

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order and—

Mr. Herbert: This is a question of privilege.

Mr. Paproski: Let him finish his point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Vaudreuil on a question of privilege.

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, my reason for rising on a question of privilege is that I very carefully discussed a point of order. I have been discussing an order of this House, and the member has now introduced into his argument on the point of order some points concerning the bill which I did not introduce and do not want to introduce at this time. I am discussing only a point of order and I respectfully suggest that you do not allow any discussion of the bill itself, the implications of the bill or any points in connection with it, but that we deal solely with the point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. After listening to the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) I think he is quite right. He has raised a point of order which concerns a matter of great importance to him since this is his bill. Perhaps with the indulgence of the House I would suggest that the Chair take this point of order under consideration and render a decision at a later date. I will recognize the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) for the purpose of discussing the point of order, without any reference to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order itself, it does seem to me that the argument advanced is to the effect that the bill, which was at report stage at the conclusion of Tuesday, as it appears at page 4119 of *Hansard*, ceased to be at report stage just because the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack) who had the floor at the time, called it five o'clock. I feel the argument he is using is phony because the bill could still be at report stage. There is no evidence as I see it that it has ceased to be at report stage. The hon. member argues that it is now at third reading stage and should go to the head of the list of private member's bills which are at third reading, this being the only one. That is a completely specious argument, and these matters ought to be taken into account when you are making your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder why the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) wishes to prevent me from speaking. He says: "No more". It seems to me that I have the right to rise in the House on such a serious point of order.

Some hon. Members: You are wasting time.

Order of Business

Mr. Pinard: I will be brief, Mr. Speaker, but I would have liked the preceding speaker to put more meat on the point he was trying to make. He claims, without explaining why, that the reasons given by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) are ridiculous and unfounded. Anyone who reads Standing Order 20(1) and (2) with serious intent and an intelligent mind will see that a distinction must be made between a bill at the third reading stage and a bill still in second reading or at any other stage mentioned in sub-paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of Standing Order 20. If we, as legislators, had not wished to give bills at the third reading stage priority, we would have remained silent on the subject, Mr. Speaker, and all we would have required is that once a bill had been dealt with at one stage and time had lapsed, it goes to the bottom of the list without exception.

But if we have deemed it necessary to provide all the distinctions set out in Standing Order 20, it must be because we wished to give priority to some bills on the basis of the stage to which each had progressed. So it seems to me, offhand, that the point raised by the hon. member for Vaudreuil is a valid one. I know you are about to reserve this matter. I do not wish to force the House to adopt my view, since it is not in my power today to give priority to the bill introduced by the hon. member for Vaudreuil over the one sponsored by the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson). If you are about to reserve this important matter, Mr. Speaker, I would urge you to read carefully Standing Order 20(1) and (2); I am convinced you will find there the reason why we deemed it necessary to give bills at the third reading stage priority over those, for instance, still on second reading. And if we follow the logic expounded by the hon. member for Vaudreuil, I think it will be found to be more convincing than the groundless argument expressed by the follow-up speaker.

● (1610)

[English]

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) are taking up the time allotted to the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) in this private members' hour. Every time the hon. member has a private members' bill before the House, the government side seems to want to filibuster it. I am surprised.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. There have been contributions to the point of order by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) and the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard). All three contributions will be taken into consideration and a decision will be rendered at a later date.

Order No. 9, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Siddon). Shall the order stand?

Some hon. Members: Stand.