

Tabling of Documents

30. What will happen is that we will certainly go on to motions.

What I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, because I think the question is whether this is a dilatory tactic—no doubt about that—to which the Government resorts to achieve its ends, is whether this dilatory tactic is in order, can a member move a motion when the only reason he has the floor is to deal with a daily routine item? This is the point on which I should like to comment.

Under "Daily Routine" we have the item "Tabling of documents", and this is when the Parliamentary Secretary rose to say: I am tabling responses pursuant to Standing Order 106, responses to petitions presented to the House. He took this opportunity to move a motion to go on to the eighth item and have the House proceed with "Motions". Mr. Speaker, I say and I maintain that he does not have the right to do that in the House. He does not have the right in the House to use a daily routine item, "Tabling of documents", to introduce a dilatory motion to go directly to item No. 8, which is "Motions" under "Daily Routine". As I see it, he does not have the right to do that because this particular item can only relate to tabling of documents, statements by Ministers, reports from parliamentary delegations, committee reports, petitions, and introduction of Bills. In my opinion, a member cannot skip over all these items and go directly to "Motions" when he has the floor for a specific purpose. Not anymore than recently when the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) rose in the House, he had the floor to speak about his Bill, to explain to the House why his Bill was intended to restore capital punishment one way or another. Although it was not a particularly attractive piece of legislation, it had to be introduced and we voted to give him leave to do that. He rose in the House and as we so graphically put it in English—

• (1110)

[English]

He tried to bootleg in a dilatory motion to go to the next item of business which was against all the rules as far as I am concerned. You sustained that. Indeed, you said that he could not do that. The Chair told the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) that he could not utilize an item under routine business to bootleg in something else. This morning we have the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Lewis) again come in, under Tabling of Documents, and try to bootleg another motion, that we now proceed to motions. That is a similar circumstance and just as unacceptable in terms of parliamentary procedure, as far as I am concerned. I submit that if he could not do it last week under Introduction of Bills, then he cannot do it today under Tabling of Documents.

Mr. Speaker: Before the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) completes his remarks, I might ask him to address carefully the matter of which he just spoke. It seems to be the memory of the Chair that with respect to the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain), the

Chair's ruling was that when it came to Introduction of Bills the Member for Mission—Port Moody did not have the floor until the Bill had been read and introduced and voted upon. It was only after that that the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody had the floor and did make the motion to move to the next item of business, which the Chair sustained.

Of course, the Hon. Member is perfectly right that the Chair insisted that the rubric be followed, but when the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody did have the floor the Chair ruled that he was entitled to make a motion which moved from one rubric to the other within Routine Proceedings. Perhaps the Hon. Member would like to comment on that.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for reminding me of that procedure. However, if I recall, that vote was never taken. The motion put by the Member for Mission—Port Moody lapsed at one o'clock, again a circumstance with which I disagree. Our Constitution says that every question put to the House must be resolved by democratic vote. That is Clause 49. I do not want to repeat the arguments I have already given but, unless you rule as to why the Chair has that right to lapse motions, I have some difficulties with that issue. I do not think we resolved the question last week when the Member for Mission—Port Moody moved his motion. The House divided on it but the vote was never taken because the Chair lapsed the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member. The point is that that question was not ultimately resolved but the effect of the Chair's ruling at that time was that the Member for Mission—Port Moody did not have the floor to do anything until the Bill had been introduced.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I find this attempt by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader to be offensive to the whole House. There is a procedure in the House whereby we go through Routine Proceedings. That procedure is explained in Standing Order 19(3) where it states:

At 11 o'clock a.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, at 3 o'clock p.m. on Wednesdays, and at 12 o'clock noon on Fridays, the House shall proceed to the ordinary daily routine of business which shall be as follows:

It lists Tabling of Documents, Statements by Ministers, Presenting Reports from Interparliamentary Delegations, Presenting Reports from Committees, Presenting Petitions, Introduction of Bills, First Reading of Senate Public Bills, and then Government Notices of Motions. It is the clear understanding of the House that we go through those items one at a time.

I have not had an opportunity to research one of your previous rulings, but there have been attempts by the Government in the past to skip various of those proceedings. If my memory serves me right, you have ruled on those occasions that we go through the items as they appear on the Order Paper. It is very essential that we be able to do that, otherwise