

*Procedure and Organization*

However, it is necessary to consider 75B in relation to 75c. What is the effect? When can 75c be invoked by a minister of the crown? Proposed Standing Order 75c provides:

A minister of the Crown who from his place in the house at a previous sitting has stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings—

And so on. The minister can then move a motion. He has to state in the house that agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B. Let us suppose there is a meeting and the representatives of the opposition parties all agree as to the time to be allocated to a certain proceeding and the President of the Privy Council does not agree; he does not accept it. He does not have to act on that agreement; he can come into the house and invoke 75c. Can he then come into the house and say there has been no agreement under the provisions of 75A or 75B? What is the opinion of the chairman of the committee on that one? Clearly he could do that under the motion presented by the President of the Privy Council, because that motion changed 75B and provided that there could be no agreement under 75B unless the representative of the government party was a party to the agreement. There is no doubt that had the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) been allowed to go ahead with his motion, he or a representative of the government could have invoked 75c, if adopted, every time the government did not agree with the opposition parties.

But can he do so under the report we are now being asked to adopt? It seems to me pretty clear that a representative of the government could not invoke 75c unless he is able to stand in his place and say there has been no agreement under 75A or 75B. In other words, he cannot invoke 75c with regard to the allocation of time on a particular measure if the representatives of the opposition parties are in agreement upon some other time allocation. I suggest that this is so. If my interpretation is right, the President of the Privy Council or anybody else speaking for the government in the house can make no use of 75c as long as the representatives of the opposition parties are in agreement among themselves as to how much time is to be allocated for a certain proposal before the house. If my interpretation is correct, the representatives of the opposition parties will control the allocation of time in the house as long as they are in agreement.

I would suppose that as far as the rest of the life of this parliament is concerned, in view of the lessons the opposition parties have learned in dealing with the government the representatives of the opposition parties will have very little difficulty reaching agreement among themselves in order to protect themselves against the government. It may very well be argued that 75c can be used. A minister could say that no agreement had been reached under 75A. I do not believe this is so, but the President of the Privy Council, the chairman of the committee or somebody else may argue it. If the argument is put forward, it will depend upon the ruling of the Speaker at the time. The Speaker will have to decide what 75c means as it is drafted. Does the government intend to push this rule through the house if, in fact, 75c can be invoked only when the opposition parties disagree within the meaning of 75B? Do backbenchers on the other side of the house understand that all the fighting now going on is to get a 75c that the government could use only in those cases when the representatives of the opposition parties could not agree among themselves? Whose tail is in the trap?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Hello.

**Some hon. Members:** Hurrah!

**Mr. MacEachen:** If that is the interpretation the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) is making and he is taking that view, what is the purpose of the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman's house leader?

**Mr. Stanfield:** I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker, if my friend would be patient.

**Mr. MacEachen:** There is more than one tail in the trap.

**Mr. Stanfield:** The minister just came into the house and he can be patient for a few minutes. I shall not keep him too long.

**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** The P.M. is allowing you to say something again, Allan, is he?

**Mr. Stanfield:** I assume from what has been said by hon. members opposite, and emphasized from time to time, that the government will not allow itself to be controlled by the opposition parties in regard to the allocation of time. Therefore, I assume the government