

It was not seconded. The Speaker then said:

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

A vote was then taken. You are saying you will not contradict. I am asking, will you contradict Speaker Lamoureux?

● (1210)

**Mr. Speaker:** The answer to that, of course, is I already have.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** I bring it to the attention of the hon. member that our practices have changed substantially since the Lamoureux ruling to which he has referred. At that time motions could be put prior to the question period and, in fact, questions came at the end of Routine Proceedings. We have now reversed that order and placed a priority on the question period, by our practice and by agreement, placing questions ahead of motions. Furthermore, we have, by agreement, purged the question period of points of order and matters of privilege which might arise, deferring them until later.

In other words, since the ruling to which the hon. member referred we have taken steps to give the question period priority over other proceedings. That is the reverse of the practice followed at the time the Lamoureux precedent applied. I might act differently—I might—if during the question period we were still operating under rules in accordance with which, prior to the question period, we had already entertained a number of motions. I do not know whether I would or not. I can only say to the hon. member that the conditions under which Speaker Lamoureux made that ruling were quite different from those under which I made mine. If mine contradicts his, that may partly be attributable to changes in the practice in the meantime. In any case, I have no intention of contradicting my own ruling.

**Mr. Thomas H. Lefebvre (Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle):** As the one who moved the motion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have further clarification. I checked the book you have in your hand while you were speaking from the chair and you quoted from it that motions under Standing Order 25 were always in order. That is what I checked this morning. I checked the precedent set by Mr. Stanfield, then leader of the opposition, in 1971 and felt that if I obtained recognition during the question period I could legitimately move such a motion. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that when members are issued with what we call the green book on orders and regulations, perhaps it should be accompanied by a printed listing of your rulings; that when we come to a chapter in this book which we can no longer rely upon, you give us the precedent created by what you have done today in every instance in the book. We are not all experts on the rules in this book.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lefebvre:** I gather from the applause that hon. members over there agree with me. To help hon. members who are not in your position and who do not possess expertise in these

*Point of Order—Mr. Pinard*

matters, I suggest you issue these precedents and the rulings you have cited to go with every chapter and verse in this book.

**Mr. Speaker:** The suggestion made by the hon. member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle is, actually, not a bad one. It would bring into play what would be called an annotated version of the Standing Orders of the House. That is a mammoth undertaking, almost an impossible one; I despair that I would ever have the time to do it. It would involve a great deal of research, a great deal of work. The hon. member will realize, also, that there are situations in which both the precedents of the House and the Standing Orders come into conflict not only with previous rulings but also with one another. This is one of them. Certain motions are declared in their very own terms in the Standing Orders to be always in order. What that language does is relieve the hon. member of the necessity of giving notice of his motion, as is required in other cases.

As the House knows, private members are entitled to have their motions considered by filing first a notice of motion, and then having them go through in rotation. Those are the conditions which surround the introduction of a motion under other circumstances. What Standing Order 25 does, with regard to a motion to adjourn the House, or to adjourn the debate, is relieve the hon. member of the necessity of giving the House notice of his intention to move that motion. It is in order at any time. This does not mean it is relieved of all constraints or, in my opinion, that it can be put during a period of time in which the House does not receive motions—for example, during the period in which we receive only motions by unanimous consent under Standing Order 43 or during the question period, and equally, during the taking of motions which relate to House business and procedural motions. These are sometimes received while motions are being put, but not during the question period.

Therefore, as I have said to hon. members, there are times when the rules come into conflict with one another and into conflict with precedents which were laid down when the rules were in different form. The Chair has to reconcile such conflicts and I have consistently reconciled this one in the following way: that I will receive such motions, obviously without notice at any time, during a time when motions can be put by members. But we have never received motions from members during the first hour of the day unless they conformed with the terms of Standing Order 43, and never during the question period. That is the precedent I have set and one which I intend to continue.

[*Translation*]

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Leader of the Opposition):** Speaking to this point of order, Mr. Speaker, we shall of course abide by your decision, but in the future we might examine further the decision you have just made because you have referred us to Standing Order 43 which specifies that at the beginning of the sitting of the House the only motions to be moved will be those that ask for unanimous consent. However, as concerns the period following motions under Standing Order 43, nothing is specified. You have yourself