

*Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen*

briefly. Those bells rang. Well, I see Your Honour shaking your head in the negative. I insist that those bells rang and Your Honour can check that with the officers of the House. They rang very briefly and then they were turned off.

It is my personal view that once the bells are started, they must continue until the whips are in and until the division is taken. In this case, it would have been a very quick division, I am sure, because we had no intention of coming back in to participate in a process in which we were muzzled. But I do draw that irregularity to Your Honour's attention so that it might not happen again. If it does, it is my view that the bells should continue to ring until a division is taken.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pinard:** This also deserves a reply. If the hon. member had remained in the House, he would have seen what happened. Here, in any case, we did not hear the bells, and I heard nothing myself. In any event, it is not a member of the NDP who asked unanimous consent to proceed with the vote. I stood up and asked for the vote myself, and this was also shown on television, and I am surprised not to have been seen in the members' lobby, but it would have been very simple for the Progressive Conservative members to remain in the House and then to see what was happening. I asked unanimous consent for the bells not to ring so that we could vote immediately and consent was given by all members present in the House. There was therefore absolutely no irregularity, and if there was, we did not realize it, and everything was covered by the unanimous consent which was granted at my request.

**Madam Speaker:** All that I can confirm is that the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) asked unanimous consent for the bells not to ring and that the Chair agreed to dispense with the bells.

• (1550)

[English]

I have a few comments on these particular submissions. I want to say to the hon. member for Yukon that he is quite correct in all of his quotations as to the right of hon. members to appeal decisions of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. All of his quotations are particularly relevant. The difficulty is that the decision was not appealed. The hon. member does not at this point feel that he wants to appeal that decision.

**Mr. Nielsen:** I can't. It's too late.

**Madam Speaker:** It was not appealed in Committee of the Whole and therefore not reported.

**Mr. Nielsen:** I tried.

**Madam Speaker:** I do not deny that. I do not pronounce myself on that fact. Of course, the Chair was not present and is therefore unable to make a judgment on facts that took place in the course of the Committee of the Whole.

Since none of these facts were reported to the Chair, it is very hard for the Chair to make a judgment on those particular facts. I know the hon. member understands that I cannot possibly rule on them in the absence of a report. If the hon. member wanted a formal redress, and he said that in his presentation, he would have another recourse, but he does not want to take that recourse. Perhaps one of the reasons is that *Hansard* is not available today; it is a bit late. We understand why it is late. The hon. member has not been able to check the record to see exactly what took place. However, his version is on the record today. We have to accept that as his version and we do not dispute what he has to say.

I understand that the hon. member for Yukon simply wanted to draw the attention of the Chair to a practice that he does not particularly appreciate. He rose today on a point of order precisely to draw the attention of the Chair to a practice in general. He is not referring to anything in particular, although he has referred to it for purposes of explanation. The hon. member is not asking me to look into the specific incidents of last night. He is just drawing the attention of the Chair to a particular practice which he does not appreciate.

I thank the hon. member for that. It is always useful when members practice their right and remind the Chair of the manner in which the rules might be interpreted. The Chair and the assistants certainly do not have objection to that. In a sense, members can co-operate in the manner in which the Chair might interpret the rules and practices. Of course, once the Chair rules, I know hon. members accept the way in which it rules. However, in between there is space for interchange on these matters.

I thank the hon. member for having brought this particular practice to my attention. I can assure him that we always review everything that goes on in the House. It is done on a daily basis. We like to look back on what we have done and perhaps learn lessons from what we have done the day before. Therefore, we always do that. We certainly will look at those events in light of the remarks the hon. member has made today as well as in light of the remarks made by the President of the Privy Council. I thank them both for this exchange.

MR. LAMBERT—PROPRIETY OF DEPUTY SPEAKER VOTING

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It draws attention to another fact which was exemplified last night. It is not the first time I have raised this with the Chair and with the officers concerned.

After 23 votes cast in a partisan manner, since they were cast with the government, I find it extraordinary that the Deputy Speaker should then step into the chair and be involved. It is my view, strongly held, that the Deputy Speaker should not vote. It is strange, really strange, that the Standing Orders preclude the chair—not that the House doubts the objectivity of the officer occupying the chair—from voting. They state specifically that the Speaker shall not vote.

In the practices that apply in this House, where the Deputy Speaker occupies the Chair at most second and third readings