Point of Order

put, at which time I appealed. It was a tie vote which was subsequently broken by the chair.

It seems to me that the point of order or question of privilege, which ever it may be, that needs to be reviewed is whether or not it is improper to rule out of order a motion that has never been allowed to be put. It seems to me a rather bizarre ruling for the chair to take and one that certainly does not allow a member to peruse his or her democratic rights as a member of the committee.

Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the hon. member for Skeena is referring to the forestry committee meeting of yesterday or the environment committee meeting of the day before. There seems to be some confusion. Perhaps he would want to clarify that.

I would be quite happy to refer to the record of the committee which met on Tuesday. As the member will know, we began at 8.30 a.m. to hear six witnesses and it ran with some intermission for the House and other matters until the time of the vote on the amendment to the budget motion.

The member brought the motion to me and did not have an opportunity either to present it or speak to it until we were literally adjourning because of the vote in the House on the amendment to budget.

At that time as the member will recall, and I have the transcript before me, before the hon. member for Skeena even put the motion I said: "While on the motion, Mr. Fulton, I have had a brief opportunity to examine it. I think the committee is in a considerable difficulty as I read the motion. It in many ways has repeated the motion that you yourself presented in the House which then came to a vote and was defeated. I think that I would like to take the whole matter of the motion under advisement".

That is basically what I said. I think I repeated it several times. I will not burden the House with repeating it. I made it very clear to all members of the committee that I would look at it to make sure that it was in order.

At no time did I rule the motion out of order and the motion was of course not put. I was prepared to give a ruling at nine o'clock this morning. Unfortunately, the

member for Skeena was not present. In respect for his interest in this issue I stood the motion until such time as he is present. At that time I am prepared both to make a ruling and to deal with the motion.

I am sorry that the member did not confer with me at any time since the meeting on Tuesday to know that that would be the case.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member has taken the time to clarify. I think there is more on the record that could be read. I simply want to make it clear the concern that I have is not with the environment committee, although the member would certainly want to make clear that I did distribute the motion in writing to every member of the committee more than an hour prior to requesting that the vote be taken. I think the record will confirm that.

The point that I was raising was in relation to the ruling out of order of a motion. It was in fact exactly the same motion, but it was ruled out of order before it could ever even be read into the record. It was never even allowed to be put before it was ruled out of order.

I see the member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury here. Perhaps he would like to explain how it is that a motion that has not been put can be ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury, who is by the way a very fine fishing companion of the Speaker, wishes to engage in this debate, I will of course permit him to do so. I must counsel all members of the House that this is going beyond either privilege or order, but I will hear the hon. member.

Mr. J.W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for that kind commendation. Even the hon. member for Skeena would recognize that a fine fisherman is never all wrong.

The hon. member for Skeena came to the meeting of the forestry subcommittee yesterday for the first time. He came and gave me veiled warnings or advice as to what he had in mind.

I heard the first paragraph of the motion, which was exactly the same motion he had presented the day before to the environment committee at which I was present, as