

No. 222

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1971

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

By leave of the House, Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—White Paper (United Kingdom) entitled "Rhodesia—Proposals for a Settlement", November, 1971.—Sessional Paper No. 283-7/46.

Mr. MacEachen, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, from his place in the House, stated that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B with respect to consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill C-259, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and to make certain provisions and alterations in the statute law related to or consequential upon the amendments to that Act and, under the provisions of Standing Order 75c, gave notice of his intention to move a motion at the next sitting of the House that four additional days be allotted for the consideration of the said bill at that stage.

And a point of order having been raised with respect to the interpretation of Standing Order 75;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no other contributions to the interesting debate on the procedural point raised by the

honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) I might be prepared to give my opinion at this stage. Dealing first with the last point, the one mentioned by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I should like to reiterate that what he is doing now is providing a *caveat* which refers to the possible application and reference of Standing Order 75A and 75B and to the question of whether, in certain circumstances, it would be open to a Minister on behalf of the Crown to invoke the provisions of Standing Order 75c in cases where there has been agreement between the three parties in the House which are in opposition to the government. Of course, as has been pointed out by honourable Members, this is a theoretical point at this time on which the Chair should not be called upon to rule. I should therefore like to go to the other two points, those which were raised by the honourable Member for Peace River.

The honourable Member for Peace River suggested, I think, that the motion should propose a time allocation to cover all the remaining stages. He suggests, if I understand him well, that it is irregular to bring a motion which would refer to only one stage. This, essentially, is the point that he has made. If I am wrong, and the honourable Member seems to indicate that I am, I