

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

which a Parliament should be able to function. What happened last night is a question essentially of whether or not a Parliament can move to some other business while there is a question about its order. That question was being raised last night, and I put this to you, Madam Speaker, because you will be giving this some consideration: how could we move to any other form of business, be it adjournment or be it unanimous consent to move from one Bill to another, when in fact there is a question of order.

It would seem to me, as long as there is on the floor of the House some question about the process by which that House is conducting itself, namely, the rules by which it chooses to operate, that if there is a question about that process, then, by the nature of our Standing Orders, attention must be given to the fact of whether or not we are in order.

To be outside of order and then to move to some other activity is simply, I believe, a defiance of the rules of order themselves. Therefore, the specific question of the events of last night are in question, as is also the hypothetical event of moving to any other state of order than the one which might be before us.

With that in mind, Madam Speaker, I would also find it necessary to bring to the attention of the House, through you, that while we had before us last night a question of order at the time of adjournment, what has happened now is that nearly four hours of business have passed since that question of order was before us. I say this to underscore the necessity of considering points of order or questions of privilege at the time when they are submitted rather than putting them aside to some later period of time. As was indicated earlier, and I will not recite the Standing Order, we have a duty and obligation, when we believe there is a question of order, to bring that question of order to the attention of Madam Speaker or Mr. Speaker, depending on what the case may be.

I have extended the argument of the Hon. Member for Yukon because I think there is not only the question of the specifics which face you now, but the whole general hypothetical question of whether or not the House can shift from any form of business to some other form of business while there is on the floor of the House a question of whether or not it is in a state of order.

● (1720)

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, in my riding today there are 15 per cent unemployed and one in 13 workers in British Columbia will soon be going on welfare. My people want this House of Commons to deal with some real business and to get some Government action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: Let us get moving. This is ridiculous. I saw the vote last night. We did not hear the vote back here, it is true, as the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) said. But as the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) said, we saw the vote being put by the Clerk, we saw it read,

and we all know that the Government was not defeated. If it had been, we are sure it would have raised hell and we would have got that vote recorded. So let us move on. We know what the vote was, we know what is happening, and there is a big need in the country to get going.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Madam Speaker, we are no longer operating with privacy in this Chamber and no longer can we conceal from the public what takes place in this Chamber.

Mr. Blais: Don't you have any unemployed at home?

An Hon. Member: Canagrex will not solve unemployment.

Mr. McCain: I think what I have just said, Madam Speaker, should caution those who are treating the procedures of this House so lightly, frivolously and so carelessly to mend their ways and be responsible to their constituents in the performance of their duties.

I did not hear, Madam Speaker, nor did I see any lips move for the presentation of that vote to this House in the traditional way. When I left this House last night the first person I met had been watching the proceedings on television. The first question asked of me was: "Don't they announce the vote in the House of Commons? What kind of a procedure do you have? Did you win it or did you lose it?" No one made any remarks as to the results of that vote, and I have never seen that happen before.

Madam Speaker: Excuse me. Just for the record, and you will see it in *Hansard*, the Speaker said "the motion is lost".

Mr. McCain: Madam Speaker, I am not quarelling with that, but I am told by a viewer that there was no awareness as to who won or lost the vote. Perhaps in the noise your voice did not carry through the audio system. But I do think we have to give some consideration to conformity with good manners and the rules of this House.

I would just like to say in closing, Madam Speaker, that when the Hon. Member from Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), perhaps most notorious for his filibustering and time-wasting speeches, rises in this House in the frivolous manner in which he just did, this House does not gain in stature or in reputation with those who know it.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, all I said when I got up was that there are 15 per cent unemployed in my riding and there are going to be one in 13 workers in British Columbia on welfare next year. It is about time the Conservative Party paid some attention to that, and I wish the Member would shut up!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McCain: Madam Speaker, no Member of this House is entitled to tell any other Member, from his position in his seat, to shut up. I submit to you, Madam Speaker, that that should be retracted forthwith, without comment.

Madam Speaker: Well, Hon. Members in the course of debate often use expressions which are a bit extreme. We have