

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If it does not, then the Hon. Member certainly has permission to proceed. The Chair is having difficulty grasping just what is the purpose of the Hon. Member's point of order. Which point of order is he making?

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on the same point of order as the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). I refer you to two citations of Beauchesne's.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not permitted to reflect on a decision of the House or a decision of the Chair. Is that what the Hon. Member is doing at this time? He appears to be reflecting on a decision of the Chair and a decision of the House. That is not in order. I will hear the Hon. Member out.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Only one point of order can be entertained at a time. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is being heard on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) must realize that he cannot interrupt on another point of order. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville cannot raise the same matter which the House has just decided.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I refer you, then, to Citation 239(1) of Beauchesne's which reads:

The Speaker decides questions of order only when they actually arise and not in anticipation.

I suggest, with great deference, that you cannot anticipate—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member is reflecting on a decision of the Chair—The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) has made an intervention? I hope I did not hear it right.

Mr. Benjamin: I was not on my feet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) must realize that he cannot reflect upon a decision of the Chair. He was recognized for the purpose of debate. He made reference to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans)—

An Hon. Member: Oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary had the floor. He was making a speech before he was interrupted by the proceedings which took place in the House in the last hour or so. I am now trying to make the same point of order that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) wanted to make but was unable to make. I want to make sure that I can make that point of order and that is why I am quoting citations of Beauchesne for your consideration. Citation 239 states that one cannot anticipate what I am going to say.

Western Grain Transportation Act

To get back to the argument I was making, Citation 237 reads:

A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

I think that these four citations to which I have referred you, and with some research and a bit more time I could surely give you more citations and more precedents, should convince you as to why I should be recognized at this time for a point of order. My point of order and the point of order of the Hon. Member from Hamilton Mountain, if he were recognized, was going to concern the speech that the Parliamentary Secretary was in the process of making. He was making a speech in this House on Motions Nos. 55 and 56. What the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain wanted to do was to make a point of order under the citations of Beauchesne—the Standing Orders of our rule book—suggesting that the speech he was making was not relevant to the motions before the House. Since he was not allowed to make the argument, I want at this time to make the argument that the remarks that he was making were not relevant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair was attempting to establish relevance. The Chair had called the attention of the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the question of relevance, as the *Hansard* record will show, and the Chair was doing its very best to determine relevance. The problem the Chair had was the constant interruptions and, therefore, the Chair could not hear what the Parliamentary Secretary was saying.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question of relevance has been raised many times in the debate regarding statements by Member of the Party to which the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville belongs. The Chair in every case listened, and listened attentively, with regard to relevance. In the case of the Parliamentary Secretary, the Chair had the greatest difficulty. At a point which the Chair considered absolutely crucial in the argument, it was almost physically impossible for the Chair to hear.

Therefore, with the greatest respect to the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville, the Chair is quite prepared to rule on a question of relevance of any speech. It is not an easy matter to rule on relevance. It is not easy at all. But the Chair was certainly raising the point and had cautioned the Parliamentary Secretary more than once about the rule of relevance. If the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville is making the point that the Chair should have called the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary to the matter of relevance, the Chair will readily agree that it was considering that but had great difficulty hearing the Hon. Member for that purpose.

Mr. Nystrom: My whole point, Mr. Speaker, is that I wanted to be heard on a point of order a few minutes ago, but because of proceedings that I thought might happen because of certain precedents that were set, I wanted to make sure that I quoted four citations from Beauchesne's to point out that I