

I had to deny this formally and clearly establish that the Standing Orders on the business of supply were adopted unanimously by the House on December 20, 1968. Now that was the kind of argument that was raised within the context of a voting procedure, where there should have been no debate or amendment, and this had been going on for some time when the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House decided to simply apply the Standing Orders after having been extremely patient. It was then the Chairman decided to take a standing vote. The House was still in Committee of the Whole. Then what happened? Instead of waiting his turn—today the hon. member is claiming that he wanted to appeal a ruling, which, in any case, was not clearly specified—in fact, he still had enough time last night to do so later on, if he had stayed in the House, with the members of his party, to raise his point of order after the vote in question, at the report stage or the third reading stage of this particular bill. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to draw the Chair's attention to the fact that a point of order may not be raised at all times, without any consideration and as hon. members please. A point of order is subject to a number of rules determining how it is to be raised and especially, when it is to be raised. I may draw your attention to Beauchesne's fifth edition, Citations 235, 236 and 237, and I shall quote a short passage from Citation 235:

A point of order may be taken after a debate is concluded and the Speaker is about to put the question to a vote or after the vote has been taken—in fact, at any time, but not so as to interrupt the Speaker when he is addressing the House.

Thus, the member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) would have been able to raise his point of order if he had chosen to remain in the House like a big boy after the voting procedure followed by the Speaker of the House.

Citation 236 reads, and I quote:

If the Speaker's attention has been called to a breach of order in the course of a division, he has directed that the division be completed—

Yesterday, that was exactly the course of action open to the member for Yukon. If he really wanted to raise his point of order, he could have stayed in the House and raised it after the vote called by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. You yourself were in the chair later that evening and could have recognized the hon. member at that time. Finally, still in Beauchesne's fifth edition, Citation 237 reads, and I quote:

A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

Madam Speaker, today's objection is arrogant and out of place. Yesterday, we adopted the bill on third reading, and during the vote there was a complaint about the attitude of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. The opposition members had their chance last night. If they had shown some respect for this institution and had behaved like adults and not like unruly students—if they had remained in the House, they would have been able to make their point before we proceeded with third reading, in other words, the final stage, of the bill in question. Today, it seem clear that the hon. member for Yukon

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

is complaining about the work of the Chairman of the Committee and is telling the House, in a manner which I find unacceptable: In the future, give him a good scolding at your meetings and tell him how to behave in Committee of the Whole. However, Madam Speaker, in the light of the facts I have just described, we have no reason to criticize the behaviour of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House last night, on the contrary. He was extremely patient and fair, and it is entirely unacceptable that a Standing Order should be used, as it is being used today, to try to discredit the work of one of your representatives, namely, the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of committees of the whole House. This point of order was not raised at the appropriate time. It is not factual and I suggest that it is simply a sham to disguise the doubtful, childish and irresponsible tactics used last night by the opposition to the prejudice of order and good name of the institution of Parliament. In view of the circumstances, as I have just explained, I found it difficult to take the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) seriously in his clever attempt to prove his point using his parliamentary experience of a quarter of a century, as he has just explained. I do not question his ability. I do not question his good will either, but I think that he has a very bad customer in the person of the Leader of the Opposition, who is an irresponsible child who wastes the time of the House, and I pity the hon. member for Yukon to have to plead such weak cases for a client with so little maturity.

● (1540)

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I will not deal at all with the personal references made by the government House leader. Let me simply draw to the Chair's attention that what he is suggesting is that we close the barn door after the horse has gone. What he is suggesting is that we could have appealed these matters under Standing Order 55(4) after they had passed. The time to appeal them was before the vote was taken. I will just leave that with the Chair.

There was one further irregularity last night, however, which I overlooked drawing to the Chair's attention, and I do so merely for that purpose. After we had left the chamber, we were watching the proceedings on television. Some of us were in the lobby and some of us were behind the curtains. When the bill came before the House for third reading, the yeas and nays were taken. The Speaker declared that the yeas had it and the members were called in. The bells started to ring.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: Then the point was raised, I believe by an hon. member in the NDP, that the bells should not ring, and the bells were turned off. My point is that the bells were started.

Mr. Pinard: No, no!

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, they were. They were heard by too many people to deny it. I am sure Your Honour heard them very