

during Question Period to proceed to Orders of the Day. That was on November 13, 1970. That motion was moved by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and was accepted by the Chair.

Based on that precedent and on my interpretation of the particular situation, I have to say that the motion presented by the President of the Privy Council was in order.

To refer to the arguments presented by the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) and others as to the sacredness of the right of a Member to present a petition, that right is not affected by using a dilatory sense motion, or as in this particular case a motion to advance the proceedings of the House. That right is not affected because, to quote Standing Order 71(1), Members may present a petition to the House during the sitting of the House "by filing the same with the Clerk of the House". There are other ways of presenting a petition. I do not feel the right of Hon. Members to present a petition has been affected, other than what is acceptable in this House. We all know that dilatory motions are an acceptable procedure which is confined by certain rules which we look at when a certain dilatory motion is presented to the House. In this particular case I have to say to Hon. Members that the motion presented by the President of the Privy Council yesterday was in order.

**Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, I listened to your ruling with a great deal of care because our House Leader presented what I thought was a totally cogent argument about an unfortunate ruling that came yesterday. I heard you make two points, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Order. I am very sorry, but I could not hear the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain on a point of order today because I did not make a ruling yesterday. I did certain other things at six o'clock. I adjourned the House on the basis of the logic of certain circumstances, but I cannot allow Hon. Members now to discuss this particular ruling. I just caution the Hon. Member about that.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Madam Speaker, I do not want to quibble on the point. We are faced with an extremely important matter in this Parliament. I am talking about a decision to accept a motion yesterday and the ruling which you have perhaps made or are about to make. If I understood what you said, you said that if there is not a rule in the book that prohibits something, then it will be permitted, which is, to understate it considerably, quite dubious. Second, you cited the one case to support your ruling—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. It is quite true that I did mention the fact that sometimes if there is nothing to prohibit something, we might consider that it is permitted. It is permitted through the practice of this House. We have had these kinds of motions before in circumstances that were quite similar. I have quoted a precedent which goes back to 1970, a time when a motion was moved by one of the Hon. Member's colleagues who is very conversant with the procedures of

Parliament. I am really sorry but I will not accept any further commentary on the ruling.

**Mr. Deans:** Madam Speaker, I must say I do regret the ruling. I wonder if I might ask a question.

**Madam Speaker:** Order. If the Hon. Member regrets the ruling, he knows what he can do. There are procedures whereby a Member can express regret about a ruling by the Chair. There is no way that this Parliament will work if we proceed by insinuations about the validity of the Speaker's ruling. I do ask Hon. Members to be careful about this particular point. It has nothing to do with me personally, but it does have to do with the office and the function that I have in this House.

MR. DEANS—OUTCOME OF VOTE TO BE DETERMINED BY MEMBERS

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Madam Speaker, I want to raise a separate point of order. Last evening at six o'clock the Speaker determined, I assume as a result of consultation although I must confess I was not party to it, to adjourn the House. This is the second occasion on which this has occurred, having occurred last week during a motion to adjourn. The bells were ringing and the Speaker determined at six o'clock that the motion to adjourn was in fact enforced by the Standing Order which requires the House to adjourn at six o'clock.

Last evening the motion before the House was quite different. It was not a motion to adjourn but a motion to adjourn, the outcome of which required a vote of the House of Commons to determine.

I submit it is inappropriate for the speaker to adjourn the House while the bells are ringing on a matter other than a motion to adjourn. The Speaker has considerable latitude in suspending the sitting, if it is the desire of the occupant of the Chair to do so, until such time as she is satisfied the House is ready to vote, as whoever the Speaker may be is entitled to do.

I suggest with all the respect that I can muster that the Chair does not have the authority to determine the outcome of a vote that has nothing to do with adjournment itself. The only people who can determine the outcome of a vote are the Members of the House of Commons. The Chair does not have that authority. It may well be that by some extension of logic, and I must confess this afternoon leaves me with some question as to logic in this place, the Chair may decide that by allowing the vote to take place it would simply take time and nothing much else could occur. That, however, is not for the Chair to decide. That is not the Chair's prerogative. The Chair's prerogative is only to ensure that a vote once called for takes place. The Members of the House of Commons who determine that a recorded division should occur should be given the opportunity to have that recorded division occur.

I suggest, without asking for any particular ruling at the moment, that the Chair consider the implications of such an act. The implications of such an act are that the Chair will now be put in a position of deciding the import of every motion