

This means that when a notice of motion is called on a given day and the government asks that this notice of motion be allowed to retain its precedence, the government's right pursuant to Standing Order 19 is limited by Standing Order 49 to make this request only on two occasions. On the third, Standing Order 49 is automatically applied and the notice of motion cannot be called a third time, even upon the request of the government. Such notice is dropped pursuant to Standing Order 49 (1). But, once more, I want to be clear on that for my argument, this rule applies only to notices of motions and not to bills introduced by hon. members, which are governed by Standing Order 19, because Standing Order 49 does not provide anything for orders, bills and so on. Standing Order 49 is very restrictive. It came twenty years after Standing Order 19. Standing Order 49 does not provide anything for bills, orders or questions on the Order Paper. It deals only with notices of motions. Therefore, it is very important, I think, Mr. Speaker, to make this distinction.

Now, it is well and good to say it is procedure, it is a matter of principles. It is easy to say just read clauses in an intelligent way, concentrate on the wordings and look at the context in which they have been brought about and passed and you will come to some practical conclusion but that does not resolve the problem. That is procedural matter.

Since the private members' hour is designed to deal with matters concerning members, I suggest that if they want it to operate rationally, because all this goes back quite far, they will have to help the government help them. In other words, the unanimous consent of the House will be required for notices of motions to be called more than twice. There is no problem with bills. I said so on several occasions already. The government will probably intervene and ask that they stand. And I forgot to mention that the reason for government's intervention is simply that it is its responsibility to determine the order of the business of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I listened closely to your remarks and I was amazed when you referred to Beauchesne's comments No. 88 on the bottom of page 88, if I understood you well. I quote:

The Government being largely interested in the progress of the business of the House is responsible for allowing a question or motion to stand, if the member is absent or does not proceed when it is called.

It seems to me very clear, Mr. Speaker, that that citation in Beauchesne is directly related to the content of Standing Order 19. It is so true that that citation is found at page 81 among the citations discussing a dozen of the standing orders, i.e. Standing Orders 15 to 27. We all know how Beauchesne's work is divided. He refers to some standing orders, then sets forth citations, and then proceeds to another series of standing orders followed by citations. Now, that citation I just read is not found after Standing Order 90, but follows a dozen of standing orders, including Standing Order 19. Therefore there is a clear relation between that reference by Beauchesne to the government's responsibility to ensure orderly progress of the business of the House and Standing Order 19. And this explains why Standing Order 19 says that: upon the request of the government, notices of motions, questions on the Order

### *Private Members' Business*

Paper and also orders of the government and bills can be allowed to stand. As I have said earlier, Standing Order 49 simply limits notices of motions to two calls by the Chair.

The reason for the government's intervention is to ensure that the proceedings of the House will take place in the proper manner. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, until these Standing Orders are changed, I think we will have to rely upon the courtesy and sincerity of all members of parliament. Without the unanimous consent of the members of the House, notices of motion will never be called more than twice, from now on, in spite of the government's request, or may be withdrawn from the Order Paper. On the other hand, bills will be allowed to stand at our request. This is all respectfully submitted.

● (2207)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would like to ask the hon. parliamentary secretary a question. When he referred to Standing Order 49(1), he said, if I understood him correctly, that once a notice of motion has been called twice, it shall be dropped from the Order Paper, but in his remarks he said more than twice.

I should like him to tell me how he interprets Standing Order 49(1) which, at least to the Chair, seems to mean that the notice of motion should be dropped from the order paper the second time, even when it is called. This matter is of great concern to the Chair, because even if the hon. parliamentary secretary has seemed to agree with the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) on this point, he adds in his interpretation of Standing Order 49(1) a second time, which is not what, in my opinion, Standing Order 49(1) means.

**Mr. Pinard:** I am grateful to the Chair for asking me this question, which will permit me to provide the necessary clarification. In my opinion, the Chair is absolutely right. This, however, does not change anything at all to the basis of my point, whether the notice of motion should be dropped after it has been called once or twice, Standing Order 49 dealing only with notices of motions, and not with orders, contrary to what you have just stated. But I agree with you that, as provided by Standing Order 49, when a notice of motion has been called twice from the Chair and not proceeded with, it shall be dropped. This means that it may be called once and that if the second time it is not proceeded with, it should be dropped. Therefore, if I said the contrary a moment ago, and I think I said it could be called twice with the consent of the government and that it was only on the third call that it was to be dropped, I withdraw what I said on this point. I think a close study of Standing Order 49 shows that there should not be a third time; the notice of motion is called twice and if it is not proceeded with on the second call, from a logical point of view, it should be dropped. But once again this applies only to notices of motions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for having brought my attention to this point.

[English]

**Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member for Vaudreuil