

Summer Recess

time to reflect, consider, and consult. That is something to which I referred a little earlier and I think is a rather good idea. If hon. members are agreeable, I would suggest that the House be adjourned until the call of the Chair, which I suggest would be approximately at nine o'clock. The Chair will consult with the Speaker and the Table officers. May I have that indulgence on the part of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Do I need to have a vote on that or may the Chair have that courtesy?

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that you have accepted the suggestion. However, just before you leave the Chair I notice that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona and the hon. member for Burlington would like to say a few words to you, sir.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair has already made the decision not to recognize several other hon. members who have stood in their places to be recognized. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has been recognized twice or even three times tonight. Before recognizing him, I would certainly recognize other hon. members who wished to contribute to this debate. Therefore, if the House is agreed, I will adjourn the House until the call of the Chair, which will be at approximately nine o'clock.

SITTING SUSPENDED

At 8.28 p.m. the sitting was suspended.

● (2110)

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 9.09 p.m.

Madam Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the incident which took place some time ago in the House and on whether an hon. member should be heard on the motion which was about to be put.

Technically speaking, I think we can say that the process of putting the question had really begun when the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) rose, but I also think hon. members will recognize that the process of debate had not been concluded, and I want to remind hon. members what constitutes the full process of debate. I refer to Erskine May, who says that the essential stages in obtaining a decision of the House are, first, the moving of a motion; second, the proposing of a question by the Chair; and third, the putting of the question and collection of voices by the Chair. That process has three stages which are very clearly defined.

The nearest precedent we could find in the very short time available to us is dated December 4, 1962, when the House had agreed to a motion. The process of debate had been completed, as hon. members will see from the precedent I will quote, and there was then a request from someone in the House to revert to the prior business of the House, a member

having alleged there was too much noise and turmoil in the House and that he could not properly follow what was taking place. On that occasion the Speaker said, and I quote from *Hansard* for December 4, 1962, at page 2287:

For one thing, of course the Chair will not accept any suggestion that it is moving too rapidly. The Chair is following the well established practices of this House. In fact, if the hon. member will consult with me I can tell him the practice of some of my predecessors as to at what stage they were when the words "Adopté; carried" were put; they were almost around the back of the chair. However, there is no question that the bill was called. Third reading was moved and seconded, and I called it. The Clerk gave it third reading and it was adopted and carried. The house cannot toss its business back and forth.

That too is an important principle which I would like to recall to the House. However, the difference between that particular case and the one we have before us tonight is that the question had been fully put and the House had made a decision on that question, which had been fully put.

In the case we have before us tonight the process had begun, no doubt, and I think the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) admitted that the process had begun, but if hon. members will recall what constitutes the full process, the three stages of that process, then that process had not been completed. An hon. member interrupted it seeking the floor at the time the Speaker was asking for dispensation with respect to reading the question in toto.

I quote in support of my ruling Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 63 at page 51 which says:

When the debate on a question is closed, and the House is ready to decide thereon, the Speaker says: "Is the House ready for the question?" If it is evident that no member claims the right of speaking, the Speaker proceeds to put the question by reading the main motion, and then the amendment or amendments in their order as the case may be.

I think we have adopted the practice in this House that even if the process has commenced and an hon. member rises to ask a question or make a point or order, the Chair, when the process is not completed, has always recognized a member and allowed him to express himself.

My ruling is very much based on the right of hon. members to express themselves in the House. This is the most sacred thing the Speaker must protect, and I am sure hon. members will understand that my whole approach to this particular incident was to try to protect the right of members to express themselves, which is not only given to them for themselves, but also for their constituents who have sent them to Parliament to represent them. The key words in Beauchesne, of course, are "If it is evident that no member seeks the floor". In this case it was certainly evident that a member sought the floor since an hon. member did rise and interrupted the Speaker in a process which had begun. I quite admit that, but it was evident that a member wished to speak. Therefore, I must recognize the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to be able to participate in this debate which, contrary to what some observers might think, is on a motion to adjourn the House until October 14, a