

motion to suspend the rules with respect to the adjournment of the House on June 30 should be listed under Motions or under Government Orders.

I intend to argue that the Government erred in listing the motion in question under Government Orders, but I would offer that argument only if you should rule that the motion is receivable in the first place. If I am saying at this time that the motion should be listed under Motions rather than Government Orders, I am not in any way thereby admitting or agreeing that it is proper for the Government to present a motion which would have the effect of throwing the rules of this House out the window just because the Government finds itself unwilling or unable to work within our current rules, even though the Government has taken great credit and continues to take great credit for these rules as being an important achievement in parliamentary reform.

I would hope it would be noted that I intend to argue both these points in some detail and to present arguments which I think are well founded. However, I want to stress that I think it is very wrong for the Government to say that it cannot live or work within the present rules, due in effect to the mismanagement of its program, and therefore it wants to use its majority to force the House to in effect ignore the rules completely.

Mr. Speaker: I have exercised considerable patience under the circumstances, but I think the comments of the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) are helpful, as are those of the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

I repeat again what I said to the Hon. Member for Windsor West, which is that he will not be stopped from giving further argument at a more appropriate time. The Hon. Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) may want to make a few short comments.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of State and Minister of State (Treasury Board)): Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to seek direction from the Chair. I would suggest with all due respect that something cannot be half premature. If argument on a procedural basis is premature, it is premature. I do not mind for a minute taking time to argue procedure, not at all. It is healthy. However, surely the 25 minutes we have now taken from debate on Bill C-129 would have been better spent on debate on Bill C-129.

I suggest that there are other items on the Order Paper. For example, item No. 33 appears on the Order Paper. We could be proceeding now with a procedural debate on Bill C-33 which has not been proceeded with by the House.

Some two weeks ago, the abortion motion referred to by my hon. friends was put on the Order Paper by the Government and it was debated at length by opposition Members. We reserved our right to debate the procedural argument because we felt it was proper to debate the procedural argument when the Bill was called. We now have another motion placed on the Order Paper. I submit the appropriate time to argue the

procedure on that, and we are fully prepared to do it, is surely on the day it is called, not now.

My hon. friend has read into the record a very learned argument which we will review and respond to, but surely the time to argue procedure on that particular motion is the day on which the Government calls it. If we find ourselves arguing procedure willy-nilly on various items on the Order Paper, as it suits the purposes of my hon. friends, we will have chaos on the Order Paper. I seek direction from the Chair. When is premature premature? When should procedural debate on a matter take place?

Mr. Speaker: I must say that the Hon. Minister of State (Mr. Lewis) raises a point which I think has some merit. As I say, the Chair has been generous in hearing the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis). It may turn out that it in fact is helpful. I hope that it will be. I hope it will be helpful to the Hon. Minister of State as well and to the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

As I indicated at the beginning of this, it is in my view probably premature. There may be some useful purpose served in having heard the very well prepared argument of the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap, and I have to say that frankly, I think it has helped the Chair. However, I think the Minister of State has a point and I think that it is appropriate now to put this matter off until such time, if it does happen at all, that the matter is called. I would ask Hon. Members to cooperate.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to question the decision you have just made, but I want to say that the point I was attempting to make was that I do not think we should ever get to Orders of the Day when this question is being called. The point is that it is coming up in the wrong place in Routine Proceedings of the day. When we get to Government Orders one day and then you call for procedural decisions, having arrived at that point, I submit that it would be too late. That is why I am saying that it is presently in the inappropriate location as it stands in the order of business before us, and it is for that reason that I would submit that some consideration at least ought to be given to rule on this prior to the Government actually calling the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Speaker: I will consider the point the Hon. Member has made. In the meantime, I think it is appropriate to adjourn the matter. I will give that particular point careful consideration. If the procedure that has been followed by the Government is found to be incorrect, it would be difficult for me to understand how the fact that that decision was made just before Orders of the Day started or at any other time would make any difference. However, I have the Hon. Member's point and I will take it into account. I would ask Hon. Members to cooperate in this.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When the House adjourned Orders of the Day for Question Period earlier today, we were dealing with Bill C-129 which, as you