

Point of Order—Mr. Herbert

the end of the sitting it will remain on the Order Paper and debate may continue some other day. So there is no question of abuse. In any case, the Standing Orders provide that when debate on such motions exceeds the private members' hour, they are allowed to stand. This is the second time we are debating the motion. Furthermore, if the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), whose argument and interpretation of what happened last Friday I cannot quite accept, is rising on a question of privilege today, it is certainly not the first time. He has done so on several occasions, and I could mention here a decision by the Chair, one of your distinguished predecessors, the Acting Speaker, handed down on December 5, 1977, concerning the business of the House during private members' hour, and if the then Acting Speaker took the trouble to hand down a three-page decision to clarify the proceedings for the guidance of hon. members and to reach a conclusion which may be somewhat different from that of the hon. member for Vaudreuil—I refer the hon. members for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) and Hamilton-Mountain (Mr. Deans) to that decision concerning private members' business.

However, I do not want to go on about this decision, it is there for all members to read and can only help to improve proceedings during private member's hour. Meanwhile, may I remind the hon. member that absolutely nothing is taken away. Questions of privilege and points of order are being raised constantly in this House, and if there is any abuse of the democratic process, it is coming from the opposite side.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The House was listening to the hon. member for Vaudreuil on a point of order. It has been brought to my attention by the Clerk of the House—and perhaps I could direct the attention of the hon. member to this—that all orders preceding No. 159 were allowed to stand by unanimous consent of the House. From what the hon. member was saying earlier, I gathered he was not satisfied with the manner in which the House proceeded with calling the bills. However, since this was done by unanimous consent I do not think it can be challenged by the hon. member. Therefore, the point of order cannot be pursued.

● (1710)

Mr. Collenette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With all due respect, you did not deal with the question of privilege which was at hand, and I submit it should be dealt with immediately. The hon. member for Yukon made a terrible accusation of an hon. member in this House, and it must be dealt with before any other matter.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I do not have the blues, but the charge which was alleged to have been made and which has been requested to be withdrawn was to the effect of obstructing the work of the House, if I understand correctly.

Beauchesne's fourth edition, Citation 154(5) at page 130 is as follows:

It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House.

I am sorry, I have quoted the wrong paragraph. According to paragraph (4):

It is not out of order to say that a member has obstructed the business of the House, or that a speech is an abuse of the rules of the House.

I do not assume there is a question of privilege but, after referring to the blues, if tomorrow the hon. member feels that he was accused wrongly, he can bring the matter up with Madam Speaker at the proper time. I find that there is no question of privilege.

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, I agree 100 per cent with what you have said but, because of the interruption, I did not come to my point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I suggest that be done forthwith.

Mr. Herbert: It certainly will. I suggest we did not follow on Friday a former procedure we have used in this House by which we substitute—this is on the record, and I can refer Your Honour to the page—one motion for another motion or one bill for another bill, dropping a member's bill down to a position where he has his second bill, thus making it clear to everyone that we have changed the position of two bills. This is the procedure we have followed in the past. I suggest this is the procedure we should have followed on Friday.

Furthermore, three of the first four bills which were referred to on Friday are marked "text received" by Your Honour's own ruling. By the ruling of the Chair bills which were not printed were to be dropped from the Order Paper but, in all fairness to the members who were submitting bills, some time was to be allowed so that where they had submitted texts, these texts could be studied and eventually the bills could be printed. If three of the first four bills in this particular grouping are still marked "text received", that means they have not been printed. Therefore, the rest of us have no knowledge of their contents. I suggest it is now time that where they were marked in that fashion, they should be dropped from the Order Paper in the same fashion that bills where no texts have been submitted are dropped from the Order Paper.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The hon. member may have a personal grievance about the manner in which it was done, but I must remind him that this could have been raised on Friday before unanimous consent was given. Again I remind the hon. member that I cannot entertain this point of order. I think it is a grievance. Perhaps it is a very legitimate personal grievance, but it certainly is not a point of order at this time.

Mr. Herbert: I must reserve my right to rise on a question of privilege on Monday.