Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with this point of order. I say that the ruling which has been brought down is one which will seriously abrogate the rights and abilities of Members of Parliament to deal with—

Mr. Pinard: Order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Let me just finish. The House Leader is so anxious to ram through this matter—

Mr. Pinard: You cannot question the ruling.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I am not questioning the ruling; I am questioning the cold premise upon which the ruling was made. I do not recall anybody standing in this House and asking for a ruling on the particular matter on which you apparently have made the ruling, that is to say whether points of order are to be taken off the time available for debate. This is a very important consideration, because if we were ready to debate that matter and raise it as a point of order, all the arguments should be made to the Speaker a ruling is made with respect to the proposition.

Let me put this to you, Mr. Speaker, regarding order and points of order, the kind of example and argument that should be placed before you before making a ruling of this significance. A point of order deals with a matter of order in the House. It may extend from disorder on the part of some Members interrupting the free flow of democratic debate in our House to a matter relating to procedural matters so that there can be a clarification. Indeed, a legitimate point of order is one in which the Speaker will hear out the representations, as was the case in this instance, as to what procedure should be followed. It does not have anything to do with the substance of the matter under consideration or the subject matter of the Bill. It is a matter of order in the House, and how without argument we can come to the conclusion—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I am going to hear the Hon. Member, although I would encourage him to come to his point of order fairly soon. I know he is aware that once a ruling is made on a point of order, the same point of order ought not to be brought up again for discussion.

I am going to hear the Hon. Member, but I wonder if he is aware that a point of order was raised by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) as to whether or not points of order are to be counted within the eight-hour time limit. Is he also aware, as I referred to in my ruling, that the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) referred to the same point of order? To the best of my understanding, no further representations were made on that point of order. Accordingly, I gave a ruling. I will hear the Hon. Member, but I would appreciate if he could come to his point.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the point I am raising now. When the Deputy Speaker left the chair—I do not care what interpretation of the English language one uses—there was no question in my mind that he had simply said there was no point of order, that the matter speaks for itself and the time would not be deducted from the time for debate. That is what he said. I am prepared to look at the blues to back that up. I would have stood up, as would have other Members in this House, to argue about that point of order if there had been any equivocation or any doubt in our minds that the Deputy Speaker, when he left this place, had any other conclusion but that the time was not—the members of the Table may have blanched. I did not blanch because I believe the Deputy Speaker was telling us there was absolutely no time on points of order to be taken off the time allocated for debate. I want the right to look at the blues and come back on this issue because I do not believe in thwarting the ability of Members of Parliament in this House unduly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I indicated when I made the ruling that I thought the words used by the Deputy Speaker, which were, as I recall, "the point is well taken", could be interpreted in both fashions; that is, he had accepted the point and given in some sense a ruling; or, alternatively, he could have meant that the point was well taken and that he would in due course consider it.

I thought it was my duty on coming here to avoid the issue whether or not the 40-odd minutes referred to taken up on points of order would have to be considered as part of the debate or not. I wanted the House to understand in what time frame it was acting.

I have no objection at all to what the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West proposes, and I made that clear in my comments. I make it clear again that for the moment the ruling is and was that debate began after the eight-hour period at 12.24. If the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West and other wish to raise that matter, I provide them with two opportunities. One is to do it immediately. The other is, as was suggested, to allow time for Members to examine *Hansard* and raise the matter again. I have indicated that in the circumstances that is the fairest way to proceed.

For the moment, the ruling is made. I think I have invented a new procedure and that is that Hon. Members may wish to take the occasion to appeal this subject if they so see fit tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, my point of order has to do with two points. The first is with respect to the comments of my colleague in the NDP and the suggestion that an arrangement may have been made on Friday. The Deputy Whip and myself obviously were not part of that discussion or we would have confirmed or denied it immediately. Therefore, we cannot comment on that.

The one thing I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention is this. According to my records, if you recognize the NDP at this time you will then have recognized nine Members of the Official Opposition, the Conservative Party, during the eight-hour debate and four Members of the NDP during the same eight-hour debate. That will give a time weight of 70 per cent to the Official Opposition and 30 per cent to the NDP.

With all due respect to the Chair's right to choose Members who rise to speak, I know Your Honour will want to give a proper mathematical division to the way the Members are