Time Allocation

nays having been heard, the bells are then limited to 15 minutes and that will take us to six o'clock.

May I suggest to the Chair that, this argument having been made, it is not necessary to make any firm decision at this point as to the regularity or propriety of having come back here at 5.12. I know that the Chair has been advised and is convinced that it is right in having done so, but the Chair does not have to adopt that position in view of the time and may leave this question open for a later decision rather than having a questionable precedent on our books.

I make that submission sincerely since it is not necessary to come to the kind of conclusion which I anticipate the Chair might do if we still had two hours or more to go.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I should like to disprove some of the allegations the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has just made. After I have completed my remarks, he may not have to rely on the bell ringing for an additional 15 minutes and calling Hon. Members for a vote to reach 6 p.m., the time for the adjournment of the House. I wish to indicate to the House that there is in Beauchesne's 5th Edition a single citation which disproves the point the Hon. Member for Yukon has been trying to make concerning the definition of proceedings or délibérations.

Before coming to that particular citation in Beauchesne's which clearly states that proceedings include the holding of a vote and the voting procedure, I should like to return, for the information of the Hon. Member, to the previous course of events. About 3.12 p.m., you recognized the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) under the item *Motions* and not on a point of order. He rose under the item *Motions* and was about to start his remarks, and as was indicated by the Hon. Member for Yukon himself, the Minister of Transport had had time to say "I move—" I submit that was enough to stop any Hon. Member of the House from moving a motion under Standing Order 33 which provides that when several Hon. Members rise at the same time, one of them may rise and suggest that some other Hon. Member be heard.

You were perfectly aware of Citation 302, which appears at page 99 of Beauchesne's 5th Edition and which reads:

(2) A motion that a Member "be now heard" must be moved before the Member recognized has begun speaking.

That is clear, Madam Speaker, and justification enough for you to say after a while to the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) that his point of order was unacceptable. Still, since he had called your attention to raise a point of order, it was only logical that you listen to his point of order. That is why you had to interrupt the Minister of Transport who had begun speaking, even though he had not gone very far, he had said at least two or three words, but indeed you had to know the nature of the point of order which the Hon. Member was trying to raise. When he moved his motion, you

were then in a position to realize that he was moving a motion pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 33. I raised my objection and drew your attention to the fact that the Minister of Transport had begun speaking. You remembered Beauchesne's Citation 302 and said to the Hon. Member for Vegreville: "I cannot entertain your motion because, according to parliamentary procedure experts and past practices, it is out of order". You made your ruling on that, and I do not think that the Hon. Member for Yukon wanted to challenge or question your ruling when he referred to those facts. However, we have to go back to those facts to understand where we stand now.

Therefore the debate on the motion under Standing Order 82 began at 2.12 p.m. Standing Order 82 concludes as follows:

—two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

The word "proceedings" is used.

It seems quite clear to me that you have made the proper decision. The Standing Orders are quite specific and bind the Speaker who "shall" put an end to the proceedings. We have to ask ourselves, since the Hon. Member for Vegreville had subsequently moved that the House proceed to the orders of the day, if calling in the members must be considered part of the proceedings. The answer to that question, Madam Speaker, is found in the fifth edition of Beauchesne. First, citation 251, at page 85, I quote:

Motions, amendments, references to committees, and the three readings of bills come under the term of "proceedings in Parliament". They are the means used to the end that a matter may be considered and disposed of by the House. The word "proceeding" is derived from the verb "to proceed" which means "to advance" or "to carry on a series of actions". Members take part in the proceedings usually by making speeches; however, many proceedings take place without any debate.

In view of the late hour, I spare you the rest of the quote. But there is another quote in Beauchesne that is still more specific it supports and confirms my point, and it refutes that made by my learned colleague from Yukon. It is found at page 91, citation 284, paragraph (2), bottom half of the page. It is short but precise. I quote:

It has never been understood in the House of Commons that the word "proceedings" covered speeches; it is not applied to arguments but it covers such things as utterances bearing directly on making motions, moving amendments, presenting reports, putting the questions, answering questions placed on the Order Paper, voting, naming a Member; it is construed as relating to procedure and not to debates.

● (1740)

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is clear that you had to stop the ringing of the bells, you had to stop the voting procedure on the motion presented by the Hon. Member for Vegreville, because Standing Order 82 provides that two hours after the commencement of proceedings on a motion to limit the debate, you shall interrupt the proceedings. Proceedings are involved when the bells ring! . . . they are proceedings because a voting procedure is involved, and this is established by the quotes I