

ourable Member for Peace River initially raised his point of order. He himself recognized this this evening, though I am sure that when he heard the lengthy presentations that followed his cursory submission to the House he must have felt a little unhappy that he had not taken the opportunity to repeat for the guidance of the Chair the lengthy and very cogent arguments that he had earlier submitted on July 2.

At that time I considered at length the arguments that were advanced by the honourable Member for Peace River, by the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and by the honourable Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). With the advice, counsel and guidance of the clerks and other advisers who assist the Chair in such difficult matters, I considered all aspects of the problem. Following this consideration I reached the decision that is recorded in *Hansard* for July 3.

I am afraid that the situation has not changed. We have exactly the same situation this evening as we had originally. I ruled on the former occasion that the motion that had been proposed by the President of the Privy Council for the consideration of the House should be transferred to Government Orders under the provisions of Standing Order 21. As pointed out by the honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis), I had said that it is at the point we are now reaching that the anticipation rule might become operative in the sense that the Minister's motion, if proceeded with, might block consideration of the committee report.

If I were asked to rule on this point at this time, I would have to say that I agree that our proceeding with the Minister's motion at this time does effectively block consideration of the motion that might have been proposed by the honourable Member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair).

At the same time I might say, having taken into account the arguments advanced by members of the opposition, that if the honourable Member for Grenville-Carleton had moved his motion I would have recognized that the rule of anticipation would have given his motion precedence, that I would have allowed his motion to go forward in preference to the motion that is now before the House in the name of the President of the Privy Council. I would have so ruled in view of the fact that our committees have now taken on a new significance. Under the Rules of the House and in the reports of the Standing Committee on Procedure we have given a new role to our committees. Since the honourable Member's motion refers to the report of a committee of the House of Commons, I would have recognized that the honourable Member's motion had precedence over the motion of the President of the Privy Council and, if moved, would have blocked the Minister's motion.

However, the Minister's motion is now before the House. Certainly the rules allow the Minister to make a motion at the present time. The motion having been moved, I suggest to honourable Members that it has to be considered.

Many other issues were brought before the House for the consideration of the Chair, though I am not sure they were entirely relevant. Honourable Members want me to substitute my judgment and my ruling for that of the House of Commons. If a majority of the Members of the House think that this motion should not be adopted, that it should be voted down and we should proceed later on with another motion, then it is up to them to take this course. Honourable Members should not ask the Speaker to do this on their behalf. My duty and my responsibility is to rule according to the rules that honourable Members adopt and pass, and which they expect the Speaker to respect on their behalf. I think it might be a dictatorial act on the part of the Chair to assume