

Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act

It seems to me that the hon. member is rendering a service in two ways. In the first place, he is raising the whole question of how private members' bills are handled. In the second place, he is raising the question of the intent of the language in the latter part of Standing Order 68 (1). It must have some purpose, some meaning, although there are Standing Orders which seem to have died through lack of use. Standing Order 68 (1) reads as follows:

68 (1) Every bill is introduced upon motion for leave, specifying the title of the bill; or upon motion to appoint a committee to prepare and bring it in.

That rule clearly specifies two ways in which a bill can be introduced. Usually we rely upon the first method, but the hon. member for Peace River has attempted to exercise the right contained in the second part of the Standing Order. I hope that this matter will be clarified, whether Your Honour makes a ruling today or holds it over for decision on a later day.

Whilst assuring the hon. member for Peace River that I am on his side, I should like to point out that another Standing Order seems to have been broken by the placing of his motion as No. 42 under Private Members' Notices of Motions.

Standing Order No. 49 (3) reads:

No member shall have more than one notice of motion at a time on the Order Paper.

The hon. member for Peace River already has a motion under this order of business, No. 39 which reads as follows:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization review Standing Orders dealing with private members' public bills with a view to making a report to the House with a recommendation that such changes be made as will allow a recorded vote on some of such bills.

● (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the operation of Standing Order 49 (3) would prevent a second motion being put on the Order Paper in the name of the hon. member. Yet the Chair or the table saw fit to put it there, which seems to me to suggest that the Chair or the table believes that in some way the hon. member's motion can or should be brought before the House. If that is the case, if it is the belief of the Chair or the table that it can or should be brought before the House, I hope it will be made clear when we shall have a chance to deal with this matter.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to

underline those points which have been brought up by my colleague from Peace River. I say it is instructive for Your Honour's guidance for Your Honour to consider that all these rules were before the committee on procedure for detailed examination last session and this rule was not amended. It was, therefore, felt that it was in order. If there was anything that was, shall we say, contrary to the practice or the intended practice with regard to the latter portion of 68 (1), that matter would have been brought to the attention of the House and the committee would have directed its attention to it.

On reading the wording of the Standing Order I think it becomes obvious that the language is quite clear and that it envisages that a motion can be moved—it does not specify by whom it shall be moved, whether by a member of the treasury benches or by a private member—directing the committee to prepare a bill and bring it in. This is, therefore, a clearly defined way of introducing a bill. Actually, it would be the committee in its report that would introduce the bill.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, it seems to me that somehow or other the table officers who were faced with the question of this motion had to fit it into some slot. Without doing their thinking for them, I suggest it is very likely that the table officers felt this would be the area in which there would be the least difficulty, namely, under private members' notices of motions. However, there is nothing in the rules that says that a member shall only present a motion under that heading.

In fact, I would put it that the argument made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre with regard to Standing Order 49 (3), to which he referred, would have an extraordinarily limiting effect on the conduct of hon. members. In other words, if the member had been unfortunate enough to have a motion put down in the normal course of events—and we know what kinds of motions these are—and if, subsequently, he had a purpose in bringing forth a bill through a committee, he would be precluded, unless he obtained the consent of the House, from withdrawing his first notice of motion which might be sixty-fifth or one hundredth on the list for consideration. In other words, it would be one which would never reach the floor of this House and the member would be completely stultified. Certainly, I do not think one would interpret our rules in so limiting a manner. Therefore there is this different,