

If the House agrees, I suggest we follow past practice and print the text of the objection as an appendix to this day's *Votes and Proceedings*.

Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. COLLENETTE—STATEMENT OF MR. STEWART PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

Mr. D. M. Collette (York East): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order or a question of privilege; perhaps Your Honour could determine which it is. Earlier today in the deliberations under Standing Order 21, the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) used the Royal Family in connection with a partisan statement which he was making. This certainly runs contrary to the rules, practices and traditions of the House.

While the Hon. Member has every right to make partisan statements, I submit he has no right to use the Royal Family to influence debate. I refer to Citation 316 of *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition* which reads:

Besides the prohibitions contained in S.O. 35, it has been sanctioned by usage that a Member, while speaking, must not:—

(g) use the Sovereign's name for the purpose of influencing a debate;

Also I refer to page 426 of *Erskine May's Nineteenth Edition* where the author goes somewhat further by indicating:

The irregular use of the Queen's name to influence a decision of the House is unconstitutional in principle and inconsistent with the independence of Parliament. Where the Crown has a distinct interest in a measure, there is an authorized mode of communicating Her Majesty's recommendation or consent, through one of her Ministers . . . ; but Her Majesty cannot be supposed to have a private opinion, apart from that of her responsible advisers; and any attempt to use her name in debate to influence the judgment of Parliament would be immediately checked and censured . . . This rule extends also to other members of the Royal Family.

I am aware that there was a lot of noise in the House at that particular time, but I submit the Hon. Member created disorder or breached the privileges of the House by that usage, and the record will officially show this. I hope, Madam Speaker, you would ask the Hon. Member for Simcoe South for an apology because his statement was certainly an affront to the Royal Family and an affront to the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member might have a point. I would want to look at the "blues". I am wondering whether the reporter was able to hear what the Hon. Member for

Point of Order—Mr. Gauthier

Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) was saying. It was absolutely impossible for the Chair to hear what he was saying. I will look at the "blues" and take the Hon. Member's point into consideration.

[Translation]

MR. GAUTHIER—INTENSITY OF LIGHTING IN CHAMBER

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), on a point of order.

Mr. Gauthier: Madam Speaker, because of a power failure in downtown Ottawa, the lights in the House of Commons have dimmed considerably today. The drop in light intensity does not seem to have had a very negative impact on the telecasting of the proceedings. Hon. Members will probably have noticed that comfort levels in the House were better than usual, at least as far as the glare is concerned. Madam Speaker, I wonder whether you could check with the television network and find out whether the televised picture was acceptable, and if so, whether you could take steps to have conditions in the House corrected or improved to make our environment a more pleasant one to work in.

Madam Speaker: I must say to the Hon. Member that I do not have the impression that the usual telecasting was possible. In any case, the proceedings were not being televised live, because the cable companies were unable to function this afternoon. However, we do have a video tape of this afternoon's sitting, which will be broadcast this evening, and we will then be able to see what the picture quality is like. I do think the bright lights and the heat they produce are most uncomfortable and that is too much to ask Members to work daily under such conditions. I realize that the technicians want to give the television audience the kind of picture they expect from studio productions, but I am looking into the matter, and I have talked to an expert who is supposed to come tomorrow, I believe, and look at the lighting in the House, so he can advise us on how to get a decent picture that will be satisfactory to the television audience. I should add that this will affect the backbenchers, unfortunately, since it was necessary to increase the brightness of our lighting because the backbenchers are hidden by the galleries which cast a shadow on their faces, which is why we needed more lighting. If the backbenchers are prepared to make some concessions for the benefit of their colleagues, perhaps we will be able to improve comfort levels in the House. As I said before, these lights are very uncomfortable for people who have to work every day in the same room.