

Hopkins,	MacGuigan,	Pilon,	St. Pierre,
Howard (Okanagan Boundary),	Mackasey,	Portelance,	Sullivan,
Hymmen,	McIlraith,	Pringle,	Thomas
Isabelle,	McNulty,	Prud'homme,	(Maisonneuve),
Jerome,	Mahoney,	Reid,	Trudeau,
Kaplan,	Marceau,	Roberts,	Trudel,
Lachance,	Marchand	Rochon,	Turner
Lang (Saskatoon- Humboldt),	(Langelier),	Rock,	(London East),
Langlois,	Mongrain,	Roy (Timmins),	Wahn,
Laniel,	Morison,	Roy (Laval),	Walker,
Leblanc (Laurier),	Munro,	Ryan,	Watson,
Lefebvre,	Noël,	Serré,	Weatherhead,
Legault,	O'Connell,	Smerchanski,	Whelan,
Lessard (LaSalle),	Osler,	Smith (Saint-Jean),	Whicher,
Lessard	Otto,	Stafford,	Whiting,
(Lac-Saint-Jean),	Ouellet,	Stanbury,	Yanakis—109.
Loiselle,	Pelletier,	Stewart (Cochrane),	
	Penner,	Stewart (Okanagan- Kootenay),	
	Pepin,		

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Earlier today the honourable Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) raised a point of order with regard to the position on the Notice Paper of a proposed Notice of Motion which he had filed on Wednesday last.

I have carefully perused the remarks made by the honourable gentleman from St. John's East and also those contributed by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

If I understand the question at issue, it would seem to me that the honourable Member for St. John's East contends that his proposed motion raises a question of privilege and, as such, that it should have been listed under "Motions" so that it could be considered tomorrow.

Today in his comments the honourable Member for St. John's East suggested there should not be two procedures followed in the consideration of questions of privilege; that is, a procedure which could be used by Members of the government and another for other Members of the House.

It is obvious, of course, that most of the time of this House is set aside for the consideration of government business; but it should be pointed out that these Rules or Standing Orders are enacted by the House which provide for that division of time as between the government and private Members. It is not within the competence of the Chair, I suggest, to endeavour to reallocate time to private Members by means of decisions of the Chair.

It was suggested also that a member of the government could avail himself of a priority in having a question of privilege considered as government business. In the limited time at my disposal no precedent could be found in that regard except such motions as were proposed by private Members, debated, transferred to, and subsequently considered under "Government Orders" by virtue of operation of Standing Order 45(2).

At any rate it seems to me that the position on the "Notice Paper" of the proposed motion is not of the essence at this time. If the question raised by the honourable Member for St. John's East is a *prima facie* question of privilege, I suggest it could have been transferred and considered under "Motions" raised yesterday or it could be proceeded with today notwithstanding its position