

Dominion-Provincial Relations

The Chairman: Order; may I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the speech to which he is referring was made on second reading of the bill, not in committee. It is not proper, therefore, to reply to the minister because that was a debate on the principle of the bill and now we are in committee.

(Translation):

Mr. Caron: Don't you think, Mr. Chairman, on this matter—

An hon. Member: Here is the light.

Mr. Caron: May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that when members opposite are speaking, I never interrupt them and I should like them to show me the same courtesy.

Don't you think, Mr. Chairman, that more latitude should be allowed, especially after what the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres (Mr. Cardin) has just said?

Mr. Chairman, if the ruling you have just made were irrevocable, this would constitute, in my opinion, a serious injustice towards opposition members, because no one could reply to the atrocities committed by the Minister of Finance. In fact, yesterday, at the end of the debate on second reading of the bill, the Minister of Finance said the worse inaccuracies and atrocities, to which it would be impossible for us to reply if—

Mr. Asselin: What section of the standing orders are you referring to?

Mr. Caron: I am referring to the practice which has been prevailing up to this day.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Hull knows very well that someone must always have the last word.

The hon. member knows very well that at the end of the debate on second reading, before the minister who introduces the bill takes the floor a second time, the Speaker or chairman must warn hon. members that the minister will close the debate, and I imagine that those words have a certain meaning. Moreover, it is obvious that a debate must always come to an end; that is the reason why the discussion held at the second reading stage cannot be resumed in committee.

Again, it is not a matter of preventing hon. members from expressing their views. However, the fact remains that if hon. members refuse to co-operate with the chairman of the committee in the enforcement of standing orders, it will be at their own expense.

It has just been suggested that I have been too lenient with the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier), and that I should therefore show the same leniency to other hon. members.

[Mr. Cardin.]

That, I think, indicates to every hon. member how important it is to abide closely by the standing orders.

I feel that hon. members should co-operate more closely with the chairman while exercising their privileges in accordance with standing orders.

(Text):

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, you are a relatively new member of the house. You were not here when the Minister of Finance—

An hon. Member: What has that to do with it?

Mr. Pickersgill:—and the Secretary of State for External Affairs and Mr. Drew sat on this side of the house and when this kind of latitude was allowed invariably on every bill on which the opposition wished to exercise it. Those speaking in the opposition were not harassed by constant points of order from the then minister of finance because he did not like the contribution that was being made. What we are being subjected to in this chamber by the present Minister of Finance is a shocking form of running closure, the like of which has never before been attempted.

The Chairman: In my opinion some of the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate were out of order.

An hon. Member: As usual.

The Chairman: With reference to the previous practice, I may say that I have consulted *Hansard* of 1956 and 1953 and I note that there was some discussion as to this problem we have here. Mr. Speaker Beaudoin then intimated that discussion in committee on clause 1 could not revive the debate on second reading. I may refer the hon. member to page 3992 of *Hansard* of May 16, 1956 when the chairman, Mr. Robinson—it was not Mr. Speaker Beaudoin—stated as follows:

This is a matter which raises a difficult problem in view of the fact that we are governed in committee by the strict rule of relevancy under standing order 59 (2). The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra in his remarks, I believe, used the word "rule" and he also used the word "right". I cannot concede that there is any "rule" allowing a broad debate such as he apparently has in mind, in view of the very clear language of standing order 59 (2).

I might say that in my personal opinion we are governed by the relevancy rule.

And so on. Mr. Beaudoin, when he was the chairman, on February 2, 1953, as found in *Hansard* at page 1551, stated as follows:

Hon. members will realize that the general discussion cannot extend beyond the two clauses