could propose his motion, since it purported to concur in a substantive proposal, only as a private member's notice of motion. Later in his comments the minister suggested that the House should not adopt a practice whereby a private member might raise a substantive question by means of a motion to concur in a report of a standing committee rather than by the other methods provided for such under our Standing Orders.

There may be considerable merit in that position, but on this occasion it is the sole and only duty of the Chair to look at the notice of motion to ensure that it has been prepared in accordance with the practices and usage of this House.

The most important question is whether it is competent for any private member or any unauthorized member of a committee to propose a motion to concur in a report of a standing committee. It is apparent that there is a dearth of precedents to which the Chair may revert for guidance in regard to the question now being considered. At the same time the Chair must not disregard any precedents that in fact exist.

The precedent of May 23, 1932, and that of May 19, 1947, both of which were cited by the President of the Privy Council yesterday, seem to establish the point that a member who is not a member of a committee may move concurrence in a report.

A review of the *Journals* for 1964-65 will indicate that no fewer than four different members moved concurrence in various reports of the Special Committee on Procedure.

An extensive search of the records of the House has failed to disclose that any objection to a motion made under circumstances similar to those now under review has ever been made. Taking into account these precedents, few though they may be, I am of the opinion that the motion may be proposed by any private member.

The next point to be reviewed is whether the notice of motion has been properly placed on the Orders of the Day. Notwithstanding the persuasiveness of the submission made by the President of the Privy Council to the effect that private members or unauthorized members of a committee should not be able to raise substantive questions in the manner proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca, the provisions of the report of the Special Committee on Procedure, as adopted on July 12, 1955, and recorded at page 944 of the *Journals* for that date, make it obligatory to place a motion to concur in a report under heading "Motions." That provision reads as follows:

> That motions for concurrence in reports of any standing or special committee, for the suspension of any Standing Order, or such other motions made upon routine proceedings, as may be required for the observances of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangements of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment shall be listed, when notice is required, called and disposed of under "Motions."

The relative words in this citation of course are, "motions for concurrence in reports of any standing or special committee." The motion to concur in the report is, I suggest, in its proper position on the Order Paper.

By way of conclusion I should like to make the following observation and suggestion, if I may. Under our new Standing Orders the standing and special committees have assumed a more important role in the legislative process. For obvious reasons our authorities do not take account of this development. In view of the decision I have taken to allow the motion of the hon. member for Athabasca to stand under motions and in light of the necessary proliferation of committee reports, there is the risk that the business announced each Thursday by the President of the Privy Council could be seriously disrupted by committees who feel their reports should be debated rather than government business. This was the point made very forcibly and clearly yesterday by the President of the Privy Council and it is a difficulty which the Chair fully recognizes. My suggestion would be that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization might like to examine this situation to suggest ways in which the business of the House can be arranged in order to reconcile the demand of committees to have their reports brought forward for debate with the requirements of government business.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been some consultations between the parties on this point and agreement reached to stand the hon. member's motion for today's sitting and also for tomorrow. Perhaps I could ask that the matter be allowed to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baldwin: At the request of the government.