

reflect upon, argue against or in any manner call in question the past acts and proceedings of the House, or to speak in abusive and disrespectful terms of an act of Parliament.

I went on to state yesterday that this is clearly upheld in Erskine May's nineteenth edition at page 153. Finally, I want to put on the record what is found on page 424 of Erskine May's nineteenth edition under the heading of "Reflecting upon votes of the House." It reads:

The objections to the practice of referring to past debates apply with greater force to reflections upon votes of the House, unless made for the purpose of justifying a motion that the vote be rescinded. Those reflections not only revive discussion upon questions already decided, but are wholly irregular, inasmuch as the member is himself included in, and bound by, a vote agreed to by a majority.

We have been sitting here for the last few weeks and we have seen, in my humble submission, the rules of the House transgressed with some regularity. I think it is about time that members, no matter where they sit in the House, put an end to this kind of situation from occurring any further. I would submit—

Madam Speaker: I would like the hon. member to refrain from referring to the fact that the rules have been transgressed. As far as I know, I have tried not to have those rules transgressed. If the hon. member feels that they have been transgressed then he must tell me exactly on what occasion and I will try to make the necessary redress. I think it would be preferable if the hon. member stuck to the point he wants to make just now.

Mr. Collenette: Madam Speaker, I certainly withdraw my last statement. Perhaps my emotion, as a result of what occurred yesterday, ran away with my reason. But certainly the example that I gave today clearly underlines the fact that there has been a transgression of the rules of the House. When I rose and brought this to the attention of the House yesterday, as reported on page 17737 of *Hansard*, the Acting Speaker undertook to review the record and reserved judgment on it. This is why I feel it is entirely appropriate for me to raise this matter today in this context.

Madam Speaker: I was aware the hon. member might raise a question of privilege, but the exact terms of it were only given to me as I came into the House. I knew that yesterday the Acting Speaker had taken the matter under advisement. Unfortunately, I was unable to check *Hansard* fully to see exactly what the hon. member was referring to. I tried very quickly to examine the quotations from Erskine May to which the hon. member referred but I have been unable to check his other quotations. Therefore, I have to reserve judgment on the matter.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I certainly have no objection to your reserving your ruling on the matter. But I trust that you will hear other submissions, if you are going to treat the matter raised by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collenette) in any other fashion than absolutely frivolous and time wasting—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cousineau: You said that, oh, boy.

Point of Order—Mr. Hnatyshyn

Mr. Nielsen: Therefore, I would submit, Madam Speaker, that you hear other contributions before coming to a decision—if you are going to treat the matter raised by the hon. member for York East with any seriousness at all. Since he complains about the attribution of motives by one member to another, I would suggest that you also take into consideration page 17738 of *Hansard*. You will find there that, in response to a submission I was making at the time with respect to extended time, the hon. member for York East interjected an accusation by use of the word "blackmail". He introduced that interjection with the obvious intention of accusing me of attempting to blackmail the House. My motives certainly were not those which the interjection of the hon. member for York East conveyed. My purpose in rising is to suggest that there would be an obligation on the Chair to hear other submissions, if the matter is to be treated seriously at all.

• (1510)

Madam Speaker: First of all, no one indicated an intention to speak on the particular question of privilege. However, it is still open to the Chair, after examining the first submission by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collenette), to come back to the House and request further submissions. There is no problem there, if the Chair feels there is any necessity to go further into the matter.

Is the hon. member raising a new question of privilege about expressions which were used yesterday? He is signalling in the negative. That is fine; that is clear.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I do not like to have my signals interpreted for *Hansard*. I can say categorically that I do not have the kind of thin skin which the hon. member for York East has. Even though his description of my motive leaves something to be desired in so far as his conduct is concerned, I have no intention of wasting the time of the House by raising a question of privilege on it.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. HNATYSHYN—TABLING OF GUIDELINES FOR MINISTERS

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to question period today. During the course of question period the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in response to questions relating to the guidelines and directives sent to ministers regarding communications with members of the judiciary in the performance of their duties, read from the guidelines. If Madam Speaker looks at the "blues", I think she will see that he was reading, in response to the questions of the hon. member for Durham-Northumberland (Mr. Lawrence), from the guidelines themselves. Those guidelines have been unavailable to us as Members of Parliament and have been retained as secret documents by the government.

Mr. Cousineau: He read from *Hansard*.