

*Privilege—Mr. A. Lambert*

I am not granting him any rectitude in this regard—he probably will have saved some hon. member on this side some difficulty. I simply point out that with reference to the parliamentary secretary who has carried the responsibilities of consumer and corporate affairs, Your Honour and hon. members opposite will recognize that his responsibilities have increased substantially, and there ought to be no attempt on the part of the opposition to try to subtract any salary from that person.

I point out, as well, that perhaps the hon. member opposite has not recognized that the Prime Minister is also part of the cabinet and is a minister. In addition, quite apart from any announcement that might be made today, tomorrow or in the future, we have at the present time one minister with two portfolios, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of State for Science and Technology, and he has two parliamentary secretaries working on his behalf.

● (1520)

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton that this matter ought to be looked into and that there should be a report back to the House about it. However, with respect, I disagree with my hon. friend's suggestion that Your Honour should be called upon to rule on this. This is a point of law and it is the same sort of thing we had a few days ago. If the point is reached when Your Honour has to decide what pay to give members of the House, you will be busier than ever. It seems to me that it is for the government to look into the matter, or for the Auditor General, or for the courts, but not for Your Honour.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would, perhaps with unseemly haste, agree at least in a preliminary way with the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I was, throughout these remarks, asking myself what responsibility I have. There is perhaps an administrative matter involved on the part of the House for which I do have some responsibility, but, again, I suspect that the responsibility lies elsewhere. However, the matter has been referred to and it will certainly be examined to see whether there are any responsibilities so far as the Chair, on a point of order, is concerned. Perhaps I shall have something more to say about it at a later time.

[Translation]

**Mr. Rondeau:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, the hon. member for Bellechasse raised a question of privilege which you considered as being a procedural matter and I would perhaps be ready to agree. But just the same it is disappointing on this side of the House and I would humbly ask you to consider the matter so that we on this side of the House may refrain from moving motions under Standing Order 43. On the other hand, it cannot be expected that members of this side will object. I remember quite well that on many occasions I saw persons in the galleries saying yes or no and I do not see how those words can be ascribed to members when they come from the galleries

[Mr. Blais.]

but are considered as part of our proceedings. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to study this question so that the individual or the member of the House who wishes to oppose a motion moved under Standing Order 43 may identify himself and we may know for sure what he has said, a "no" generally, when he opposed a motion under Standing Order 43, that he has really said those words while participating in the debates of the House and that they have not been said by someone in the galleries.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important matter because words from people we cannot identify because they are not members of this House on extremely important questions often raised by motions moved under Standing Order 43 could make this House look rather ridiculous.

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the question put by the House leader of the official opposition to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) who is at the same time the government House leader.

Considering that Bill C-84, which has not yet been presented to the House and is still at the first reading stage, seems to be the cause of considerable delays in the House because of very lengthy discussions, could the President of the Privy Council tell the House if there will be special meetings of the House leaders concerning Bill C-84 so that we can reach agreement without having to refer to Standing Order 75A, 75B or 75C? If that is not possible, when will these meetings be held? Could we delay the study of Bill C-84 until next fall so we may celebrate the Saint-Jean-Baptiste, the holiday of French Canadians, as well as Confederation Day so that this House might be adjourned during those two weeks?

[English]

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, this is one of the bills that I should like to discuss with the House leaders. I am trying to arrange a meeting for tomorrow and I hope my hon. friend will be present at that time. There is fairly long agenda before us to the end of June, and I share his wish that we should dispose of this business before then. He said that he hoped we would not use Standing Order 75A, B or C on Bill C-84. I certainly had not contemplated anything of that kind. I had hoped, however, that there would be a disposition on the part of the House leaders and the House generally to find some way in which we can debate Bill C-84, have an expression of all points of view and come to a decision within a reasonable time.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on this question, perhaps one point we might agree on is to reduce the length of speeches.

\* \* \*

#### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

First report of Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services—Mr. MacLean.