HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, July 11, 1988

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPORT OF CANADIAN OBSERVER AT MUNICIPAL AND LEGISLATIVE ELECTIONS IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 67(2), I wish to table, in both official languages, the report by the Canadian Observer at the legislative and municipal elections in El Salvador on March 20, 1988.

[English]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 106(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages government responses to 20 petitions bearing Nos. 332-4675, 332-4676, 332-4773, 332-4776 to 332-4778 inclusive, 332-4793, 332-4795 to 332-4799 inclusive, 332-4802, 332-4804 to 332-4806 inclusive and 332-4808 to 332-4811 inclusive.

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE TO TRAVEL

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex-Windsor) moved:

That the legislative committee on Bill C-130 be empowered to adjourn from place to place in Canada and the United States for the purpose of hearing witnesses on the proposed trade agreement with the United States.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt—

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to contest, if I may, the procedural acceptability of this motion being on the Order Paper under "Motions". The reason I do that is this.

Traditionally, the heading "Motions" has been reserved for concurrence requests in reports of standing committees which have been prepared by this House through the efforts of the standing committee, an independent body of this House. Members of standing committees, as the Chair will know, have the right to request that a concurrence motion be put on the Order Paper and then any member of the committee can move that concurrence motion in order to have a debate. I suggest that if motions of this nature are allowed to be put on the Order Paper under "Motions", we will have a complete subversion of the private Members' process.

If you look at the Order Paper under "Private Members' Motions", you will see other motions of instruction which a private Member puts in a draw and takes the chance that the motion will be drawn from a hat and thus go through the regular private Members' motions process. The House will know that process was developed by the parliamentary reform committee to ensure that private Members' motions and Bills had a decent opportunity of receiving full consideration by this House.

A private Member drafts a motion exactly as my hon. friend has drafted his, puts it in a hat and hopes that it is drawn out. When it is, it goes to the private Members' committee for deliberation as to whether or not it will get one hour's debate, such as the motion of the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) on the Order Paper today, which says:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider designating as potential parkland all military lands located in urban areas and presently used for military purposes, once their present use is discontinued.

There are other examples on the Order Paper.

I suggest we have a process for private Members' motions. You will note this motion is on the Order Paper in the name of an individual Member. It did not flow from a committee. It is an individual Member's effort to bring something to the attention of the House. It is a subversion, in my opinion, of the private Members' motion process and private Members' Bill process which was instigated and enacted by this House. For that reason I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend is trying to do something by way of Motions which he should quite properly do by way of a private Members' motion.