

time, at each and every stage of the bill? That is significant to the privileges of each member of the House and it is significant to the privileges of all members of this House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: I intend to respond very quickly and immediately to the point made by the hon. member, not because the hon. member does not put forward a grievance. He does, and he puts it forward with argument and with eloquence, but he is asking me to interfere on the basis that it is privilege.

I do not think that I can do that, at least not under the circumstances. The government, for whatever reason, has decided to follow orders of this place which are placed here as a consequence of the will of the House and to which we are all bound.

• (1510)

Second, as a consequence of the time allocation order, there has to be a vote of this House. That takes authority over other things. I take nothing away from what the hon. member has said. His grievance has been very well put forward, clearly, succinctly, and with some passion, but it is not a question of privilege.

* * *

[Translation]

POINT OF ORDER

BILL C-21

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the point raised by the Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons yesterday concerning Bill C-21. I need some guidance, and I would like the Chair to reflect on the comments I am going to make.

The minister raised a point of order to argue his case against the message of the Senate regarding Bill C-21.

I had some difficulty with the debate yesterday, because to me it seemed highly irregular—

Mr. Speaker: One moment, please.

Point of Order

[English]

I think I indicated yesterday that, accepting the invitation of the hon. member for Kamloops, I was going to put off further argument on that matter until I could consult with all parties, and come back at a time convenient to everybody.

At least one member came to me earlier today and wanted to know if I was going to proceed this afternoon. I said I have no intention of proceeding this afternoon. There is no need, in case anybody feels that they are not yet in a position to argue, to proceed.

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier probably does have some points which will be of help to me. I would ask hon. members to concur and to accept the arrangement which we made yesterday. That is where it is going to be. I will come back to all hon. members involved as soon as it is appropriate.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste the time of the House. I am just trying to understand the process here, because rules and order of this House is what the Chair is supposed to keep. I understand that. I want to make sure that I understand the same rules.

In view of citation 315 of the fifth edition of Beauchesne, I just want to ask why, yesterday, a point of order was allowed on a decision made by a majority of this House some 20 days ago to return a message to the Senate, which contained an acceptance of one amendment and others in principle.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member alluded to that yesterday. It will be part of my eventual reply. It is part of the argument that takes place as to whether or not the point of order was, under all the circumstances, even in order. I will deal with all that.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne's fifth edition, Citation 315:

(2) It is irregular to reflect upon, argue against, or in any manner call in question in debate past acts or proceedings of the House,

That is what the minister did yesterday. I ask you to rule on that.

Mr. Speaker: I am not entirely sure the hon. member is right.

There was more than one message from the Senate. I am not going to argue the case of hon. members at the moment. The matter has been put off. I will come back.