

*Procedure and Organization*

Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre, and seconded by Mr. Winch, is that this house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) then said:

Mr. Speaker, I was rising originally to support the admissibility of the motion.

Your Honour then said:

Perhaps the hon. member might now like to speak to the motion itself.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, with those words of July 17 you ruled that it was an admissible motion and it could be moved by any member of the House of Commons, not necessarily by the government house leader. Your Honour ruled that the motion was procedurally correct and was on all fours with our Standing Orders. I submit that in view of that ruling, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) having thoroughly dealt with the precedents in this respect, this is a proper motion, it is admissible and should be put.

With regard to the argument that a motion such as this can be put only by the government house leader, I repeat that the motion does not concern the question of business. It is a motion dealing with the time of adjournment of the house. Last night we witnessed an angry parliament. If the house leaders have the opportunity to sit down and negotiate, and observe the dignity and decorum of this place, it will be worth while because Canada is watching parliament and needs parliament. Parliament will determine whether it shall live or die. The motivation behind my motion is to give the house leaders an opportunity to sit around the table and negotiate with the hope of reaching a compromise.

Had I any other motivation or reason behind the motion I would not have stood in my place and moved it. I submit that the motion is procedurally correct and is put forward on a sound basis. It is the kind of motion we can expect to raise this place to the kind of dignity Canadians expect of us, rather than having the guillotine methods which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the President of the Privy Council wish to use.

● (3:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I suggest to hon. members that discussion on this point should be limited to the point of order, which is on whether the proposed motion is admissible.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

If there are no further comments I should like to express a few brief thoughts in connection with the proposed motion. I should like to state first, despite what has been suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), that no ruling whatsoever was made by the Chair when this matter first came up when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre first proposed his motion. As he knows, this is a very new type of motion; it was new to the extent of having been difficult for the Chair alone, or with the assistance of the Table officials, to accept or refuse the motion, but in view of the fact that no objection had been made to it the motion was put to the house. So I do not feel bound by anything because actually there was no ruling. A question was simply put to the house, and this is my view, one which I hold very strongly.

At the same time I still have the reservations which I had previously. I cannot agree with the argument put forth by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) because, as has been pointed out by other hon. members who took part in the debate, the precedent to which the President of the Privy Council referred did not deal precisely with the point but rather with the arrangement of the business of the house, and to that extent would not be covered by Standing Order 42(1). I think that Standing Order 42(1) is beyond the scope of the precedent which he quoted.

At the same time the very interesting precedent, quoted by the hon. members representing the opposition parties who took part in this debate, is also to some extent not quite relevant because that precedent of 1961 basically dealt with the extension of sittings and, as hon. members know, our new Standing Orders, particularly rule 6(5) (a), cover a situation which has been dealt with by the precedent. So I am not convinced either by the precedent against or by the precedent in favour.

If anything will tip the scale in favour of the motion, it is the Standing Order itself. I have great reservations about the Standing Order, whether it really means what it is purported to mean. Hon. members know that they have to refer to the French translation to interpret it the way they want. In my view it is just as legitimate to interpret the French version of our rules as the English, but it produces a new concept that hon. members have to refer to one side of the page of the Standing Order to interpret the rule one way