

Point of Order—Mr. Hnatyshyn

period of time, we have terminated consideration, fine. If not, it will be adjourned for further consideration at a later date.

After 45 minutes we will consider all stages of the Bill to amend the Salaries Act, to be introduced later today concerning the Lieutenant Governors. We have an agreement for one speaker per Party.

Third, two resolutions to approve the appointment of Inger Hansen, Q.C. as Information Commissioner and John W. Grace as Privacy Commissioner will be dealt with. We have an agreement to deal with the two resolutions with two speakers per Party.

Fourth, we will deal with Bill C-152, an Act respecting the organization of the Government. That is the business for tomorrow.

[Translation]

Monday will be an Opposition day. Tuesday, unless we finish today, we shall resume debate on Bill C-151, which authorizes the Government to borrow certain sums of money. We are now at the second reading stage, and this Bill must be passed as soon as possible. Wednesday will be a day set aside for Private Members' Business. As for next Thursday, agreement has been reached between the parties to pass all stages of Bill C-156, an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 3), with the amendments relating to this Act, by 6 p.m. at the latest.

Madam Speaker, that was the order of business for next week.

* * *

*[English]***POINT OF ORDER**

MR. HNATYSHYN—APPLICATION OF EIGHT-HOUR TIME LIMIT ON DEBATE—RULING BY MADAM SPEAKER

Madam Speaker: I would like to rule on the matter which was raised concerning the inclusion of the time concentrated on points or order in calculating the time of speeches and the total amount of time that is given for discussing a certain matter. After having examined the arguments put forward very carefully, I would like to make the following points touching on the substantial elements put before by me last Thursday.

First, I must say that it is highly unusual for me to consider arguments on a ruling given by the Deputy Speaker or an Acting Speaker. We all know that a Speaker's ruling under our Standing Orders and our practice cannot be appealed. In this case I heard the Hon. Member because he made it clear that he had been invited by the Acting Speaker on May 16 to make those arguments to the Speaker, but I am now making the point that an Acting Speaker's decision has the same finality as if it had been rendered by the Speaker.

Second, the Acting Speaker gave a ruling as to the substance of the problem. That ruling is entirely correct and reflects our rules and our practices in that whenever a specific

length of time is attributed to any proceeding in this House, the time taken up by points of order within that period is not subtracted from the total time allowed. That is the general rule. However, as the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) stated, the Chair at its discretion can extend the time allowed for a Member's speech if, in his opinion, he has been unfairly interrupted by points of order. Whether such an extension ought to apply equally to the total time for debate is similarly to be determined in any specific case at the discretion of the Chair.

The general practice of counting the time used by points of order against the allotted time for a specific proceeding is not new to this House. It certainly was the practice under the Standing Orders prior to September, 1982, and I see no reason to change that practice under the Provisional Standing Orders.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Madam Speaker, may I get clarification of your ruling with regard to points of order. I believe you indicated that a ruling by the Acting Speaker is the same as that of the Speaker and is not subject to appeal. May I ask when is the Deputy Speaker the Acting Speaker and when are the two Assistant Chairmen Acting Speakers? Because the ruling that was originally made, I submit to you, was made by the Deputy Speaker. Our rules provide very clearly for an appeal from a ruling of the Deputy Speaker. There is a procedure for it. Therefore, I say that there is a difference between the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. When is a Deputy Speaker and a Chairman not acting in his or her capacity? There is only one Speaker in this House.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member knows that whenever a Speaker or Acting Speaker or Deputy Speaker is in the Chair, what I said about their decisions applies. I think the Hon. Member is confusing the time at which a Speaker is sitting as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. At that time there is a procedure, I believe, to appeal the decisions of the Chairman.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Madam Speaker, I listened intently to your ruling but I have to confess I was not altogether clear as to the exact nature of your ruling. Maybe you can clarify it for me from this point of view. In terms of the debate on Bill C-155, which is the proposed amendments to the Crownsnest Pass rates, is it your ruling that the time, which consisted of about one hour, taken up by points of order with respect to the interpretation of the rules is to be subtracted from the eight hours which is allocated to the 20-minute speeches, or is it your ruling that that time is included in the eight-hour calculation?

Madam Speaker: Hon. Members are in the habit of asking for clarification of rulings. They should know they can read them in *Hansard*. If they require clarification, they can speak to the Table officers. The Hon. Member perhaps had a moment of distraction. I said that there is an amount of discretion allowed on the part of the Speaker.