

*Point of Order—Mr. Knowles*

What purports to be a motion is really, on its wording, an opinion of the government rather than a motion of the House of Commons. Clearly, it must be moved; the House must be asked to do something definite, clear and precise, and that does not appear on the words. Therefore, the words, by themselves, are not sufficient. If the government House leader had put the words "that this House resolves", or, "it is moved that", or words asking the House to do something, then we would have more than merely a conclusion to an argument.

With respect, in the French version on the opposite page, it is even more obvious that we have a conclusion following an argument rather than a substantive motion.

For clarity, I am going to briefly repeat the third point. The motion is, in certain of its parts, self-contradictory. Therefore, the will of the House, in passing the motion, is not certain. As hon. members recall, I relied on Citation No. 311 from Beauchesne's.

I want to call attention to the provisions of Standing Order 40, which that part of the motion purports to deal with, and particularly Standing Order 40(7) which appears on page 36 of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. It says:

(7) When it is provided in any standing or special order of this House that any specified business shall be continued beyond the ordinary time of daily adjournment or that any such business shall be forthwith disposed of or concluded in any sitting, the adjournment proceedings in that sitting shall be suspended.

That is what the Standing Order says, and it is pretty clear. Apparently the government, in part of the order, wanted to somehow get rid of Standing Order 40. Its obvious intention was that the House would sit beyond the time allotted and that the private members' rights to which I have referred would be written over; but they wanted to get rid of it. If the government had meant to say there should be no adjournment debate at ten o'clock, p.m., or at midnight, or whenever, under the order which had been proposed, it simply would have allowed Standing Order 40(7) to take effect because it is already there. There was no need to deal, or purport to deal with it, at least in the wording of the government's motion.

Standing Order 40 exempts certain things, but the exemptions contained in Standing Order 40 are also exempted. We have a contradiction in terms. I do not know what it means. Nobody knows what it means. The government House leader says, "Very easy." But I am not so sure that it is quite so easy or, more importantly, that it is clear and certain.

Therefore, I respectfully submit to the Chair that at best it is a redundancy, and it is perhaps a contradiction. But in any event, it is a fatal confusion, and it ought not to be allowed to stand. If it does not stand, then I respectfully suggest there is a case that the motion itself ought not to stand.

Finally, the fourth submission I wish to make to you is that in its wording, the provision for tabling speeches directly offends the practice of this House. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre read the precedent upon which I rely, Citation 311 of the rules of the House. I do not think I have to read it again, because it is quite clear.

Citation 311 is a devastating and conclusive attack on the ridiculous proposition that this House and this institution could be served and that Parliament could function if we write our little 3,000 word essays and put them on the Order Paper or *Hansard*. There is not one self-respecting hon. member of the House of Commons who can stand up and do anything else but condemn what must be a warped aberration of the mind of the government House leader.

There is an hon. member down there who is shaking his head. I recognize he is shaking his own head, and we know what hon. member is shaking his head, we can hear it. He does nothing at all to detract from the force and the truth of the argument.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pelletier:** A point of order, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier) on a point of order.

**Mr. Pelletier:** Madam Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

[*English*]

**Madam Speaker:** Unless the hon. member accepts this, there are no questions allowed on points of order, I would think the hon. member should continue his intervention and not receive questions at this time.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The hon. member can keep shaking his head, and I can speak to him later outside.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Get a job on the Muppet Show.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said that the traditions of the House of Commons are enshrined in Beauchesne's. They are not enshrined in the mind of the government House leader. They are not enshrined in the mind of my hon. friend who is shaking his head, agreeing that it would be appropriate for him, at any rate, to file his speeches. That is not the point at all.

● (2100)

My submission will be short. The fact is that the proposal made by the government House leader is directly contrary to the practices set out in Beauchesne, if the intent itself is specifically to exempt the proposal from the operation, custom and practices which Beauchesne dictates. Beauchesne is the repository of those customs, practices and traditions.

It is void, as well, because there is nothing in there that says, notwithstanding any Standing Order something shall be done; that is vacant; that is absent from the clause which deals with the filing of speeches. Without it, Madam Speaker, the proposition of the government House leader falls to the ground.