

like this, *ipso facto* becomes an order to the Government to introduce specific legislation, to table policy, or to do other things.

According to our knowledge and our research, the ancient and valid tradition, of course, is that Parliament recognizes in its forms and words the difference between a motion which, if agreed, becomes a resolved resolution and, by distinction, a motion which, if agreed, becomes an order.

To put it precisely the House expresses itself to the Government by "resolution" as distinct from an "order" that is given to execute a decision of the House or an order given to different officers of the House in the view of executing that decision.

To support our argument we wish to cite the 1970 edition of the parliamentary dictionary by Abraham and Hawtrey, page 185 where it is stated under the word "Resolution":

An expression of the opinion of the House with reference to some subject or a declaration of its intention to do something. A resolution is sometimes ordered to be communicated to the other House with a request for its concurrence, e.g. a resolution that it is expedient that a joint committee be appointed to consider a certain subject. A resolution may be rescinded.

Resolutions must be distinguished from Orders, i.e. directions or commands addressed by one or other House to members or officers of that House or to other persons. Thus the House of Commons *resolves* that an address be presented to the Queen, but *orders* it to be presented to her by those Members who are privy counsellors or members of the royal household.

In light of that argument, we submit the proper way of wording the motion would be, as has always or long been our practice, not to say, "it be an order of the House that—" but instead say, "this House calls on the Government to—". That is the wording which we respectfully submit should be included in this motion.

Having made that point, I want to reiterate to colleagues of opposition Parties that, consistent with Citation 480 of Beauchesne's, we certainly do not expect the Chair to come back immediately with a ruling on the arguments I have just presented. Consistent with the practice of the House, we should get under way the debate of the very important issue that is put before us today.

In that light I think it is reasonable and important for us to obtain a ruling from the Chair so that in the future we can know what to expect. This would reasonably give

Supply

us a good idea of a distinction between the use of one set of words or another set of words.

I humbly suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the meantime while Your Honour is reflecting on this matter that perhaps you, Sir, could indicate the different circumstances, if any, which allow or require the use of the phrase: "It be an Order of the House—" such as is used in both Notices of Motions under Private Members' Business in the name of the Right Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) and the Hon. Member for Kamloops (Mr. Riis) with respect to calling individuals to the bar of the House. I think that is a good example of something the Chair may wish to clear up.

Our basic point is that the use of the words that are proposed to us today would break some new ground. In that context we feel compelled to bring Your Honour's attention to this matter so that it may be clarified and that in the future we know exactly what to expect.

• (1130)

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interjection by my hon. friend and colleague, the Deputy House Leader for the Government, on this issue. I want to explain the reason that these particular words were chosen. I see this issue as different from most issues brought forward on opposition days. I think it is fair to say that on most opposition days the Opposition brings forward a motion which the Government tends not to support. A motion is often aimed in a rather critical way at the Government and, of course, a votable motion normally is actually even designed that way.

On this issue, we felt that it would be appropriate to ask that it be an order of the House that certain initiatives follow because of the non-partisan nature of this particular motion.

We are simply making the assumption that all Members, Government Members, as well as members of the Official Opposition and Members of the New Democratic Party, will be supporting this opposition day motion today. Who would not think it appropriate that we should have an environmental officer of the House? After all, we have the responsibility of providing leadership on critical issues. Second, who would not say that it was appropriate to have plans in place for the disposal of toxic wastes and so on?