

Point of Order

perhaps it will get no legislation at all. That is for the House to decide. In any case that should not prevent us from at least considering the amendments proposed to us by our colleagues in the other place.

• (1520)

Mr. Speaker: If I may assist hon. members, I will hear the rest of the argument from the Official Opposition. I will hear the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, then I will move to my hon. colleague who I know is going to present some wrap-up arguments for the New Democratic Party in the absence of the hon. member for Kamloops.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary on a point of order.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, may I also indicate that I would like to add at some point five or six minutes' worth of comments.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps in carrying on in the usual tradition, I could call on the parliamentary secretary after arguments are completed.

Mr. Gauthier: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I gave you notice yesterday that I wanted to add some brief comments.

Mr. Cooper: Again?

Mr. Gauthier: No more than you will do, but just as many.

Mr. Speaker: I thought yesterday I got the point. I will hear the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier first.

Mr. Milliken: I think he is prepared to let me go ahead, Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker is much helped by the agreement between colleagues in the Official Opposition. The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the points that have been raised by the government House leader. I may say that it has been helpful to have an opportunity to review the comments he made because he referred to so

many authorities in his speech the other day. I thought that I was going to have to spend hours reviewing them to find out exactly what point he was—

Mr. Speaker: Despite what the hon. member may have thought, I hope he has managed to adjust his thinking for this afternoon. I am sure the Speaker does not need to hear a commentary on all those authorities.

Mr. Milliken: That is the point of my comments, Mr. Speaker. I think that the member got carried away. I find it hard to believe that he read all the authorities, not because he could not have done so in the time he had available, but because if he had read them, he would not have cited them in support of the arguments he was putting forward, in my view.

There are basically five points I would like to make to Your Honour in connection with the arguments he made. First, there is the question of the point of order. I want to stress the general rule that a point of order in this House must be raised at the earliest possible opportunity. In support of that I rely on citation 321 of Beauchesne's sixth edition, which reads as follows:

321. A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in this case the Senate message rejecting this bill and suggesting amendments to it was sent back to this House.

On March 12 the government moved a motion rejecting certain of the amendments and accepting certain other of the amendments and stating for all the world to read what the government believed were the principles of the bill. I will come to that later.

That resolution was debated for two days in this House. The government invoked closure on March 13, when it was passed and the message was sent back to the Senate.

If the amendments that were proposed by the Senate were out of order at that time, I submit that it was the duty of the leader of the government in this House, to stand on his feet and object to those amendments.

Indeed, being a modest man, I am very reluctant to quote my own words. But on March 13, in the course of my contribution to the debate, I said exactly that. I know