The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am in receipt of a notice of motion under Standing Order 52 from the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

# [Translation]

# POINT OF ORDER

# DISCUSSION ON A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic-Compton-Stanstead): After last Wednesday's Oral Questions Period, Mr. Speaker, I rose on a question of privilege and the Speaker asked me to defer the debate and to advise hon. members and other parliamentary leaders as to when debate would resume.

I believe it would be convenient to resume debate tomorrow after Oral Questions Period.

# [English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not know why the hon. member is getting up at this time. We still have an application under S. O. 52 from the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville. His point has nothing to do with Orders of the Day.

I have to listen to the application under S. O. 52 from the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville. After that, if the hon. member would like to get up on a point of order, that is fine, but the hon. member for Yorkton— Melville has the floor.

### \* \* \*

# **MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52**

## SENATE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, earlier today I gave you notice that I intended to rise under the provisions of Standing Order 52 to ask that you consider adjourning the House for the purpose of discussing a matter that I believe is of urgent and pressing necessity at this time, namely, the events surrounding the nomination of the eight additional senators last week. I think they have left the people of the country quite confused and uncertain about the

# **Routine Proceedings**

propriety of that act as it pertains to the Parliament of Canada.

I believe that this undermines the House of Commons and that we are now working under a cloud of uncertainty and a cloud of confusion. I believe that this is a crisis at this time—

Mr. Speaker: I have been considering for some hours the application of the hon. member. I assure the hon. member that I have given it a great deal of consideration.

The point I am making at this moment is that applications for emergency debate should be brief, concise, and to the point. There is a reason for that. If the discussion strides into debate, under the Standing Orders, no other member in the Chamber can rise. That creates a situation in which one person has the floor, gets into debate, and there may be very grave differences of opinion as to what is being debated, but no other member can rise on the matter.

That is why we have the order and I know that the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville understands that. I would ask him to complete his remarks very briefly.

Mr. Nystrom: I had just completed my remarks, Mr. Speaker, as you were rising. I believe it is an urgent situation. There is a crisis in the land and the people want to see this issue before Parliament.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members will remember that when the reform committee was dealing with the rules of this place, one of the recommendations was that a Speaker not give reasons when an application for an emergency debate was turned down. I have tried to follow that admonition most of the time. However, sometimes it is important that the public which is watching and listening understand something about what goes on in the Speaker's mind when trying to assess whether or not it is appropriate to adjourn all other business of the House and go into an emergency debate. One of the things that guides the Speaker is if there are any other avenues open to raise the issues which would be debated if there was an emergency debate.

The hon. member knows that the matter he raises has been the subject of comment in this House and in question period, and there will be further opportunities in the next number of days to raise the matter.

If an emergency debate is turned down, it does not mean that the matter is not an important matter. Many