

*Report of Special Committee*

reports from the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. The first one would be the fourth report, the second would be the fifth report. I would be grateful if the Chair would call the motion with respect to the fifth report.

I move:

That the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure presented to the House on Thursday, March 3, 1983, be concurred in.

This is the first opportunity, Madam Speaker, that any member of that committee has had to address the House with respect to concurrence in the reports, beyond the third report, setting forth the temporary rules we are living under at the moment. Therefore, in my preliminary remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to certain people who have laboured long and hard on the work of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure, the committee, generally, of parliamentary reform.

The first group I would like to mention is the very distinguished staff of the committee. We had two co-ordinators on the committee, Mr. Alistair Fraser, who was a Clerk of the House, and Mr. John Holtby, who is a distinguished student of Parliament and who learned his craft over many years in the Ontario Legislature. I am so pleased he was able to help our committee in such a competent way. The Clerk's department was represented by Mr. Marcel Pelletier, Mr. Robert Marleau, Mr. Philip Laundy, Mr. David Gussow, Mrs. Susan Baldwin, Lucie Gratton, Hugh Stewart, Nino Travella, Rita Blais-Beaudoin and Marjolaine Morrisette.

The Library of Parliament was represented by Mr. Gerald Schmitz, Mr. Gary Levy, Mr. Bruce Carson, Mr. Louis Massicotte and Mr. Brooke Jeffery. As well—

[Translation]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, may I refer you to page 27998 of yesterday's *Hansard*? The Chairman of the Special Committee on Parliamentary Reform (Mr. Lefebvre) said the following—this is very short—and I quote:

Madam Speaker, because my position as Chairman of the Committee was brought into question by the words that were spoken, I want to say that there definitely was an understanding by the members of that Committee that these reports—

—and one of these reports is the one the Hon. Member is debating—

—would be arrived at by consensus, that there would be unanimous decisions on the understanding there would be no move to concur in the House.

The Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) is betraying his colleagues, the members of the Committee, and he is breaking his word, and in the circumstances I submit, with respect, that he is acting contrary to an understanding among Committee Members and that he should not be heard in the House today, because—

**An Hon. Member:** Order.

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Speaker, I quoted the Chairman of the Special Committee on Parliamentary Procedure who said on the floor of the House yesterday that there was an understanding among Committee Members that there would be no move to concur in the House, including the report the Member for Nepean-Carleton wishes to debate. I can only say that he is betraying his fellow Committee members, that he is out of order and that he does not have the right to move his motion today. I am simply making a point of order, and I ask the Chair to interrupt the debate in order to respect the undertaking that was given and observe, purely and simply—

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. I thought the President of the Privy Council was proceeding to a motion of one sort or another. For that reason, I have allowed him to go on. There is nothing coming out of the point being made by the President of the Privy Council. If there is indeed a point of order which he wants to make, I will obviously hear it. However, so far I have not heard a point of order.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am asking the Chair to declare this debate out of order, considering the fact that, as the Chairman of the Committee said yesterday in the House, there was an understanding among members of the Committee according to which—

[English]

**Mr. Nielsen:** That is an abuse of the rules.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. That is a dispute between, in this case, the President of the Privy Council and the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton. I need to have a motion of some kind before me relating to unparliamentary statements made on either side of the House, or something of that order, before I could deal with a point of order. I do not yet see a reason for interrupting the debate or for calling the debate out of order.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Speaker, a dispute between the President of the Privy Council and the Member who was speaking? I quoted the member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle (Mr. Lefebvre) Chairman of the Special Committee on Parliamentary Reform. The dispute is not between me and the member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) but between the Chairman of the Committee and the Member for Nepean-Carleton.

[English]

**Mr. Nielsen:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr. McGrath:** Why do you not quote what I said?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** The President of the Privy Council does not, in my view, advance an argument which causes the Chair to become responsible for interrupting the debate. The essence of the remarks made by the President