

*Point of Order—Mr. Hnatyshyn*

tion of the rule and the spirit of the rules by which I would submit Your Honour should be bound.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should be very happy to participate at length in a debate on the theoretical aspects of this procedural problem, and I shall say a word in that vein, but I should like my intervention to be regarded mainly as a suggestion with respect to what we might do today. However, I shall come to that in a moment.

First may I say that I think Your Honour is quite correct that, as the rules are set up, there is a collision that arises when the putting of a motion has been allowed, and 2.15 arrives. I think that those of us who were on the standing committee that drafted these rules, or agreed to them, have to take some responsibility for the fact that there was a point which we did not cover. I think that an effort should be made, perhaps through that committee, to cover that point.

It seems to me that common sense, which is not a standing order in our rules, of course, would tell us that if the House agrees under Standing Order 43 that a motion may be made, that implies more than just putting the motion. I know that the standing order does not say that, and I know that the standing orders require that we move to the question period at 2.15. But surely on those rare occasions when the House gives its consent to the making of a motion under Standing Order 43, the House expects to decide on that motion.

There is not much point to a motion being put, a few words being said to it, and then for it to languish on the order paper for the rest of the session. I think we should find some way to resolve that problem.

One of the reasons we got into this collision was because we had made changes back in the old days. Motions under Standing Order 43 used to come after the question period and, if they were allowed, the debate could go on and on. Then this also got mixed up with the problem as to what happened to motions for concurrence in reports of committees. It was that kind of a motion respecting the flag debate that got us into a position where, day after day, we had to carry on that debate because it was on the motion for the adoption of the report from a committee. It was in an attempt to resolve that impasse that 45(2) was put in the book in its present form. I do not think that those who were drafting 45(2) at that time to cover that problem realized what it would do to a motion under Standing Order 43.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to participate in the theoretical aspects of this. It seems to me that such a discussion should start from the basic common sense proposition that if the House is willing unanimously for a motion to be put, especially a motion that has the very day's date in it, the House wants to resolve that matter that very day.

As I say, I should like to see this matter discussed. I think Your Honour has the proper answers. When the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) asked you to review the matter, you have reviewed it at great length and on many occasions. That does not give you the right to change the rule. But maybe the kind of review that is necessary is a review by

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization of the House.

Having said that, may I get to what I think is more urgent today. The House received, with applause and approval, the suggestion made by my friend, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), that certain things be said about the arts in Canada and that this day, Thursday, October 26, be designated as Arts Day across Canada. If there is any day to pass that motion, surely it is today. There is not much point to our passing a motion sometime in November or next March making October 26, 1978, Arts Day.

We got into a situation that is perfectly understandable. My friend made the motion. We thought it would be carried at that point, but the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) chose to stand and speak, and he kept talking until 2.15.

My suggestion is that the House now agree unanimously to call that motion so that the debate can be concluded just as soon as we get through routine proceedings. My suggestion is that it be a debate with one speaker per party, and a limit of ten minutes for each such speaker. If it is agreed, I hope the House will allow the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie to be the speaker for our party even though technically, having made the motion and sat down, he has exhausted his right to speak. I hope this might be considered seriously. I think we would be carrying out the thinking of the House on motions under Standing Order 43 generally, and carrying out what we in this House felt when the motion was put and received so enthusiastically today.

● (1532)

That is a suggestion I put forward, hoping it will be considered right now. The theoretical idea is that it can be dealt with at some other time. However, I hope that just as soon as we finish routine proceedings, before we go to whatever is to be the business of the day, the House will agree that there be a debate with one speaker per party. I will not even object if the government contends it has not had a speaker, although the Secretary of State had six or seven minutes. I suggest there be one speaker per party and that the motion be put at the end of that debate.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the easiest way to solve this very simple problem of when a motion put under Standing Order 43 can be debated is this: I feel the surest way is to refer to the Standing Orders themselves.

Let me refer to four standing orders which are relevant in this case. At the beginning, Your Honour has very pertinently underscored three of them. Obviously, it starts with Standing Order 43, which is relevant and under which we can put a motion on an urgent matter. However, it should not be forgotten that Standing Order 43 is an exception to the general principle outlined in Standing Order 42, which stipulates that an advance notice of 48 hours must be given prior to the