

Debating Time Allotment

too, could make a quotation, this one from Pope: A little learning is a dangerous thing.

An hon. Member: You have a hell of a lot.

Mr. Hees: Now you have exhausted your capacity for humour, let us get on with it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): While I may have exhausted my capacity for humour—

Mr. Hees: This is going to be terrific, Donald. I hope your wife is here today to hear that. She would be proud of you. What a meatball!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It has been argued that if I move my motion today I will be anticipating the motion of which the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has given notice, and that consequently my motion cannot be admitted.

This argument is based on the assumption that whenever a motion would bring on a debate and a decision by the house which might be brought on by another motion of which notice had been given, the former motion cannot be moved. But in the case under consideration, I would point out first of all that there is no question of supplanting a proceeding which has already begun. May states that a motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the house, whether it be a bill or an adjourned debate upon a motion. This citation appears on the same page as that to which the hon. member referred, though he did not quote it. In this case the motion has not even been moved. If the hon. member had moved his motion, and if a time had been appointed for the resumption of an adjourned debate upon that motion, the situation would obviously be different.

All that the house now has before it from the hon. member is a notice of motion. I raise this question: How can either Your Honour or the house know whether it is still the hon. member's intention to move that motion?

Mr. Aiken: I gather that it is not.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member strengthens my point by raising a doubt as to whether it will ever be moved. I cannot guarantee that it will, nor can you, Mr. Speaker. Nor can one predict when that motion would be called. Indeed, there seems to be a certain disposition in the house—and I refer to the words of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in this regard as

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

reported at page 10699 of *Hansard*—that the motion by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton should not only not be moved but that it should be dropped.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): See! I think it is clear from what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said and from what the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has said that there is reason to doubt that the motion of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton will go forward.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Of course not; he has been bulldozed by the government to drop it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): To ask that my motion, which I am quite prepared to move today provided the house disposes of the official languages bill, be prohibited because at some future time the hon. member may decide to move his motion, is to engage in dilatory speculation. Neither you, Mr. Speaker, nor the house should be asked to make decisions on such a basis.

Referring to the authorities, both Beauchesne, at the place indicated by the hon. member, and May make it clear that the decisive consideration involved here in deciding whether or not a proceeding already begun by a motion in the house can be supplanted by proceedings on another motion is whether or not the supplanting provisions, that is to say, the subsequent proceedings, will be at least as efficient as those supplanted. Here May says at page 399:

The rule against anticipation, which applies to other proceedings as well as motions, is that a matter must not be anticipated if it is contained in a more effective form of proceeding than the proceeding by which it is sought to be anticipated, but it may be anticipated if it is contained in an equally or less effective form.

In other words, when there is a conflict between the proceedings already begun and supplanting proceedings the test is the comparative efficiency of the proceedings. The question is: Will the new proceedings be at least as satisfactory for the house as those they will supplant? In the present instance, if the hon. member had moved his motion the question would be whether my proposed motion would enable the house to debate the subject of time allocation as effectively as his motion. The proceedings on my motion would not need to be better. All that would be necessary would be that my motion should