

*Private Members' Business*

motions at any given point in time. The government facilitates that procedure.

What the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) is trying to do is attack the role of private members to determine when the pieces of legislation they have proposed shall be brought before the House of Commons. While it may be something which irritates the hon. member, for many private members it is very important that they have some right to choose the time they want to bring forward a particular piece of legislation or a notice of motion. It would seem to me that any step by the Chair that forced members of parliament to bring their motions before the House when the Chair or the hon. member for Vaudreuil chose would indeed be a retrograde step.

All we really want to do is give members the opportunity to place their ideas before the House in the form of motions or private legislative items, allowing them to choose the time when those items should be brought forward. Let me point out to Your Honour that even though the orders of the day lists a whole series of things in numerical order, under government orders they are only brought forward when the government chooses to bring them forward after consultation. I would urge upon Your Honour to take into account the wishes of private members as a whole.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Does the hon. member wish to rise on this particular point of order?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** No, Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with my motion.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to see the debate on the motion proceed. Therefore, I will be very brief. First, I should like to join in the view Your Honour expresses, namely, that motions 2, 3, 4 and 5 are really being called today for the first time in terms of the Standing Orders. When they were called previously, they were allowed to stand both at the request of the government and by unanimous consent. There is no problem there. Motions 7, 8 and 9 are, of course, being called for the first time on any account.

The point I want to make to the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) is, as the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) has said, this involves a matter of convenience to hon. members and there should not be any objection by the hon. member for Vaudreuil unless somebody is abusing something, such as trying to squeeze somebody out of order or play some other kind of trick. In that case he should complain. However, if it is just a matter of convenience which has been agreed upon in advance, I think the hon. member should go along with it.

**Mr. Herbert:** Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to be brief because I would like to see the debate proceed. I merely suggest that when the motions are brought forward again, presumably next week, Your Honour makes a ruling in relation to Standing Order 49(1).

[Mr. Reid.]

**Mr. Cafik:** Mr. Speaker, now that the question has been raised in such a way that it calls or asks for a ruling by the Chair, I think it should be fully understood that Standing Order 49(1) and Standing Order 19(1) are not in contradiction. There is really no discrepancy between the two. They can both be followed at exactly the same time. Standing Order 19(1) takes into account the situation where there was not a request by the government to stand a motion when it was called. In that case, it is quite clear that when it has been called twice it should disappear from the order paper. Standing Order 19(1) provides, also, that when the government has in fact made a request that a motion be set aside, it shall not be taken up but shall retain its rightful position. I do not see any discrepancy between the Standing Orders.

It may be there is a problem in terms of the government formally making a request to allow a motion to stand and retain its rightful place. In my role as the acting government House leader—or some other acting House leader—perhaps there should be a formal request, so that we will all know exactly what position a motion is in.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. As far as the Chair is concerned, there is not much difficulty in making a ruling on the request by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert). I think he would have great difficulty in making his position stand, unless he forgets Standing Order 19(1) which provides for the government's right to request that a private member's motion be stood.

● (1712)

I agree with the point raised by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) as to the validity of this procedure which facilitates the workings of the House particularly in private members' hour. It gives members a chance to be present and, at the same time, to prepare their interventions; and perhaps that facilitates the debate.

At the same time, the Chair has to abide by the Standing Order. It is not the responsibility of the Chair to beg the government, as it sometimes has to do, to agree to the motion being stood at the request of the government. This is the complaint of the Chair at this time and I take advantage of the point of order raised by the hon. member for Vaudreuil to bring it to the attention of the government and the representative of the government.

The parliamentary secretary has already indicated that it is at the request of the government that motions Nos. 2 to 9 be stood, which is the right of the government. Therefore, I think we should proceed with motion No. 10 standing in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).