

Point of Order—Mr. Deans

moved that the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) be now heard. I contend that that is out of order. A Member who gets the floor on an existing point of order surely is not in a position to move that another Member be now heard. If there is a point of order being discussed on the floor of the House, a Member rising on that point of order cannot then move, under Standing Order 33, that another Member be now heard.

● (1530)

I ask, for the sanity of the place if nothing else, that that matter also ought to be reviewed and that a clear ruling be made that when a point of order is under discussion it is not then possible for a Member to rise and, in advance of the point of order having been ruled upon, make a motion that another Hon. Member be heard. I would suggest that that is quite improper.

I further suggest that if it were to be allowed that a Member, once engaged in discussion whether on a point of order or something else, whether in debate, on a point of order or a question of privilege, cannot then transfer his speaking place to another Member simply by motion. If that were the case it would be possible for one Member or one group of Members to preempt any other Member from gaining the floor legitimately.

That speaks in part, although I did not intend it to, to the point raised by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I did not intend to address the question he raised but I put it to you that, unfortunately—and this is no reflection on the Chair because these things do occur—it can create some very difficult situations. This was the case this morning. If that prevailed, once one Member got the floor, he or she could transfer that speaking order to another Member who could transfer it to another Member who could transfer it to another Member, and so on. The only way to stop that would be to hold a vote, and I do not think that is what Standing Order 33 was intended to do.

Madam Speaker: I suppose I have to thank the Hon. Member for bringing up the matter. I was not in the Chair this morning when those events occurred but I understand that the Member who tried to pre-empt the Member who was speaking on a point of order was ruled out of order, and that was to the satisfaction of the House. Exactly what the Hon. Member says should not be allowed to happen was prevented by the fact that it was ruled out of order.

I will review the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). I see the Hon. Member shaking his head. I am not going to review the other point brought up because that matter is closed. I will look at what the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is referring to. If there has been any injustice to any Member, we will certainly try to correct it.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. While you will be making all those beautiful reviews, perhaps you would consider reading Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 117, Subparagraphs 4 and 5. I think that if those provi-

sions were to be applied we would have more order in the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I should like to suggest that you review the "blues" for today when a point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Alt-house)—I did not have my electronics functioning as they usually do—I rose trying to say to the Chair that there could not be a point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre when there was already a point of order before the Chair; but the Chair allowed that. It is no reflection on the Chair but that is the kind of thing I mean. That is my recollection. I could be wrong.

* * *

PRIVILEGE**MR. GAMBLE—RIGHT TO BE RECOGNIZED ON A POINT OF ORDER**

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege as a result of the occurrences in the House this morning. It is not very often that I take positions of this nature or become involved in procedural matters. I came into the House at a quarter after eleven and was here until one o'clock. During that very extensive period of time points of order were raised with respect to the nature of the business of the House for today. I came in to deal with the matter that I understood would be dealt with, and that was the motion of which this Party had given notice yesterday before the House closed and with respect to which there had been a designation of an Opposition day by the House Leader for the Government. As I finally viewed his conduct in the House at the end of that day, his acknowledgement of consent to the nature of the business of the House was the motion that I came into the House prepared to deal with.

These remarks are made by way of preliminary discussion only because this morning the Chair ruled that regardless of any of those consequences—quite frankly the nature of which I have discussed here and no one else has with respect to that last comment—the nature of the business of the House was not to be the nature of the business that I anticipated. I had on several occasions endeavored—

Madam Speaker: Order, I have to interrupt the Hon. Member. There was no ruling on this. The Chair had no choice but to contemplate the business of the House which was before the House. The business which was before the House was probably different from what the Hon. Member for York North was expecting it to be. The Chair does not determine what the business of the House will be.

The Hon. Member has to be quite clear that this is not the role of the Chair, and the Chair has not done that. The business of the House is determined by the Government which gives the Clerks an indication what the business of the House will be for the next day. The Clerk of the House of Commons has no choice but to write that down and make it the business