

Debating Time Allotment

bring on proceedings at least as effective as those already in progress on his motion.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that my motion would bring the house into direct contact with the subject of time allocation. It would permit the house itself to amend the proposed new standing orders. In the case of the motion of which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has given notice, the subject of time allocation would be approached by the house only indirectly, as the hon. member for Peace River has pointed out, that is, by considering whether or not to concur in the report of a committee. In a proceeding of that kind the house itself would not be able to amend the proposed new standing orders. It would be able only to send the report back to the committee for amendment.

We now find ourselves in a situation the reverse of that in which we were placed last December. At that time, and for good reasons, I submit, when involved changes in standing orders were being considered, particularly with regard to supply, it was decided that the house should consider those changes by way of a report and discuss the recommendations in a general way before making a further reference to the committee with regard to a complex picture. But here we have a simple question—whether these recommendations should be adopted, or whether the terms of the standing order should be amended by the house itself in the course of debate. This subject is not one so complex that an approach by way of returning a report is desirable. I mention this, not to claim that the proceedings on my motion would necessarily be more efficient. Rather, I am only claiming that the proceedings on my motion would permit a debate at least equal in efficiency to the proceedings on a motion to concur. If this is a valid claim, then I submit that both May and Beauchesne show I have a right to make my motion.

Hon. members will readily understand what the consequences of any interpretation of the rule against unwarranted anticipation other than the one given by Beauchesne and May must be. If merely by introducing a public bill, or by inscribing a notice of motion under that heading in *Votes and Proceedings* and then relying on speculation that the bill or motion would be proceeded with inside a reasonable time, a member could block government bills or motions dealing with the same subject, it could be made impossible for parliamentary government to continue. On every issue in every session a government

could be rendered impotent by the exaggerated interpretation of the rule against anticipation now favoured by the hon. member for Peace River.

Perhaps I might deal with one of the arguments raised by the hon. member last week, namely that by proceeding on my motion the opportunity to discuss the report would be lost. I should like to bring to the attention of the house the decision of Mr. Speaker on February 24, 1936 to be found in volume 74 of *Canadian Commons Journals* at page 68 wherein the Speaker of the day, ruling in favour of a motion put forward by the government, made it perfectly clear that the motion which was being supplanted could be discussed when the matter in question was under consideration.

● (2:40 p.m.)

Therefore, if I have taken some time to present what I believe is the rule on anticipation, it is because a decision in this instance favourable to the views put forward by the hon. member could not help but be damaging to parliamentary government, and I think would push us toward a congressional system.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) seems to get some satisfaction out of the fact that I would like to see the motion in the name of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) dropped. May I say that that is a correct statement, and that I should like to see the motion of the President of the Privy Council dropped as well.

Let there be any doubt about this, let me make it perfectly clear that we on this side of the house are completely opposed to the provisions of rule 75c. We are opposed to it in substance, and we are opposed to any moves that might facilitate getting that rule through the house.

The President of the Privy Council has sought to argue that the rule on anticipation can be brought into play against a second motion only when debate on one motion has actually been commenced. I submit that the authorities are not as clear on that point as the President of the Privy Council would have us believe. For example, if one looks at the wording of citation 131 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, he finds these words:

In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time.