

moving from one page to another page of his own notes, left out a phrase that was at the bottom of the page. It was simply a human error.

On both counts it has brought home again—as I think it always must, because in every case it is always well, I think, for a member to raise such errors or omissions when he sees them and bring them to the attention of the Chair, either in the House or privately—the reminder that we should always be vigilant that these errors may occur. After all, human error can take place, and editorial judgment has to be used from time to time. All of us should share the vigilance of the hon. member for Yukon in bringing such points to the attention of the Chair in order to make sure that we always have the highest quality of recording.

When we do have a human error, of course we try to point that out and make sure that we are conscious of it, but in this case there was certainly no aberration in the practices; I believe there was simply a mistake made. There was a judgment made in respect to the omission of the word “hypothetical” and that does concern me to a certain extent.

I also, with all hon. members, reflect on the relationship between the electronic facilities we have here and the human reporting facilities which we have had for so long. I think that it is essential we recognize on some occasions the superiority of the one over the other and make sure that in the future we have a useful combination of the two, and not a conflict, as may occur from time to time. Again, I reiterate that the way to ensure this is for all members to be vigilant whenever they spot any kind of error in *Hansard* and bring it to the attention of the Chair so that we can exercise the kind of quality control that all hon. members demand.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. HNATYSHYN—OPERATION OF STANDING ORDER 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of order with respect to the matter of the motion under Standing Order 43 moved by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), where the Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts) took opportunity to debate the motion prior to the allotted question period time and which, as I understood it—I did not hear over the general murmur that goes on in this chamber, therefore, I may not have heard you clearly, sir—gave me the impression that we may be inadvertently moving into an area of precedent which might be contrary to what I suspect is the spirit and the intentions of the standing orders and the rules of this House.

I wonder if I could beg your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to speak at some little time to put forward my contention with respect to my understanding of the procedure and the rules relating to Standing Order 43, for I believe, sir, that you did indicate at the time when the debate was interrupted that the matter would be considered under government orders, which, in the vernacular, means that the matter will come back again

Point of Order—Mr. Hnatyshyn

at the pleasure of the government itself, as opposed to the pleasure of this House.

I would just like to make my points procedurally on the basis of precedent, and if I may be permitted to do so at this time it would then be appropriate for you to take the matter under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Certainly, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) will be permitted to proceed with the point. I would like to set the record straight and then the matter can be discussed.

By virtue of relatively recent changes in our procedures, we have transferred the consideration or the calling of motions pursuant to Standing Order 43 to the beginning of the day, prior to the question period.

This problem has arisen once or twice in the past. On those rare occasions when the House does give its consent that the motion be presented, the question is put. The question is not, as all hon. members will know, when an application is made pursuant to Standing Order 43, for the passage of the motion, but simply for the putting of the question, for there is no authority to put a motion at that hour of the day, or, for that matter, at any time by a private member, outside of the private members' hour. Therefore authority is sought, pursuant to Standing Order 43, to put the question, and the question being asked is not the consent of the House to pass the motion, but the consent of the House to put the motion.

Occasionally the House gives it consent, as it did today. Therefore, when the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) put the question earlier, he was seeking the consent of the House that his motion be put, and since the House gave its consent, the motion was put. The motion then becomes debatable, and it is the duty of the Chair therefore to call the motion for debate: “Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?” Any members then rising obviously must be recognized by the Chair for participation in the debate. Today, the only member who was rising at the time of the calling of the question was the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Roberts). At 2.15 a confrontation, or collision, occurs between that rule pursuant to Standing Order 43, and that practice in another standing order which prescribes that the question period shall begin at 2.15 and continue until three o'clock.

I want to refer hon. members to Standing Order 45(2) which reads:

When a debate on any motion made prior to the reading of the orders of the day is adjourned or interrupted, the order for resumption of the same shall be transferred to and considered under government orders.

It seems to me that we had two choices at 2.15. One of them was, by virtue of having put a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43, to set aside the question period at 2.15 because the debate was under way. Obviously the danger with that is that if we set aside the question period and the debate carries on—for example, until three o'clock or later—we would need the consent of the House to restore the question period. So, the risk is that if we continue with the debate at 2.15 we wipe out