

will be about, so that the Chair can try to find out in advance the facts leading to the question of privilege. The notice is not very specific, but I will hear the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, if it is your wish, I am prepared to delay discussion of my question of privilege until Wednesday in order that you may be given more information.

Madam Speaker: I think that is a very good idea, and I thank the hon. member for his co-operation.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. LEWIS—HOUSE OF COMMONS—PRESENCE OF SECURITY GUARDS BEHIND CURTAINS IN CHAMBER

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, I rise to ask you to consider a point of order which flows out of the report you made to this House yesterday on the presence of security guards in the chamber on October 24, 1980. The reason that I am asking that you rule on this point of order is that I seek direction for this House as to whether or not a Speaker's report is the same as a ruling by the Speaker. Does the Speaker's report become a precedent which then goes into *Beauchesne's* and *Hansard* and then is looked to in the future for guidance by people who are seeking to apply a new set of facts to a report of the Speaker?

I would like to know how a member of this House can have input into a report made by the Speaker, if it does have the same effect and force as a ruling. Such input would assist your office and give you as Speaker the benefit of some of the experiences in which we participated on that particular evening. In the future people will be looking for guidance from whatever is said by Madam Speaker. I think that it is very important that we decide whether or not a report becomes a ruling. I reviewed *Beauchesne's* and I cannot find anything which states that a report becomes a ruling. I am concerned, because I have very serious reservations about what was stated in the report delivered by you yesterday, Madam Speaker.

Also, as part of my point of order, I would ask you to consider something which is in *Beauchesne's*. It is suggested in *Beauchesne's* that the Speaker may request the Sergeant-at-Arms to prepare a report on a disturbance in the House. I would suggest that perhaps this has not come up too often. I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that you have an opportunity to bring *Beauchesne's* up to date on what is happening in the world today in that the practice of administrative bodies investigating their own acts is rapidly disappearing in Canada.

When the Sergeant-at-Arms is asked to investigate a disturbance in the gallery or in the corridors, that is an entirely different matter than when the Sergeant-at-Arms is asked to investigate a disturbance which involves his staff.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, and I say this with the utmost of respect and dignity, there are facts in that report which are

Point of Order—Mr. Lewis

simply not accurate. I refer to the last portion of the report where it is suggested that the vote was called and the guards left the House. The vote was called, I pulled the curtains while the bells were ringing and the Acting Speaker, the hon. member for Lachine (Mr. Blaker), who was sitting in the chair, immediately ordered the guards to leave. That is what concerns me. We will not set history in 1980 but in years to come when people refer to *Hansard* and to your report to determine what happened, they will weigh what was said yesterday. I am concerned that they will apply that report to a new set of facts and, quite frankly, that particular part of the report is not accurate.

Mr. McDermid: That's right.

Madam Speaker: To begin with, the statement I made in the House the other day was certainly not a ruling. It was merely a statement, a report on a situation on which I promised the House I would report. I think that is clear. The hon. member then proceeded to ask me how members can have some input into investigations, or a report of that nature. I would suggest that he could speak to the Sergeant-at-Arms and give his version of what happened so that the Sergeant-at-Arms would investigate the facts as the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) saw them, and compare that to what he is being told in the course of the investigation, by the security staff.

● (1220)

I would point out that I am asking the Sergeant-at-Arms to review the procedures and the type of general instructions which the security staff has in case there is a disturbance in the House.

The report that I received from the Sergeant-at-Arms suggested that the staff was carrying out its normal instructions in the circumstances. I have asked the Sergeant-at-Arms to review the whole matter, however, because if some members found the positioning of the security guards offensive on the night of October 24 or October 25—I am not sure if that is the right date but at any rate we know exactly what we are referring to—in case some members found that offensive and not in the spirit of our Standing Orders, I have asked the Sergeant-at-Arms to review that and make recommendations to me as to changes that might be made in the practices and the instructions which the security staff receive in order to deal with this kind of situation.

I shall inform hon. members, when the Sergeant-at-Arms gives me a report, of that review of the instructions given to the security guards. If hon. members are not satisfied at that stage that it fully covers the grievance they might have in this respect, then—and the hon. member referred to people on the staff making their own inquiries into things that they themselves had done—if hon. members are not satisfied, perhaps we can devise some other way of getting advice about how these instructions could be carried out and how they could be defined. I shall endeavour to do that if it is the case that hon. members are not satisfied.