Point of Order-Mr. Deans

thing that occurs in this place is, of course, debate. We have a precedent that says even Question Period is debate.

Yesterday the Government House Leader was heard after the motion was put. I was heard. Today, the Chair was confronted with a situation where he had to put the motion without debate. He applied the Standing Order, in my view quite rightly, rigidly and put the question immediately without hearing any points of order or whatever—because they are all debate.

That area has to be clarified because, Madam Speaker, one thing was done yesterday and quite another thing today. We are, therefore, in somewhat of a dilemma. I would suggest very strongly that you might want to hear other Members, particularly the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette. I suggest very strongly that you do not come to any decision today on that question but take it—I see the Chair nodding its head in the negative. I make the suggestion not for the purpose of asking her, as she said yesterday, to shirk her responsibility. I would never do that. However, I would ask her to take it under very careful consideration, look at past practices in the House, look at the orders and at the precedents before coming to any precipitous ruling. The question and its future application is important not only to the Opposition but the other side as well, because they also have used that Standing Order.

Referring to precedents of the Chair, particularly when it is not necessary to come to an immediate conclusion today, it might be prudent for the Chair to consult with her officers and satisfy herself by a personal reading of the precedents that there might be some merit in what I am saying so that we can be guided more efficiently in the future.

Madam Speaker: I think we can end this matter. I do not see why the time of the House should be taken for clarification by the Speaker on points of procedure. I am not in the habit of giving clarification of points of procedure in the House. That is not my function.

This case is clear enough. It has been dealt with. The total proceedings took place yesterday and everything was perfectly in order. Today, after the proceeding is all over, Members are asking for points of clarification for future conduct, as the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) says. Certainly the Speaker is not going to fall into the trap of giving clarification and applying it to future conduct which the Speaker knows nothing about. Future situations in the House will be judged as they occur, taking into account all of the circumstances, the Standing Orders and precedents which may apply to the particular situation which has arisen.

The Hon. Member says quite rightly that a motion that an Hon. Member be now heard has been dealt with one way on one day and a different way the other day. That is precisely because the circumstances were different. The Hon. Member did not mention the fact that, of course, Members may on a point of order ask that an Hon. Member be now heard as long as no other Member has the floor legitimately. Beauchesne states that a motion that a Member be now heard must be moved before the Member recognized has begun speaking. If

the Member recognized has simply said "Madam Speaker," that is enough to be in possession of the House and, therefore, under those circumstances a motion that another Member be now heard is not in order. If the Hon. Member who has been recognized has not exercised his right to speak and another Member rises and proposes that another Member be now heard, then the motion has to be put to the House forthwith and voted upon.

The two circumstances were different. They are quite clear to me and, I am quite sure, they are clear to all Hon. Members. I consider this matter closed. I do not feel it is necessary to hear any other argument unless we have a seminar on procedure. We could do that at some other point; we could go out of the House and have a seminar on procedure. I will be quite willing to share my knowledge with Hon. Members and to share their opinions on a number of matters, but I do not think this is the time or the place to do it.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. DEANS—APPLICATION OF RULES OF DEBATE

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I have been attempting since twenty minutes to one to gain the floor on a point of order on a question that arose at twenty minutes to one or thereabouts. Strangely enough, it touches upon something that was raised without dealing with the same circumstance. I know the Speaker may feel that I am trying to rehash, but I am not. I hope she will listen to me in this instance. I would raise it later, but I have to raise it at the earliest possible moment.

This morning during debate, two things occurred that require, in my opinion, the Speaker to make a ruling. The first was that a Member had the floor on a point of order. Another Member took the floor away from that Member by rising on a point of order. That happened this morning. The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was speaking on a point of order. At that point a motion was made by another Member who rose on a point of order that the floor be given to someone else.

I do not want to go into the detail. I would simply ask that the Speaker review the debates of this morning to determine whether or not my submission on that is accurate and, if it is, to rule, as I would have asked had I got the floor, that one Member who has the floor on a point of order cannot be interrupted by another Member rising on a point of order. That is the first question. It is important that that be upheld; otherwise chaos would ensue.

The second point is, in my judgment, equally important. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) sought the floor and got the floor today during the discussion on points of order. The only way that he could have got the floor was to rise to speak to the point of order that was then under consideration. However, having engaged in discussion for a moment or two, in fact for a minute or two, he then