

recognized in order that the number of seats held by each Party in the House will be properly respected when the eight-hour debate is over. I suggest that if you recognize the NDP at this time, you will be giving them 30 per cent of the debating time. Based on the number of seats held in the House, 132, broken down 31 and 101, to sort it out properly and fairly between the two Opposition Parties, 75-25 is a more accurate split of debating time.

● (1230)

I would therefore suggest that the Chair might reflect upon its desire to do justice to the number of seats in the House, and on that basis reconsider who the Chair recognizes at this point in the debate.

**Mr. Althouse:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I believe that if you are to reflect on the number of seats as proposed by the House Leader for the Official Opposition, you should put the statistics into a framework that is more fair than what he suggests. I believe the House Orders read that there shall be one speaker from each of the three Parties on the first round. I think those first round speakers must be taken out of the figures that were presented to us here today in order to use proportional representation as is normally followed in the House for the speaking rounds after the first three speeches have taken place. That will change the proportion somewhat.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, with reference to the comments made by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), I am sure he would want to be fair and point out that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nielsen) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) get unlimited time in debate. There is no reference to that privilege being granted to the NDP Party as a minor Opposition Party. If we are to put all of those items on the plate, let us deal with everything pertaining to time allocation.

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the point that must be underlined is that the eight-hour debate period does not embrace those three speakers with unlimited time. The eight hours begin after the three Party spokesmen have made their contributions, so the calculation must be based upon those eight hours of debate and not upon the time used in the preceding by three speakers.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Let us see if we can dispose of this matter. The Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) was quite courteous to the Chair and indicated that he would want the Chair to be fair. I caught the implication that in his view the Chair would also want to be reasonable with the Parties. He is, incidentally, quite correct. The Chair does work with a mathematical ratio. If it has been in error, I believe that between myself and the other occupants of the chair we will come to a conclusion whereby we could see that any necessary redress is made.

I hope that the Hon. Member is not now arguing that we should reverse the decision made by the Chair with respect to

### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

recognizing the Hon. Member for Dauphin-Swan River (Mr. Lewycky); but if he is, he can raise a motion in that regard, as he well knows. I simply indicate that I and the other members of the Chair will examine the situation very closely to see whether or not the proper ratios have been followed; if not, we will seek to make any redress appropriate.

The Hon. Member for Regina West on a fresh point of order?

**Mr. Benjamin:** No, Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to add to the point raised by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) following the point the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) made about the length of time taken on points of order not being included in the eight hours. It was certainly my intention to rise on that point of order, but the Deputy Speaker said that the point was well taken, and I believe he made another remark a few minutes later when another Hon. Member rose to speak. It was my impression that the Speaker then said something to the effect that time taken on points of order would not be included in the eight hours of debate. If he had not said that, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West and myself and probably others would have been on our feet right then and there. However, it was our impression and assumption that the matter was then closed and that time taken up on points of order would not be included in the eight hours of debate time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I say to the House that I believe this is a repetition of the point already made. I wish to put a simple proposal to the House which I am now putting to the House for the third time. I recognize that the words used by my predecessor in the Chair, the Deputy Speaker, lent themselves to several interpretations or understandings. Time is available for Hon. Members to review *Hansard*, seek precedents and review procedures. I did not want to make any suggestions in that regard earlier but I would now suggest that Hon. Members might see the opening of the House tomorrow at 11 o'clock as an appropriate time to review this matter. I do not want to suggest to the House the manner in which it ought to proceed, but I do want to say that I have made a ruling and the ruling is that at 12.24 we began the next classification of debate; but the Chair is open to renewing that point of order and to reviewing it completely.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I have only two points to raise. When the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) begin to raise the point again, your predecessor in the Chair, the Deputy Speaker, said that that point had been settled and the time taken would not be included in the debate. I believe that *Hansard* will bear that out.

The second point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it would be very unreasonable to include time spent on point of order in the time spent on debate. For instance, with respect, you yourself took seven minutes to give a ruling. If it is to take seven or ten minutes for the Speaker to give a ruling, it would not be fair to take that time away from the Members' allowed time in debate. I say that with respect.