isolate those sections which he feels ought not to be amended or that ought to be voted upon separately, without offending the principle of the bill. I think that would give the hon. member and other hon. members an opportunity that they should enjoy, to put their position on the record, which I think ought to be known, and also to require others in the House to vote in respect of that position.

In the same vein, Speaker Sauvé also expressed her opinion on June 20, 1983 at page 26538 of *Hansard* in this manner:

[*Translation*]

Thus, although some occupants of the Chair have expressed concern about the practice of incorporating several distinct principles in a single bill, they have consistently found that such bills are procedurally in order and properly before the House.

[*English*]

The Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons has not been given any specific authority over the form or content of omnibus bills. From time to time, suggestions have been put forward by the Chair on how hon. members may voice their positions on various sections of omnibus bills. As Speaker Jerome indicated, for example, report stage motions to delete certain clauses may be one way of proceeding. As I stated on June 8, 1988 at page 16257 of *Hansard*:

Until the House adopts specific rules relating to omnibus bills, the Chair's role is very limited and the Speaker should remain on the sidelines as debate proceeds and the House resolves the issue.

In conclusion, under the circumstances I cannot accept the objections made to this bill to divide or set aside the progress of Bill C-63, an act to dissolve or terminate certain corporations and other bodies.

I thank all hon. members for their contribution.

Mr. Dingwall: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly I want to thank the Chair and Table for returning back to the House so expeditiously and giving us a ruling with regard to Bill C-63.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate very much the comments of the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond. Some of these questions are not easy and they require a lot of work. I think that all members who have to work on these judgments very much appreciate the thanks and appreciation extended by members.

The hon. member for Skeena. We are returning to the hon. member's question of privilege.

PRIVILEGE

COMMENTS OF MEMBER FOR CARIBOO—CHILCOTIN

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin is present in the House. The question of privilege that I raised arose originally from his remarks of March 13 and have been carried on since then.

I would draw your attention to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, sixth edition, citation 64 on "Reflections on Members", and citation 92 on "Interfering with Members" which says:

92. A valid claim of privilege in respect to interference with a Member must relate to the Member's parliamentary duties and not to the work the Member does in relation to that Member's constituency.

I believe that—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if I could just get some clarification here and then I will hear the member out. Were these comments made outside the Chamber?

Mr. Fulton: They were. The most recent remarks were made outside the Chamber and I can in fact come to them very quickly.

The issue arose on March 13 in a statement made by the member for Cariboo—Chilcotin which I and I believe the Chamber believe that he subsequently withdrew on March 25 and put an end to it. That resulted from a point of order that I raised and that you reserved on. As I said, the member rose on March 25 and apologized to the House thereby, I believe, withdrawing the remarks from the record.

On March 26 I publicly thanked the member for that apology. A letter was in fact published yesterday in the newspaper in his constituency. However, the newspaper in his constituency quotes him yesterday, March 31, 1992, in the Williams Lake *Tribune* on the front page where it suggests that the member has now moved the attack on the Library of Parliament. It says and I quote: "Worthy is upset at the use of the parliamentary library and has sent a letter to the Speaker of the House, John Fraser, asking him to look into the matter. They used the library of the