

*Privilege—Mr. Herbert*

other words, let the buyer beware if somebody is offering him a bargain in this field.

## OLYMPIC COINS—POSSIBILITY OF ISSUANCE OF GOLD COIN

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the minister earlier this week neither denied nor confirmed that gold coins will be minted in order to supplement the sagging coin program, and as Simpson's of Toronto are already taking orders for just such Olympic gold coins, will the minister not take the House into his confidence and let us know whether gold coins will be minted, as Simpson's obviously already know.

**Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General):** Mr. Speaker, the coin program is not sagging, which is good news. Actually, now that the uncertainty as to whether there are to be Olympic games next year has been cleared up, the coin program is going along very well. As to whether there is to be a gold coin, I will take the House into my confidence. I assure the hon. member that such a decision has not been made by the cabinet. In so far as people taking orders in Toronto, they take them at their own risk. They will be quite red in the face if they are unable to deliver the orders in the event that we determine not to issue gold coins, but proceed in some other manner.

● (1200)

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## PRIVILEGE

## MR. HERBERT—CONDUCT OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil):** Mr. Speaker, I request your indulgence while I explain the various incidents that lead me to raise this question of privilege at this time. I had attempted to raise the matter in private members' hour, where it would be more appropriate, but our rules do not permit that procedure. I have risen in private members' hour in this House on several occasions, on points of order, to protest the procedure allocated for private members' business. The daily correction procedure does not cure the recurring problem which affects the rights of all members.

On Tuesday of this week, private members' business was not called until 5:45 p.m. due to preceding votes. The item called was No. 40, which was the thirtieth item on the list of public bills which are presently before the House. Speeches by the introducer of the bill and by others acknowledged that this bill, C-240, had effectively been superseded or made redundant by another bill, C-208, which had passed second reading, committee discussion and report stage and was awaiting third reading. The first item of business listed on the order paper that day was Bill C-208, an act respecting National Heritage Day.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

It is my understanding that Bill C-208 was not called because the government is to introduce a comprehensive bill dealing with all holidays. Recognizing that the Department of the Secretary of State is not progressing as fast as many of us would like, I agreed on March 14 in this House to an amendment to the Canada Day bill, Bill C-231. An intervention by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on that occasion suggested that a member could not propose, himself, that the subject matter of his own bill be sent to committee. This point of order was upheld by the Chair. On Tuesday last I was advised that an agreement had been reached that the bill under discussion would be withdrawn and that unanimous consent would be requested for the withdrawal. Thus, when the member sponsoring the bill rose at a half-minute to six and was recognized, I assumed it was for this purpose. I was also under the impression, from the procedure followed on the previous point of order, that the sponsoring member would be out of order in making the proposal to send the subject matter to committee. Mr. Speaker, I called "No" on Tuesday at 6 p.m. and was prepared to speak at that time. I was not heard or recognized, in the noise, as everyone rose to leave the House.

I would like to make five points. One, the first item of business, Bill C-208, was not called and there was no indication from the government that it wished this item of business to remain at the head on the list. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that such an indication is very important, since National Heritage Day has already been incorporated into labour agreements and members receive many letters from workers who maintain that they are being deprived of an assumed benefit due to the lack of progress of this House on a measure that would receive all-party support if it were called.

My question deals with the procedure that was followed at precisely 6 p.m. on Tuesday last. The amendment by the member was out of order. Why was it not so ruled? Why was that member permitted to stand again and be recognized for a second time, when at least three other members had risen and had not been recognized?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member ought to proceed to develop a question of privilege if he feels that in some way the procedures that were adopted in respect of private members' business treated him unfairly. However, there is certainly no point in the hon. member carrying on a discussion as to whether or not any decision or action taken by the Chair was consistent with the circumstances at that time or was in order or out of order. That simply constitutes an appeal to the person now occupying the chair against the person occupying the chair at that time. The hon. member ought not to use his time on that question.

**Mr. Herbert:** I apologize, Mr. Speaker. The point I want to make is this: when we have already reached six o'clock, would it not be a preferable procedure for the Speaker to ask if there is agreement that he should not see the clock, in order that noise and confusion that often occurs at that hour should not hide from the Speaker the wishes of the members? "Unanimous" means every member present, and if there is in fact unanimity, then nothing is to be gained by rushing our procedures just because the hands of the clock have passed 6 p.m.