

As the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and others have pointed out, if these words mean anything they must be accepted as a procedure which ought to be followed. If so, what is the procedure contemplated by the words in 68(1)? With respect, I have come to the conclusion that it is not the procedure which is suggested now by the honourable Member for Peace River. I mention in passing that the terms of the honourable Member's Notice of Motion would appear to involve a charge on the Consolidated Fund, and if this is so the question could not be considered until after a recommendation from His Excellency. But I am not ruling on that point; I have some qualms on the point but I think they should be set aside and that the ruling of the Chair should at this time relate exclusively to the question raised specifically by the honourable Member for Peace River, the honourable Member for Edmonton West and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre.

It would appear to the Chair that the one question which must be resolved at this time is whether the honourable Member's motion may be proceeded with during routine proceedings. While Standing Order 15(2) does provide for the introduction of such bills at this time it does not permit the proposing of a motion to appoint a special committee to prepare a bill during routine proceedings. In accordance with paragraph (4) of Standing Order 15, such a proposed motion may be considered only under government orders or, in the case of a private member's motion, only when private members' business is being considered between the hours of five and six p.m. on a Monday, a Tuesday or on a Friday. It is suggested that the provisions of 15(4) are quite explicit in this regard.

The honourable Member for Edmonton West and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre drew attention to another problem in connection with the motion proposed by the honourable Member for Peace River, pointing out that we now have on the Order Paper two Notices of Motion standing in the name of that honourable Member. My understanding is that this decision was taken in the face of the difficulty which arose through the motion having been proposed at that time, and because it was difficult to hold consultations at that moment. It may have been an error; possibly the matter should have been held in abeyance until the honourable Member had had an opportunity to explain his views, and the Chair to consider them.

In any event, we find ourselves in a situation, now, in which, contrary to Standing Orders, the honourable Member for Peace River has two Notices of Motion appearing in his name whereas in accordance with the rules, he is entitled to only one. It is of interest to note that the honourable Member's Notice of Motion No. 39, the one which stands as a *bona fide* Notice of Motion on the Order Paper, seeks to alter the procedure relating to the consideration and disposal of private members' business. This point was made by the honourable Member for Peace River in the course of his presentation. I wish to say that I have every sympathy with the objective sought to be achieved by the honourable Member as expressed in the terms of his Notice of Motion No. 39 and by the motion now being discussed.

There is much to be said for a re-examination of our procedure in the whole field of private members' legislation and it may well be that this is a suitable topic for consideration in due course by our committee on procedure and organization.