

Point of Order—Mr. Deans

that is up for a vote. The Chair will have to determine on every occasion at six o'clock whether or not the motion is of sufficient importance, not to the Members but to the Chair, to justify waiting until the Members are prepared to vote.

• (1600)

I do not believe that it is the prerogative of the Chair to make that kind of judgment. I do not believe that it is the prerogative of the Chair to evaluate the worth of a motion before the House of Commons. I considered yesterday's motion to be out of order and the bells ought not to have been ringing at six o'clock anyway, and I still feel that way. However, regardless of what the Chair may feel is the value of a motion, if a motion is duly moved, the only ones who can dispose of that motion, unless there is a specific Standing Order that intervenes, are the Members of the House of Commons by recorded division.

I ask, Madam Speaker, in the interests of the House operating with any degree of fairness and common sense, that the Chair please not put herself in the position of having to make judgments about the relative values of motions that are standing before the House awaiting disposition by Members of the House of Commons.

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I think that this is a very simple matter. The Hon. Member wrongly stated that you, Madam Speaker, cannot stop the bells the way you did last night at six o'clock because there is no Standing Order authorizing you to do so. I respectfully submit that that is very wrong. Standing Order No. 1 is very clear. It states:

1. In all cases not provided for hereafter or by sessional or other orders, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as in force at the time shall be followed so far as they may be applicable to this House.

There is no Standing Order in our book, Madam Speaker, that states that you have the right to stop the bells at six o'clock. Just because there is no Standing Order does not mean that you have no authority to do so, because Standing Order 1 refers to practice followed in the United Kingdom. The other day you referred quite rightly to May's Nineteenth Edition at page 295 where it reads:

Dilatory motions, i.e. motions for the adjournment of the House or of the debate, or that the chairman do report progress, or do leave the chair, pending at the moment of interruption, lapse without question put.

Since our Standing Orders are silent on this subject, the passage I just read is applicable because Standing Order 1 refers to practice in the United Kingdom and the case referred to happened in the United Kingdom.

It now becomes important to know what a dilatory motion is, and that is why I say that the matter is simple. If the motion I moved yesterday is a dilatory motion in the sense understood by May, then that solves the matter.

Let me quote from Bourinot's Fourth Edition, page 322:

There is a class of motions, common to all parliamentary assemblies, intended to have the effect of superseding or delaying the consideration of a question. For

instance, motions for the adjournment of the house or debate, for reading the orders of the day, and for the previous question, are all in this direction.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is obvious that the motion to go to Orders of the Day is, in a sense, a dilatory motion as understood by the authors May and Bourinot. It was a dilatory motion to move to something else, something which was the main subject of discussion and is so important, something which we want to debate and which the NDP does not want to debate.

What I am saying is that the motion moved yesterday was a dilatory motion in that sense. It is covered by the precedent in the United Kingdom that you have referred to, Madam Speaker, and which is quoted in May's Nineteenth Edition at page 295. It seems obvious to me that logic is important but understanding and knowledge of the rules and practice of the House is also most important before judgment is passed on any situation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, I have two points to make. I followed the argument of the Member for Hamilton Mountain on the question of vote with interest. Referring to page 25686 of *Hansard*, you make the statement, Madam Speaker:

That motion, of course, is in order, pursuant to Standing Order 50. All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that at that point we have gone beyond a debate and are now into the putting of the motion which, under Standing Order 12, gives Members an opportunity to be recorded as to where they stand on whether or not they should move to Orders of the Day.

It was perhaps missed in the discussion last week, but the motion last week that the House do now adjourn was in fact won by the Opposition on the verbal division and was so declared by the Chair. We are sure that the Government felt it was very important that it have an opportunity to have a recorded division on that vote. It did not have that opportunity, but that is a question that I believe should be addressed, the question of whether or not, once the question is called for on the yeas and nays, the House does not move out of debate and into the question under Standing Order 12 of a vote. That is one point.

The other point I would make, Madam Speaker, is this, the Government House Leader has referred to Standing Order 1 which provides that under the rules, if the House finds that something is not covered by our Standing Orders, it can refer to the Standing Orders of the United Kingdom. Standing Order 1 and Standing Order 27 of the United Kingdom make reference to what can be debated and what cannot be debated. I am by no means an expert, and I do not know who in this House is an expert, on what the Standing Orders of the United Kingdom say with respect to debate on this type of motion, but it would appear that under the Standing Orders of the United Kingdom the House can debate the question whether the