

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

---

**Monday, December 9, 1968**

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

[*Translation*]

### FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Fourth report of standing committee on finance, trade and economic affairs, in French and in English—Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau).

[*Note: Text of foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

### BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

#### TABLING OF SECOND REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

**Right Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, with the consent of the house, copies of the English and French versions of Volume II entitled "Education" of the report of the royal commission of inquiry on bilingualism and biculturalism.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Has the right hon. Prime Minister leave to table these documents?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

### PROCEDURE

#### MOTIONS FOR CONCURRENCE IN COMMITTEE REPORTS

On the order: Motions:

December 6, 1968—Mr. Blair (Chairman of the Special committee on procedure of the house):

That the fourth report of the special committee on procedure of the house, presented to the house on Friday, December 6, 1968, be concurred in.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to this notice of motion. The point of order I wish to raise is to the effect that in the light of the privileges and practices of the house this matter should not be dealt with in the way proposed, and further that consideration should be given to the form of this motion before we reach the point at which it is moved for debate. I do not

contend that it is necessary for Your Honour to rule on my point of order today, but in view of the fact that this is the first opportunity for me to raise the point of order I felt I should do so at this moment lest I be out of court if I left it until later.

Standing order 50 reads as follows:

Whenever Mr. Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the house is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament, he shall advise the house thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and quote the standing order or authority applicable to the case.

I do not contend that there is a precise rule or standing order governing this matter. Indeed, there are no standing orders that tell us how to revise our standing orders. I do contend, however, that dealing with the matter in this way is contrary to the privileges of parliament, and I make that contention on three grounds. In the first place I draw the attention of Your Honour and the house to the fact that on other occasions when the rules of the House of Commons have been subjected to a thorough overhaul, it has been done by referring the matter to the committee of the whole house. I contend, therefore, that it is against the privileges of parliament to ask us to deal with this major overhaul with the Speaker in the chair, which gives us no opportunity to deal with the various rules one by one.

May I take a moment to document my contention that the privileges of parliament are clear so far as our past practice is concerned. In 1867, the first time there was any revision of the rules this parliament inherited from the parliament of the former Province of Canada, a motion was made on December 28 to refer the proposals made by the committee at that time to the committee of the whole house.

The next time the rules were revised was in 1876, and the same practice was followed. If you will consult *Hansard* for that year, at page 905, for March 29, 1876, you will find that the matter was referred to the committee of the whole house. The rules were dealt with seriatim by that committee of the whole house, and subsequently the house gave them both second and third reading.