

to whatever motions or procedural usages may interrupt those Routine Proceedings. I put this question to Hon. Members who, I know, wish to address the Chair on it because it seems to me that whenever Routine Proceedings are interrupted, some Hon. Members will at least for a period of time lose what rights they are supposed to have under the Routine Proceedings of that day. I would ask Hon. Members to comment on that.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond specifically to the point on which you asked us to comment. I respectfully direct your attention to page 209 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 666, which reads as follows:

The right of petitioning the Crown and Parliament for redress of grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution and has been exercised without interruption since 1867.

If the right to petition the Crown and Parliament for redress of grievances is a fundamental principle of the Constitution, surely it cannot be abridged nor can it be wiped out by procedural game-playing on the part of the Government. I call upon you, Sir, as the guardian and protector of the rights of this institution and therefore of the rights of the Canadian people, to rule—where the purpose of the procedural measure offered by the Government, as is the case here, is really to wipe out Routine Proceedings, which are in our Standing Orders to provide opportunities to Members of Parliament to have their say, but more particularly to wipe out the right of Canadians to petition Government and Parliament—that this is contrary to a fundamental principle of our Constitution. In fact, it is a fundamental principle of the British Constitution dating back 1,000 years and which provides the foundation for this parliamentary system. I ask you to rule that this parliamentary game playing is not acceptable and must be rejected.

● (1750)

I also want to say something about the feeble attempt—

Mr. Lewis: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Benjamin: You cannot have a point of order when there is a point of order before the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary rises on a point of order. It may very well have to do with something said by the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray). If it is, I can hear it.

Mr. Lewis: I respectfully—

Some Hon. Members: Sit down!

Mr. Beatty: He can raise a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I can help Hon. Members. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has heard something the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) has said. It may well be that the point he wishes to make is a point of order in relation to something that was said. I am not talking about

debate. If that is what the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary is rising on, then I will be able to figure that out pretty quickly and I will hear him.

Mr. Gauthier: Point of privilege.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) on a point of privilege.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, clearly the rules of any debating society as well as the rules of Parliament entertain only one point of order at a time. You cannot have a point of order on a point of order. I submit that the Parliamentary Secretary is out of order when he puts to you a point of order which is, first of all, a phoney point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, my points of order have been called a lot of things but usually only after I have said a few words.

I believe the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) was exactly on target with his point of order *vis-à-vis* the right of a member to make a motion as did the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain). My point of order, with respect, is that the point of order of the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) and the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) should have been made earlier in the day at the point when petitions were abridged. This point of order concerns whether or not it is in order for the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody to make the motion he made, not to abridge petitions which, by the way, are taken care of by Standing Order 106.3.

Mr. Gauthier: That is nonsense.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, it has long been established that you cannot raise a point of order about a point of order, especially not as a surreptitious way of smuggling in argument. Even so, the Member's argument is so empty that I suppose I should welcome it because it shows the shallowness and lack of substance of the Hon. Member's position.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): I was simply responding to Your Honour's request to provide comment or argument on specific points that interested you. I regret very much that someone with the august position of Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader—he often styles himself Deputy House Leader—shows so little respect for the Chair that he attempts to interrupt with a specious point of order an Hon. Member who is simply trying to respond to an invitation, if not a request or command, from you to offer comment on the point that interests you. I do not know if the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary will later get up and offer words of apology for trying to prevent a Member from obeying an order of the