

Standing Order 43 must be moved as soon as the House opens, or between two o'clock and 2:15.

Since this procedure has been introduced, I have noticed that motions moved under the provisions of Standing Order 43 are much more serious and concern much more than before matters which require the immediate attention of the House.

However, government members still have the habit of voting systematically against any motion made under Standing Order 43 by the opposition without identifying themselves, which is not always in the best interest of the population. What is more disillusioning, Mr. Speaker, for the reader of *Hansard*, is that he cannot know which member objected to the motion, and that does not do justice to the hon. member who did so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to an important part of our Standing Orders, Standing Order 28, which reads as follows:

28. Every member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered—

—this is a bit obsolete because no one wears a hat these days—

—and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

However, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of democracy itself and out of respect for our institution, I respectfully submit that any hon. member who wishes to speak in this House and whose intervention aims at justifying a ruling of the Speaker must comply with Standing Order 28 and ask for permission to speak, even if it is only to object to the moving of a motion by simply saying no.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I moved a motion on a very important and urgent matter, as it had to do with thousands of industrial milk producers. Unanimous consent was refused by an hon. member, but from reading *Hansard* tomorrow nobody will know who he was, and yet he did take the floor.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Shefford:

That members of this House be required to comply with Standing Order 28, even when opposing or seconding a motion moved under Standing Order 43.

● (1510)

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) certainly brought up very interesting and important points with regard to the interpretation of our Standing Orders and procedures. It is not a question of privilege but a mere matter of procedure. It might be well to explain, first of all, that it is not a matter of getting the floor, pursuant to Standing Order 28, but merely of presenting a motion, without expressing agreement with it. That is an entirely different matter, because there is no question of discussion it. A motion was put merely before the House, under Standing Order 43, which requires unanimous consent of the House. If there is not unanimous consent, a single dissident vote suffices to to prove it. Interpretation of Standing Order 28 therefore constitutes not a question of privilege but a matter of procedure. That problem could perhaps be looked into by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

*Privilege—Mr. A. Lambert*

[English]

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the course of the question period I asked a question of the government House leader with respect to the problem which seems to have arisen out of the fact that if the Salaries Act is to be observed, there is in fact one parliamentary secretary who has been paid—at least, it would appear that way—and therefore sits as a member of this House improperly drawing upon the revenues and resources of the Crown as a result of the resignation of the hon. member for Papineau. I am not sure of the date with respect to that.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Tuesday, March 16, 1976.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I understand now that it was Tuesday, March 16. The President of the Privy Council, in his answer to the question, indicated that there is likely to be the appointment of a minister later in the day. I ask your Honour, at your leisure, to look at section 25(2) of the Parliamentary Secretaries Act under the Government Organization Act, 1970, dealing with parliamentary secretaries. It provides:

There shall not be at any one time more parliamentary secretaries than the number of ministers who hold offices for which salaries are provided in section 4 of the Salaries Act.

If my figures are correct—and it is subject to correction—there are 27 parliamentary secretaries and 26 ministers to whom this would apply.

**Mr. Blais:** One minister has two portfolios.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** The question then arises: What happens beyond this day if there is a minister who holds two portfolios, as indeed I suspect one additional minister of the Crown might, at perhaps around four o'clock or thereabouts, or whenever these ceremonies take place and wherever they take place?

**An hon. Member:** Don't you know?

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** My time will come, I hope. In any event, there may well be one minister holding two portfolios. I ask the Chair to look into that as a possible solution to the problem. However, I respectfully point out that the way section 25 reads, it would appear that the number of portfolios a particular minister holds does not matter, but what is important is the number of ministers. I have not addressed myself very much to that secondary point, but I think there is a real point to be investigated. I am sure the government House leader would want it investigated because if a minister is sworn in today either as an acting minister or a minister holding two portfolios, in my respectful submission since March 16 there would have been paid out of the revenues of Canada a parliamentary secretary's indemnity to one too many parliamentary secretaries.

I am not sure who it would be or how it would be figured out, but I think the point is there and I am sure the government House leader joins me in wanting to have this matter cleared up.

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, first I should like to express my gratitude to the hon. member for drawing this matter to our attention so early. In the event he might be right—and