

*Government Orders*

I am going to ask the House again if the House will give me the courtesy to dispense with reading nearly three-quarters of an inch of documents.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the Chair that we do feel it is a long motion and we would be more than happy to offer our co-operation in allowing the Chair to dispense rather than read it into the record. All members can read it.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I think on every occasion to date when we have had a lengthy motion, a bill, or anything for consideration of that size we have asked that we simply have it tabled. We are talking about changing the fundamental ways that this House operates. It is of specific interest to every member.

Since you have been in the chair, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that for you to read it would be inappropriate. I notice that you have your hon. colleague standing by who probably has rested during Question Period and ought to be prepared. I think on behalf of my caucus we would like to hear the details of the proposals being brought forward.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, may I just beg the indulgence of members of the NDP. We have had this motion printed twice in the Order Paper every day for a while. We have it printed twice in the Order Paper today. I have read it. They have read it. Why don't we proceed?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lapierre:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I can also tell the Chair that, unlike the majority of members who are part of national caucuses, we were not consulted at all, while we know that some members and House leaders have been for nearly a year. But these rules apply as much to us as to the main political parties. We were not afforded the same treatment. The government leader did not even have the courtesy of at least notifying us. He acted in a sneaky way. So, Mr. Speaker, we want to have the benefit of listening and thinking while this document is read to us, because we did not have as much time as the other members to examine it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Very quickly I must say I have read the 30 pages of material on the Standing Orders. Obviously it is a very

important matter, but the whole reason this House is in such a state of disrepute is the necessity of going through reading it. Frankly, this is the type of thing that all members could have read. You cannot understand it until you relate it and correlate it to the Standing Orders as amended. This is what makes this place such a farce.

I would hope that perhaps the hon. House leader of the government might add another clause, if you are going to get into debate and procedures, to make sure that we can prevent this type of hocus-pocus and get on to the substance.

There are many matters of substance to be discussed and debated on these matters of procedure, rather than this business of a preliminary procedural ambush and stating with a straight face that your counterpart can read, when we all know that if ever there were a motion not to be read, which does not make sense unless you have the Standing Orders, this is it.

I am really disappointed by these paragons of procedural virtue to my left who try to pretend one thing and practise another.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge some of the comments made by my hon. colleague. We have to recognize that we are here as the elected representatives of the people of Canada. The people of Canada who are watching this performance are obviously interested, but I simply have to remind the House that when the question is put it must be put and, I might add, in both of Canada's languages.

We would expect the motion to be read in English and then in French.

• (1510)

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point, because I think it is important for people to understand what is going on.

We have a motion which was put before this House on March 22. This is March, 26 and we have not yet started debate on it. People do not realize that this government has said publicly time after time that it wants to ram these changes through.

We want to point out how massive and how destructive these changes are. I think that point can be made very well by having the Speaker read exactly how many rules