

rose on a point of order to propose his motion to proceed to Orders of the Day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of this motion. If the Leader of the New Democratic Party . . . Madam Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Deans: I rise on a point of order.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Madam Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have a new point of order? If so I can hear him, but I have already ruled on his first point of order.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I want to ask if the ruling of the Chair is intended to indicate that one may not move a motion on a point of order. If so, let me refer the Chair to May 7, 1979, page 1049 of *Hansard*, when the President of the Privy Council rose on a point of order to move a motion. The Speaker of the day ruled that there were occasions when it was appropriate to rise on a point of order in order to move a motion. In fact, there were certain motions that could only be moved on a point of order and this happens to be one of those motions. I suggest to the Chair that there is no other way to stop this Government from overriding the Opposition than to rise on a point of order and to move as I did.

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I remember very clearly the occurrence in 1979 to which the Hon. Member was referring. At the time, there was a debate on whether or not the Social Credit Party had been recognized. The Speaker at the time, intending to recognize one Member, actually recognized another Member. I intervened, being in the Opposition at the time, to move that another Member be recognized, under the provisions of Standing Order 29—that is the old numbering, I do not know which Standing Order it is now. The Speaker refused to recognize me on a point of order so that I could move to have another Member recognized. It was not until the next day, after listening to my arguments, that the Speaker acknowledged that there was practically no other way to be recognized in order to interrupt one Member and have another Member recognized.

That was a very specific situation, and at the time, if I remember correctly, the Speaker said that it would have been better if I had indicated, as soon as I rose on a point of order, that I was rising on a point of order under the provisions of Standing Order 29 or 26—whatever, I think it is 29.

Therefore, in the circumstances, what the Hon. Member is saying is incorrect. This was a very specific case where, in fact, I was not recognized, and in which the Speaker told me, after

Extension of Hours

the fact, that I was right and said that I should have specified that I was rising under Standing Order 29.

Finally, in answer to the point raised by the Hon. Member, perhaps I may refer the House to Beauchesne's, Fifth Edition, Citation 234, paragraph 2—

[*English*]

A Member cannot rise on a point of order to move a motion.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker: The circumstances of the precedent as described by the Hon. President of the Privy Council are absolutely correct. The situation is entirely different from the one we are discussing today. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) is certainly out of order. He cannot move a motion to proceed to Orders of the Day by rising on a point of order. That is clearly against the Standing Orders, and that is my final decision.

Mr. Pinard: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I would like to speak briefly to the motion I moved earlier, to extend sitting hours between now and the end of June.

It should be understood that this motion is being moved, and I may say Hon. Members are aware of this, pursuant to the new Standing Orders of the House, as part of our experiment in parliamentary reform.

The basis for the motion is as follows: We already know that under the new Standing Orders, the House is to adjourn on June 30. We now have a set parliamentary calendar, and on June 30, the House will have no alternative but to adjourn until September 12 of this year. However, since the Government has traditionally been able to take advantage of part of the summer to wind up its legislative business, the Members of the Special Committee on Parliamentary Reform suggested, with the unanimous consent of the Members on both sides of the House, that a Member, and not necessarily the President of the Privy Council or the Government House Leader, be allowed to move a motion to extend sitting hours during the last two weeks or so of the month of June.

That is exactly what we are doing today. There are several other bills which we would like to get adopted before we adjourn, and we feel that by extending the regular sitting hours for a few days and with the good will of both sides of the House, we can agree to pass a reasonable number of bills. We may then go back to our constituencies and tell our constituents that we have all helped to make Parliament more productive within the framework of our parliamentary reform.

Mr. Speaker, that is the spirit of this motion. What it says in fact is that we ask that, instead of adjourning at 6 o'clock, the House adjourn at 11 o'clock between now and June 30 inclusively. This means that we shall be sitting between 6 o'clock and 11 o'clock, or five hours more than usual on each regular sitting day except Friday, of which there is only one remaining before the end of June since the last two Fridays are legal