

Business of the House

referred to several standing orders of the House of Commons. At page 12405 of the *House of Commons Debates* the following argument was submitted after the Speaker had asked if the matter could be taken as a question of privilege related to a right or privilege of a member of the house.

And yet under section 74—

[Text]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand that the hon. member has already spoken at length on this matter. I am prepared to give a decision but I would urge the house to accept the solution that appears to be the desire of everyone in the house, namely that inasmuch as the desire of the hon. member for Beauce has been attained we should proceed to get on with the business of the house.

[Translation]

Mr. Perron: Mr. Speaker, dealing specifically with your question, the fact that almost all hon. members considered it a matter of principle—

[Text]

Mr. Speaker: Order. There was no decision. I want that clearly understood by the member. It was a suggestion to try to help the house at this particular stage of the proceedings. Inasmuch as it seems to me that it is the general desire of the house to get on with the business, may I suggest that the house accept my suggestion that orders of the day be now proceeded with.

[Translation]

Mr. Perron: Mr. Speaker, I raised that question of privilege in the form of a question and today, the purpose is to have a strict application of the rules. In that case, I appeal your ruling.

[Text]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The standing orders apply to the hon. member just as much as to everyone else and he has already spoken three times when he is entitled to speak only once. If I may say so, I suggest for the last time that we proceed with the business before the house and try to get something done.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, in suggesting that orders of the day be proceeded with, does it mean that the motion is withdrawn without the unanimous consent of the house? Will the house resume the debate on the pensions plan or will it take

another matter of business until we get the committee proceedings in French?

[Text]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand that the Prime Minister suggested the bill be suspended until Monday next, that by that time the evidence both in English and French will have been translated and I assume filed in the house and, that being so, that there would be no question of privilege before the house and we should proceed with the business of the house.

Mr. Douglas: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, could we be clear about this? Do I take it that the question of privilege still stands and will be raised when the measure comes before us next week, or is Your Honour ruling on it now? If Your Honour is ruling on it now I would like to say something before Your Honour gives your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I said three times that I have made no ruling but perhaps I have made too many suggestions. The house is master of its own affairs but I once more suggest that we consider that there is no question of privilege before the house at the moment because the objective of the proposed motion has been attained, and that we proceed with the business before the house.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, the only way Your Honour can say there is no question of privilege before the house is if those who have raised the question are prepared to withdraw it. I made the suggestion, and I still press it, that if the government is prepared to leave the legislation on the order paper at its present stage and not proceed with it until such time as the evidence before the committee has been printed in French I would hope that those who moved this motion would withdraw it, and therefore there would be no question of privilege. However, if they do not withdraw their motion, then it seems to me that the question of privilege is before the house, and on that basis I think we should state our opinions with reference to the matter of privilege.

Your Honour's suggestion so far has been to the effect that this motion of privilege has to do with whether or not the house can proceed with a piece of legislation until the evidence before a committee has been translated and printed. I suggest to Your Honour that in the view of many of us there is a totally different question involved. It is not whether the house can proceed to deal with a piece of legislation until all the evidence