

recognize a second creditist member during the question period. This, to my mind, is a fair proportion under the circumstances.

I have perused our Standing Orders, as well as Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice and Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, to ascertain what the Speaker's powers are as to the counting of hon. members. The only reference I have found is the case of an hon. member inquiring whether there is quorum. Mr. Speaker, considering that you took the liberty to count the members of our party who were present in the House at the time to justify the number of questions allowed, I feel it is within my rights and privileges, as parliamentary leader, to explain why there were only five of us present in the House. Four hon. members were representing fellow citizens involved in arbitration awards of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, while the other two were attending a committee meeting. Mr. Speaker, I feel that our 11 members carry their share of the load as well as any other party and that this practice of counting hon. members should cease forthwith.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would remind the hon. member that it was not the Chair that raised the subject. The hon. member for Témiscamingue raised the question of whether or not one of his colleagues ought to be recognized during the question period. My reply was simply to indicate I was trying to maintain a proportion between the various parties in this House. There were at the moment five members of his party to whom he referred present in the House. I indicated I had the intention of recognizing a second member during the question period, which I did, and that two out of five for Ralliement des Créditistes in proportion to the attendance of other parties in the House was absolutely just in the circumstances bearing in mind—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker:—that two members of the Ralliement des Créditistes out of five members represents 40 per cent. If the Chair were to recognize 40 per cent of the New Democratic Party and 40 per cent of the Conservative Party at the same time, there would not be enough time, to say nothing of government members seeking to be recognized.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I say only that my reference to the number of members of Ralliement des Créditistes present in the House was not my idea but was raised by the hon. member for Témiscamingue.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Further to that question of privilege, I can understand that you could say then that there were only five of us in the House. When the Chair allowed us three questions, for instance, during the question period, we never complained; the Chair did so willingly. But the other day, being told that there were only five of us was insulting. The number of members in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I am very serious in pointing it out to you, is our business. I doubt that the Chair counts the number of hon. members

Point of Order—Mr. Joe Clark

present each day before deciding how many questions will be allowed the Conservatives or the New Democrats.

Last Monday, the NDP had six members in the House and we had five. To my knowledge, in 16 years, the Chair has never said to the House: There are so many members in the House; you are therefore entitled to this or that many questions. The Chair has made its little point—

• (1510)

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I might point out to the hon. member that I was perfectly aware on the day in question of the fact that there were exactly six members of the NDP in the House, that is the difference between the two parties at the moment, and the leader of the NDP did not ask me why they were not recognized. I have heard questions from their members. I recognized exactly two from their party and two from the Ralliement des Créditistes, which I felt was more than just in the circumstances in relation to all hon. members present.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): I simply wish to let you know that twice you have called us the Ralliement des Créditistes. This is not our name at all. We are the Parti Crédit social du Canada, The Social Credit Party of Canada.

So I respectfully request that you call us by our name from now on.

[English]

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my point of order relates to an answer which I have just received to a question on the order paper which will be recorded in *Hansard* which, I believe, certainly inadvertently misleads the House. My question had been to seek the names and positions of those people who had served in the political offices of ministers of the Crown since 1963 who are now in the public service or the agencies. The answer in the reply of the President of the Privy Council indicated:

A reply to this question would require the review of personal files of every individual in the Public Service of Canada.

I submit that that is not correct. An alternative method to proceed would have been—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I seriously question whether the hon. member has a legitimate point of order. He has received a reply. Whether or not he questions the quality of that reply is not a point of order in this Chamber.

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) raised the point as to whether or not the statement tabled by the President of the Privy