

Perhaps the Hon. Member for Algoma could collect whatever it is he wishes to let me know about and bring it back a little later when I bring this matter back to the House.

In the meantime, the Chair is concerned about perhaps hearing too much of one side of the story without the opportunity of the other side of the story being heard. I do not want to leave anyone with the impression that only one side is being heard in this matter.

Perhaps the Hon. Member for Algoma has a comment.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on this matter and support the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and his representations concerning his point of privilege. On the same day that the Rural Dignity group called at his office, earlier that day I met with Rural Dignity people and a large number of my constituents, some 60 or 70. I had thought that this was just a general public meeting of people from up and down the north shore of Lake Huron and all those communities because they were concerned.

As we left the meeting, we were told that officials from Canada Post were sitting across the road in their vehicle conducting surveillance on the group and keeping track of who was there and, I believe, intimidating many people who were associated with Canada Post from even attending—

Mr. Speaker: The difficulty the Chair is in is that it is one thing to say that they were intimidating. I do not know all the evidence. It seems to me that the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis is putting forth a very sensible suggestion that this matter be adjourned, at least for now. I will bring it back to the Chamber. If there is hard evidence of the allegations that have been made, I want to know what that evidence is.

Hon. Members will know that there is a difference between attending a public meeting and some surreptitious exercise of surveillance, which may well go beyond just surveillance and become intimidation. Surveillance within itself could become intimidation.

The appropriate thing to do at the moment is to adjourn this matter. I have no doubt the Hon. Minister responsible for the Post Office (Mr. Andre) will hear about this discussion. I will bring it back to the Chamber in due course, and Hon. Members will have every chance to put to the Chair, as fully as they can, the story as they know it. That is the appropriate thing to do at the moment.

I see Hon. Members indicating some support for that. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis).

Point of Order—Mr. Riis

POINT OF ORDER

APPROPRIATE LISTING OF MOTION ON ORDER PAPER

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order unrelated to this matter to bring to your attention what I consider to be a serious breach of the rules, the customs and practices of this House.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday my colleague, the House Leader for the Official Opposition (Mr. Gray), rose on a point of order to challenge the procedural acceptability of the motion currently standing on the notice paper in the name of the Government Deputy House Leader. You indicated yesterday that you would hear this point of order if and when the motion was called for debate.

I wish to raise a somewhat different point relating to the same motion. In yesterday's notice paper the motion to which I have referred was listed under Government Notices of Motion. As it was submitted last Friday, it has since been transferred to Government Orders pursuant to Standing Order 24(1). It is my contention that this motion, which deals with extending the sittings of the House past the normal date for summer adjournment, should be listed under Motions, not Government Notices of Motion. Because my point deals with the proper notice procedure and not the substance of the motion itself, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you should hear my point at this time rather than waiting until a later date when the motion is actually called.

It is my position that Government Notices of Motion are those that deal exclusively—

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member may have a very serious and legitimate point, but again the Speaker is in the same situation that the Speaker was in earlier, and that is whether or not the point that the Hon. Member is making or wishes to make is premature. If it is, then it seems that it is not appropriate for the Chair to use up the time of the House in hearing this matter at this time. I certainly want to let the Hon. Member know that when it is appropriate to hear it the Hon. Member will have every chance to express his concerns, as will other Hon. Members. Perhaps the Hon. Member would like to respond to my concern.

● (1530)

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I anticipated your intervention. I would simply like to make the case that if Your Honour permits me just a few moments to proceed into the case that I wish to make, you will see that to hear my point of order at the time when you call for the motion would be inappropriate. The argument I want to put forward now is simply to indicate that the listing of the particular motion put forward by the Deputy House Leader is inappropriate in its particular positioning. Therefore it would be critical now, if you would, Mr. Speaker, at least be prepared to hear a few points. I will assure you—