

*Point of Order—Mr. Hnatyshyn*

another matter. But, as things stand now, it cannot be said that because Standing Order 15(2) was introduced just recently the other standing orders become non applicable. There is in my view a basic principle that must be respected. When an act or a regulation is amended or a new one is introduced, each provision is construed in light of the others and they must all be consistent, otherwise they are amended. This has not been done in this case.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to limit myself strictly to the point that was raised, much has been made this week about the introduction of new members. This delayed the oral question period, and per force Standing Order 15(2) was not adhered to. As you very appropriately emphasized, you assumed there was unanimous consent, there was no objection, and you quite rightly did so. One thing must be said however. Although new members do not come every day, each and every day motions are put under Standing Order 43. Things must be looked at in their right perspective, Mr. Speaker. As you can see, my point is therefore very logical. I believe we have no choice if we want an orderly House, we must simply abide by our standing orders. They are clear. Four are relevant to the case. If we are not happy with the result—and for quite some time I for one and other members on this side of the House have been suggesting our procedure should be amended—let us sit down and modernize parliament, let us make it more efficient by all means. In the meantime, let us apply the rules, let all parties be treated on the same footing as provided for in our rules.

Coming finally to the suggestion by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who asked for consent that one speaker from each party deal with today's motion, my view is that it would be a dangerous precedent. Because you know it is not every day we receive sensible motions under Standing Order 43. Most of the time you know how the preambles are too long, they are partisan, and the rule is abused. However, this will be the subject of another debate you have reserved and in which I will welcome the opportunity to participate. On the precise suggestion itself, Mr. Speaker, the mere fact that consent has been granted—and I think the Leader of the Opposition understands me—to the waiver of notice under S. O. 43 for the hon. member putting his motion forward reflects a collective will to concur in the substance of the motion that today be called Arts Day. I believe that any additional debate and a division would be futile and a needless waste of the time of the House. It is an undeniable fact that all hon. members agree on the contents of this motion, but the government needs more time to discuss matters which have higher priority. That is all I wanted to say.

● (1542)

[*English*]

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, my heart bleeds for this poor government which is so afflicted by the backbenchers of this House, particularly the opposition, that it is not able to carry out its functions. After listening to 20 years

[Mr. Pinard.]

of amendments to rules of the House, particularly in the last 12 or 15 years, I know that every time rules are made there is an attempt by the government, which unfortunately too often is supported by the Chair, and I exclude Your Honour, so far, from that—

**An hon. Member:** Cheap!

**Mr. Baldwin:**—which has the effect of denying private members the rights they have had. These rights have been taken away from them slowly over the last number of years. There is no question about that. If it is not asking too much, I would hope the House would approach the question of these rules in a mood of common sense. I know this is difficult to ask from members of the government side, but I would hope this would be done. I think this requires an examination chronologically of these rules.

I had something to do with Standing Order 43. I do not know whether I was the father, godfather, or grandfather. I remember it was originally used at a time when the House was seeking a chance to debate a motion dealing with the problem in Biafra. We used a motion at that time. Unanimous consent was secured, and we went ahead and had an excellent debate. Use of the rule has grown since then. I would be the first to admit that there are occasions when we may need to look closely at the rule and its application, but that is a question for another debate.

I was involved in the debate on Standing Order 45(2) as a member of the procedure committee. I agree thoroughly with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). It was thought, quite properly, that debate on certain motions, particularly motions with regard to concurring in a committee's report, should not go on and on ad nauseam and the sensible decision was made and accepted on both sides of the House that we would limit debate at that time to one day. A motion to concur in a report of a committee would be a motion which would come within, for example, the parameters of Standing Order 45(2). Both sides agreed the House should have a one-day debate on a motion of that kind, and that was it. I think the same thing was understood to apply to Standing Order 43. But it was much later than that when changes were made with regard to the establishment of fixed times.

I would suggest to Your Honour, as a member of the profession to which you and I have the honour to belong, that common sense should be applied and that the application of those fixed times must be taken to be ingrafted on our rules subject to the existing arrangements.

I think the wording of Standing Order 45(2) gives support for my view. It says:

When a debate on any motion made prior to the reading of the orders of the day is adjourned or interrupted—

I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to those words "adjourned or interrupted". I think in the first place you could apply the rule of *ejusdem generis*—the "interrupted" must be taken to be within the context of the word "adjourned". I am supported in that contention. I was able to send for the dictionary. This is a dictionary from the Table; I am sure Your