You found something wrong with the report, and that was the same with respect to the report in the last parliament.

I support Your Honour's position. It is quite a different thing for you to deal with a report that has been tabled and to find in your judgment that there are things in the report which should not be there, from Your Honour ruling on what a chairman did in the handling of a standing committee.

● (1540)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,039, 4,065, 4,124, 4,155 to 4,157 inclusive, 4,167, 4,301 to 4,303 inclusive, 4,595, 4,607, 4,608, 4,768, 4,777, 4,911 and 4,945.

[Text]

MECHANICS' LIEN AGAINST PART OF CFB COLD LAKE PROPERTY

Question No. 4,039—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. Is the government aware that a mechanics' lien registered in the Land Titles Office for the North Alberta Land Registration District at Edmonton on November 23, 1959 as Number 491, Book LS, Folio 16 is still registered against part of the Cold Lake Air Base property and, if so, does the government intend to vacate it?

2. Does the government intend to continue extradition proceedings against John Blandy Jenkins, former comptroller of City Construction Company Limited, in order that he may be tried in connection with fraudulent sworn declarations regarding monthly progress payments for the Cold Lake Air Base?

3. What progress has been made with the United States authorities in this case?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Defence and Justice as follows: 1. Yes. The Department of National Defence does not intend to vacate the mechanics' lien since such a lien filed pursuant to provincial legislation against